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2003 CTA Fall Meeting
October 24, 2003 — Business Meeting
Ramada Plaza, 1702 Commerce Street, Fort Worth
Presidents’ Forum

Clell L. Bond

Take those artifacts and shove ’em. Hopefully that’s not what you’ll hear when you take your Held-in-Trust collection (that means those artifacts you excavated under an Antiquities Permit) to your favorite curation facility. It seems like forever that the CTA, the Texas Historical Commission (THC), several curatorial facilities and various state agencies have been discussing, debating and holding meetings about how artifact collections must be inventoried and finally stored for eternity.

First we went round and round over the 3-D issues of disposal, deaccession or destructive analysis of collections from state lands. Driven in part by the massive collections held by a few state agencies, much of truth in the issue related to the huge cost of preparing the collections for curation and the potential that such curation might overwhelm the facilities who could accept them. After more debate at the Antiquities Advisory Board on what parts of a collection are important and what are simply redundant, the disposal part of the process is now functional and portions of one huge collection will not be occupying space on the shelves of the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory. Now that the disposal threshold has been crossed it is very likely we will soon see other requests to reduce the size of collections before submittal for curation.

The second salvo was the almost never-ending debate about the definition of the term “inventory”. The issue centered on the term’s use in Rule 29.3 of Chapter 29 (Management and Care of Artifact Collections) of the Texas Administrative Code. Almost everyone seemed to have an opinion on the issue. When Rule 29.3 was brought out of the closet at a THC Collections Management Committee meeting in Abilene in the spring of 2002, the meeting was well attended and animated. With each successive public hearing the attendance declined until the archeological community was primarily represented by state agencies that had large artifact collections and faced a curation dilemma. In the end the term “inventory” was left in the proposed rules, albeit with some qualifiers; however, in talking to many of the active participants in the debate, one has the feeling that there is not full trust in the rules or the process under which they were developed. The THC has some new rules; many remain apprehensive about how they are going to be applied.

Having decided what artifacts to curate and recognizing that we need an accurate specimen inventory, we now need a facility to curate them. To that end the THC is moving forward with a program to certify curatorial facilities. Although the underlying need for such certifications may be a noble cause, there is considerable concern about the proposed rules that will implement the program. Concerns expressed by other agencies, several curatorial facilities and CTA members include the proposed time frame for certification, conflicts with other Chapter 26 rules, inventory costs, provisional status of facilities, inventory accuracy, disabling factors for facilities, and an overly long application process. The newly revised rules have now been published in the August 15, 2003, Texas Register and will be discussed and probably adopted at the next quarterly THC meeting in Amarillo on October 16 and 17.

CTA members need to keep abreast of these issues and rules and be prepared to comment if you see an issue that may affect your ability to conduct archeology. Having attended a number of sessions related to the above issues in the last couple of years, I can assure you that your voice, while not always heeded, does cause those who formulate these rules to take notice and consider their actions.
Kevin Miller

PRESIDENT-ELECT

When I was nominated for President-elect in the spring meeting, my first thoughts were, “Do I really want to do this? If so, why?” After much debate, the answers to my initial questions became “yes” and “because I believe in the organization and believe I can help forward the CTA’s goals and vision.” Since my election, I have received a wide range of responses, from hearty congratulations and good lucks to dire warnings and questions regarding my sanity. Naturally, I have ignored the more downbeat responses and have become more focused and excited about the prospects of becoming president and leading the organization in the coming years. The upcoming fall CTA meeting in Fort Worth is a wonderful opportunity for me to meet members, hear more opinions and debates, and begin to get more involved in the basic nuts and bolts of the organization.

As my first contribution to the newsletter, I do not want to begin by providing a long laundry list of issues and optimistic goals I have for the CTA (but I do have them!). Over the years, the number of topics and initiatives addressed by the CTA has grown to cover quite a wide spectrum, from curation to membership to public outreach to legislative issues regarding professional archaeology. My goal will be to continue to address these issues and build on these initiatives that are vitally important to the CTA and professional archaeology in Texas. As I stated in my nomination speech, I will strive to bring a new perspective and strong leadership to the organization. I firmly believe the CTA can be one of the most effective organizations of its kind in the country, a forum for the exchange of ideas and knowledge regarding Texas archaeology, a place viewed by both new and established archaeologists in all fields as an important institution to be a member of and to contribute to.

With this in mind, one of my more immediate goals is to foster better communication between CTA members, committees, officers, and the public. As I have become more involved in the basic functions of the organization since the Spring meeting, it has become apparent that the CTA needs to improve its communicational structure. I was quite frankly surprised to find out how little officers, committees, and the general membership communicate outside of the month or two leading up to the Spring and Fall meetings. As Newsletter Editor Andy Malof so aptly points out in his article herein, the basic nature of the organization (group of volunteers with very busy schedules) lends itself to these lapses in communication and, in my opinion, a loss of momentum and action. I want to begin to overcome some of this through initiatives designed to promote communication and action in the CTA. Utilizing feedback I hope to get from talking to many of you at the Fall meetings, I plan on putting forth initiatives next year that will overcome this challenge, such as emails, possibly conference calls, and an upgrade in the design and functions of our website. So, I look forward to seeing you in Fort Worth, drinking a beer, and bending your ear a little.

Missi Green

SECRETARY-TREASURER REPORT

Hope everyone had a great summer! Now it’s time to think about the Fall meeting in Fort Worth and getting together with all our old friends and compare the summer’s digging stories! I look forward to seeing everyone there!

Keep in mind that the dues for CTA are for the calendar year — January to January. I will be sending out renewal notices via e-mail in December. When renewing, please make sure that I have your information correct, especially your e-mail. Paying dues and renewing your membership is easy through PayPal. If you have problems or would rather renew the old fashioned way, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Currently, we have 139 members of CTA, and 40 contractors on the list. These numbers are not bad, but I’d like to get a few new members, and a few old members, into CTA next year. All of the accounts are in the black: $13,298.99 in checking, $8,694.62 in money market, and $6,746.05 in the scholarship fund.

By the April meeting the Contractors’ List was just over half the number of last year. By the
end of May, we had almost the full list paid for 2003. By using a “deactivation” method on the webpage, contractors quickly paid so that their listing became current. Thank you all for paying attention to the webpage and paying your dues!!

Andy Malof

NEWSLETTER EDITOR REPORT

It seems as though it’s been quite some time since a newsletter was out. I guess that’s because it was March/April, just before the last meeting. It’s an interesting schedule; three newsletters in quick succession (September, December/January, March/April), then six months without one. I guess that’s to guard against complacency. So now that I’m well into my second year as editor, and have had a leisurely summer to contemplate such things, I have an observation about the nature of CTA’s business.

During each of the two meetings held each year, the first in April, the second in October, a number of issues invariably arise, are discussed, then dealt with or set aside for the time being. It is this second category that I find interesting. These are items that are initiated through discussion, often as a means of addressing some larger issue or problem. Much like brainstorming, ideas are tossed about, considered, but rarely fully accepted or rejected. Usually, it’s the “devil in the details” that results in the tabling of some measure. To be reexamined at the next meeting. Six months later. Problem is, this does not always happen, and if it does, there is no guarantee of action.

As an example, the ongoing issue of increasing membership. One year ago it was suggested that by making memberships available to “techs,” these archaeologists could be brought in and convinced of the value of the organization. One method was to have the firms pony up the dues. Another was through providing one-year trial memberships. Then the issue became how to make these memberships valuable to those persons. Well, the most obvious way was to post job openings, as well as providing a means for archaeologists to promote their availability, with the website the most efficient means of accomplishing those goals.

The item came up again six months ago, and all present at (the much better attended) Spring meeting seemed to agree. And now, six months later, there is no apparent movement towards reaching those goals.

These observations are made not to point fingers or cast blame. It’s the nature of the beast, a group of volunteers who take time from their busy schedules in order to try to improve and strengthen the world of Texas archaeology. This is acknowledged when these ideas come up. The Communications Committee (old Web Site Committee) has made active pleas for assistance. Other committees and action groups are also always in need of help through ideas and time. Yet we all have other things to do, and it’s easy to let noble concepts hibernate for six month stretches.

There are ways, I think, to improve the situation. One is to start with the newsletter. Probably the most valuable aspect of the newsletter is the Minutes section. Missi Green puts an enormous amount of energy into capturing meeting events. Simply by pulling out (or down) the newsletter and reviewing the minutes from time to time would help to keep issues and ideas fresh and in the forefront. The same for the committee reports, Sue Linder-Linsley and Dan Julien have made the newsletter an immediately available resource. But it can’t help if it’s not utilized.

There is another resource I think is underutilized, and that’s the CTA Members e-mail list. This could be a very valuable tool for developing and maintaining momentum in CTA-related business. Simply by dropping a note to Dan Julien announcements of committee actions, requests for input and opportunities for involvement can be made immediate and therefore valuable. I might further suggest developing a Listserv, so that discussion regarding CTA matters could take place year-round.

So that’s my nickel. Perhaps in six months or so I’ll think about it again, or maybe I’ll be working on other things. In the meantime, thanks again to all of you that contributed to this newsletter. And even for those committees that had no action, I would still argue that a reminder of what the committee’s task is and what has been accomplished (or not accomplished) is a valuable and necessary part of keeping general membership informed, and more importantly, engaged.
Patricia A. Clabaugh, Chair

ACCREDITATION AND REVIEW COUNCIL

The Accreditation and Review Council will be meeting in Austin for a September planning and working session to continue our discussion on the future of ARC as a functional CTA committee. Since we are no longer tasked with accrediting institutions that house archaeological collections, we are assessing the need to revise our charter to reflect a new mission, or simply dissolve altogether. To date, the Texas Historical Commission has not asked ARC for copies of the existing accreditation documents. Nonetheless, these documents are available to all interested parties. Please contact Ms. Carolyn Spock at c.spock@mail.utexas.edu with specific requests.

The CTA Curation Guidelines are undergoing minor revisions to reflect current curatorial standards and a draft should be available for distribution this fall. The Accreditation and Review Council would like to hear from the CTA membership about these and any other curation issues.

Eric Schroeder, Chair

GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

There was no news from the Governmental Affairs side of the house except for the institutional certification policy that Clell covered in his report. I have provided a short synopsis of my view regarding survey methods, which is included in the Articles section of this newsletter.

Karl Kibler, Chair

MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

At the Spring 2003 meeting of the CTA the Membership committee was pleased to announce the recipient of the 2003 CTA Student Research Grant. This year’s recipient is CTA student member Scott Brosowske of the University of Oklahoma. The $500 grant will allow Mr. Brosowske to fund his ongoing research on the structure and organization of Late Prehistoric Plains Village-Southwest exchange networks. Mr. Brosowske plans to use the funds for x-ray fluorescence or XRF analysis in order to source obsidian artifacts from Alibates Ruin #28, an Antelope Creek phase site. The data generated by this analysis will be compared to trace element data from obsidian artifacts from Odessa phase sites in the Oklahoma panhandle, 80% of which are derived from Cerro Toledo, a Jemez Mountain source. Mr. Brosowske’s hypothesis is concerned with whether Alibates Ruin #28 served as a regional distribution center for obsidian and other Southwest trade goods or did Odessa phase groups and other Plains Villagers develop independent trade alliances with different eastern Pueblos, each controlling different sources of obsidian. Mr. Brosowske extends his thanks and gratitude to the CTA, and all of us wish him the best of luck in his research.

Last year’s recipient, Larkin Hood of the University of Washington, is continuing her research on the function and production of ceramic vessels and residential mobility of Ceramic Period hunters and gatherers of the Galveston Bay area. She presents some of her latest research and findings later in the newsletter.

In other matters regarding the CTA Student Research Grant the membership committee will soon be sending out the CTA’s annual notice announcing the research grant to colleges and universities across the state and surrounding states. Look for the announcement on a bulletin board near you! In closing I’d like to say that the CTA Student Research Grant fund is ALWAYS looking for contributions.
Kerri Barile, Chair

MULTICULTURAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE

As many of you know, the Multicultural Committee is in a period of adjustment. Dr. Alston Thoms resigned as chair in early 2002, and Bob Skiles, his co-chair, decided to step down earlier this year. Despite being ‘leaderless’ the remainder of the committee has continued to foster relationships between the CTA and various organizations throughout the state. For example, the Texas Archeological Society’s Native American Scholarship Fund, facilitated by CTA member Margaret Howard and partially financed by the CTA, was extremely successful at this year’s field school (see Jonelle Miller’s article, this newsletter).

A few days ago (September 2), I joined the Multicultural Committee as the new chairperson. I would like to offer here, in brief, my two cents on the current direction of the committee and possible ideas for future outreach. Though part of this discussion is biased towards my own personal interests, most is based on general observations at various CTA meetings, as well as communication with those doing archaeology throughout the state.

Over the years, the committee has continued to reach out to the many Native American groups living throughout the state and has been very successful. This interaction is certainly of utmost importance to Texas archaeology, and it is an avenue that should always be considered an integral part of this committee. It seems, however, that we have become more of a ‘bicultural’ committee (if I can be callous and ignorant enough to group all Native American tribes together) by circumventing all other non-Anglo groups in our examination of Texas culture.

When I moved to Texas about four years ago, one of the things I immediately found unique about this area is the multitude of people that have come to call themselves Texans in a relatively period of time. All of these groups have contributed to Texas culture and left an indelible imprint on the material fabric that we, as archaeologists, study every day. Texas multiculturalism, therefore, should include Mexican- and Spanish-Americans, African-Americans, German-Americans, Asian-Americans, and all of the other groups who came to this state. We regularly work on missions, plantations, and railroad encampments and address the larger issues of ethnicity, race, and hegemony, but until now, the CTA, the primary group of professional archaeologists in the state, has generally preferred to shy away from propagating a discussion on these types of sites.

More importantly, many of these groups have very active descendent and local community support, and the CTA should acknowledge these groups and their contributions to historic preservation. For example, several of my fellow graduate students at UT-Austin are working with Black Dallas Remembered on several archaeological projects in Dallas through the university, and the descendent group has outright said that they were shocked any archaeologists in the state cared about their culture.

With that said, I suggest that the CTA’s multicultural committee (and membership at large) continue to reach out to the many Native American groups throughout the state, but I would add that the CTA should return the ‘multi’ to the cultural portion of what we do. If anyone is working with descendent communities out there or knows of a group that might need our help or guidance, let us know. Through better communication on these types of actions, we can hopefully increase awareness of Texas archaeology and maybe even increase CTA membership. More importantly, perhaps we can develop a support group for people studying these issues, like similar groups sponsored by national organizations like the SAA and the SHA. Watch out, though, I’ll be hitting you all up for volunteers and ideas in Fort Worth...
This fall the Public Education Committee will begin to accept nominations for the coming spring’s E. Mott Davis Award for Public Outreach in Archaeology. Now in its fourth year, the award recognizes efforts by archaeological firms and project sponsors in making CRM investigations accessible to the public. The award is named for Professor E. Mott Davis in honor of his lifelong contributions in bridging the gap between professional archaeology and the lay public. CRM archaeological projects that include contributions in public outreach or education are eligible. Past nominations have featured publicly oriented books and brochures, museum exhibits, classroom curricula, public lectures, and site tours. Nomination forms are available on the CTA web site.

During the past spring meeting, the 3rd annual E. Mott Davis award was presented to Hicks & Company and the City of Austin for their efforts on the New City Hall Development Project in downtown Austin. Nominees for Hicks & Company included Dr. James Karbula, Cultural Resources Director and project Principal Investigator, and Rachel Feit and John Clark, project archaeologists. Receiving the award for the City of Austin was Ron Davis, project manager from the City of Austin Department of Public Works and Transportation, Architectural and Engineering Services Division. This project, which studied Austin’s nineteenth-century red light district, Guytown, was interpreted for the public in a series of lectures to local clubs and associations, television interviews, tours of the area’s historic buildings, especially the Schneider Beer Vaults which the project helped to preserve by raising public and city awareness of their historic importance, popular articles, and a contribution to the Texas Beyond History web site. Future plans include a popular publication and the development of an exhibit for the city.

Other nominees for this past year’s award included Southwest Texas State University for the Burleson Homestead Archaeological Project and Antiquities Planning and Consulting and URS Corporation for their public outreach activities at the Indian Mesa Wind Farm. The Burleson Homestead Archaeological Project represents the combined efforts of the University Administration, the Center for Archaeological Studies, and the Aquarena Center to increase public awareness of archaeology, especially the archaeology of San Marcos and the Southwest Texas State University campus. The project featured archival and archaeological research at the site that was incorporated into public lectures as well as providing information for public tours at the university’s Aquarena Center. In addition to the approximately 250,000 annual visitors to Aquarena who learn about the history and archaeology of the Edward Burleson Homestead, the project has sponsored mock excavations for school children near the homestead. Individual nominees for the project were Dr. C. Britt Bousman, Director of the Center for Archaeological Studies, Dr. Michael Abbott, Special Assistant to the President, and Ron Coley, Director of the Aquarena Center. The other nominee, the Indian Mesa Wind Farm Survey and Investigations, was selected for a public brochure describing investigations of a burned rock midden at Indian Mesa in Pecos County near Fort Stockton. The brochure, which was distributed to Fort Stockton historical museums and the public library for distribution during Texas Archeology Awareness Month, presents information on the excavation and interpretation of a crescent midden pit oven feature that was damaged during construction of an access road for a wind turbine farm in the eastern Trans Pecos region. Individual nominees were Molly Godwin for Antiquities Planning and Consulting, and Joe D. Kuebler, P.E., project manager for URS Corporation.
The Spring meeting of CTA was called to order by President Clell Bond at 9:40 am. Clell welcomed everyone and thanked Shellie Sullo for hosting the meeting at Camp Mabry. He thanked all of the committee chairs for the work they’ve done since the last meeting, particularly the Nominations, Contractors’ List, and Education committees.

The meeting began with some Announcements beginning with the Saturday research papers portion of this spring’s meeting was cancelled. The committee behind the Saturday session had no response to their solicitation for papers, and Steve Black admitted that they had not pushed real hard to get it going until it was too late, and they will try it again next year. Also, it was announced that there were changes for the Fall session with TAS being discussed and that an increased focus on increasing the numbers of papers being presented on Texas archeology would be emphasized. This year’s Fall meeting will be in Fort Worth.

There will be seven papers presented this afternoon concentrating on historic archeology in Texas. Afterward, the social will be at the picnic ground on Camp Mabry, and thanks go to the committee that always make it special. Reeda Peel will have some of her rock art forms for folks to use and comment on. You’ll need to check out her display in the display room on how to fill out these forms.

Lastly, CTA is going almost totally electronic—newsletters, dues, you name it. Please let Missi know when your e-mail changes so that the database can be kept up to date. A short discussion on the use of passwords for getting to the newsletters took place and will be discussed later in the meeting procedures. Clell then asked for the approval of the Fall meeting minutes as they were published in the latest newsletter. It was moved, seconded, and passed.

In his President’s Report, Clell reported that he had participated in several meetings including the Advisory Board and collection management meetings in San Antonio in January and the TAS Annual Meeting planning meeting in Fort Worth in late February. At the Advisory Board meeting, several topics were discussed including TxDOT’s decision to deaccession artifacts and other curation issues, and censure of a PI for not following procedure on obtaining permits. There were discussions at the TAS planning meeting of changes for CTA at the annual meeting. These changes will affect CTA’s meeting time at TAS. At the Stewards meeting several new stewards were elected.

The Past President’s Report was presented by David Brown. David also attended the TAS meeting where CTA and TAS integration in the future was discussed. He also was part of continuing discussions with the consulting parties concerning 41VT98. The Galveston Corps of Engineers have revised the research design submitted to the Advisory Council and resubmitted, with the Advisory Council now agreeing to the research design. The revised research design should be submitted to all consulting parties for review in the very near future. The basic resolution is that some analyses will take place.

Newsletter Editor Andy Malof thanked those who contributed reports and articles that keep the newsletter interesting.

Secretary-Treasurer Missi Green reported that the accounts are indeed growing. The use of the electronic payment method was working quite well, although PayPal did take a minimal fee for each transaction: $1.03 for a $25 transaction, $0.74 for a $15 transaction, and $3.93 for a $125 transaction. Membership was continuing to grow and the Contractors’ List was over half the number expected for the year.

Committee Reports

**Governmental Affairs:** Chair Eric Schroeder indicated that there were three bills CTA needed to watch. House Bill 929, the unmarked burial bill, will die without support. A letter of support from CTA would be helpful to show additional support. House Bill 1434 is in support of development of a catalog of artifacts from burial sites no matter where or how the artifacts
were excavated. This is still in committee, but there are some fiscal and responsibility issues to be worked out. Senate Bill 301 approves a Native American liaison in the Governor’s Office. This is currently assigned to the State Affairs committee. Eric mentioned that the Native Americans are getting organized and pushing for all of these bills. (It was agreed that letters of support should be forwarded with Clell’s signature indicating that CTA is in full support, and that HB 929, in particular, be supported with affirmative defense from prosecution language.)

Contractors’ List: Chair Meg Cruse asked that any changes for the list be in to the committee by the end of the week (week of April 7) so that the changes can be made and incorporated into the web page by the end of the month. Any additional changes will be made at a one-month time frame after this meeting.

Public Education: David Brown spoke for the committee announcing that Dana Anthony had resigned as chair and he would take over. The committee hasn’t met formally since the last meeting, but has been in contact. The main topic of business was the nominees for the E. Mott Davis Award, of which there were three.

Multicultural Relations: Bob Skiles has resigned as chair due to health concerns. Alston Thoms spoke for the committee and would like a new chair appointed (volunteered). He did, however, correspond with Bob and Eric Schroeder on the legislation being presented.

CTA Web Page: Dan Julien spoke for the committee stating that the web site is still operating, with 565 visitors last month. The most popular hits were the Frequently Asked Questions, the Contractors’ List (474 hits) and then general viewing. Steve Black suggested that the site have meeting information posted free, with no need for a password. Suggestion was taken under consideration.

Membership: Chair Karl Kibler reported that the committee is still interested in increasing the membership with field techs, but how do we get them interested. Suggested that posting jobs on the page might be an attraction to techs, providing it as a free service. This issue will continue to be discussed within the committee.

Karl also announced the newest recipient of the latest Scholarship Fund award. Scott Brosowski at the University of Oklahoma is examining the organization of Southern Plains regional and interregional exchange during the Late Prehistoric period. In doing so, he hopes that the scholarship funds will support his x-ray fluorescence analysis on a sample of obsidian artifacts from the Alibates Ruin #28. Congratulations to Scott! In addition, last year’s winner, Larkin Hood, has contributed some information on her studies on hunter-gatherer ceramic production and use on the Upper Texas Coastal Plain in the most recent newsletter. Check it out!

Accreditation and Review Council: Carolyn Spock spoke for this committee stating that it was working in an advisory role now. It was continuing to go through some self evaluation; considering tackling the CTA guidelines on curation for updating; and considering polling the membership for committee direction. The committee hoped to have an update on the guidelines by the next newsletter.

Anti-Looting: Chair Todd McMakin indicated that the committee seems to have hit a brick wall, but feels that the committee is important and should be revitalized. Pat Mercado-Allinger has a pocket brochure designed as a public outreach tool and had the committee review the text. It is currently being distributed by THC. The committee has $500 at their disposal for production of posters and suggested that this money be reassigned for the insert in the THC brochure. And as always, anyone who would like to join, please do.

Survey Standards: Chair Marianne Marek reported that the standards are completed and have been published.

Old Business

Steve Black announced that a new exhibit on Timber Hill could be found at Texas Beyond History and that smaller exhibits were coming soon. They’ve been getting up to 1500 hits a day, and becoming more visible through different links. At the last meeting, Ron Ralph asked for a breakdown on funds, and that breakdown was distributed to the membership by Steve. Basically $187,010 was brought in through donations and grants, although the dream
would be $250,000 a year. He asked that CTA be a partner again this next year with another donation of $2000; he asked the membership to donate individually as well.

Reeda Peel made an appeal for support for the rock art database. There has been much development and moving forward. The rock art database committee is trying to develop a well thought-out, concise form, which is essential for the database. Marietta Tretter, a database specialist at TAMU, is assisting in the development. She requested input from CTA and brought a faux rock art panel to use as an experiment. Forms have been provided and input requested to make the form a better tool.

**New Business**

Jeff Williams, a student at Stephen F. Austin, worked on the Columbia Shuttle debris field mapping project early in the recovery stage. He presented a report of the results of the size and magnitude of the recovery effort and the area affected. Using high resolution GPS equipment and GIS, he was part of the crew used to map the early recovery efforts. He also pointed out that debris is entering the soil matrix in East Texas and that this will be a problem for archeologists now and in the future; that archeologists and THC must be aware of the size and degree of the debris field. Maps depicting this linear debris field will be completed in May and should be available on the Forest Service website.

Duane Peter of Geo-Marine, Inc. announced that he and James Karbula of Hicks and Company, as Board members of the American Cultural Resources Association (ACRA), should make the membership aware of certain legislative issues affecting our profession. Those issues being curation, cutting back on preservation funding, and streamlining environmental, and subsequently, cultural resources laws. He noted that as a profession, we should emphasize the positive aspects of the profession, such as heritage tourism, since economics is what the current (Bush) administration will understand. He also mentioned that the ACRA annual meeting will be held in early September in Dallas this year where these and other important topics and how they will and should be addressed for the 21st century cultural resources profession will be discussed. Everyone is invited to attend.

Election of the President-Elect was next. Russ Brownlow presented the two candidates, Chris Lintz and Kevin Miller, to the membership and asked if there were any nominations from the floor — there were none. Each of the candidates made short statements about their background and their vision for CTA. Ballots were passed out, votes cast and tallied, and the winner announced. The new President-Elect for CTA is Kevin Miller! Congratulations!

Pam Wheat spoke about the TAS Academy. Two of the academies have been held and were well-attended. Marianne Marek acted as PI for the Houston Academy on their visit to the field, while Tom Hester served in that role at the San Antonio Academy. Over 140 people combined attended these two academies. The focused curriculum is toward preservation with the objective to get folks recording sites rather than collecting them away. The next Academy will be held in Fort Worth with Johnnie Byers as PI. Plans are already being made for the next three locations next year. Pam also mentioned the Speakers Bureau being set up on the TAS web site. This is an outlet for folks to find avocational and professional archeologists interested in volunteering to speak to groups about archeology and preservation in Texas. The Bureau would like some help from CTA.

Margaret Howard announced that TAS would like to provide the opportunity for sponsoring Native American groups to attend the TAS field school. At this point, five recognized groups and two bands have been invited to the San Saba field school. There would be a small stipend for travel provided and tuition, housing, and food provided once there. If all groups accept, the total cost would be $3500. She asked if CTA would help support this initiative.

The proposed budget was reviewed for approval. Margaret’s request for help at the TAS field school. Steve Black motioned that $500 be allotted to the TAS Field School for offering Native American groups the opportunity to attend. Alston Thoms made a friendly amendment to up that amount to $750 and Steve seconded. Some discussion of where these extra funds could be taken from was heard. Duane Peter suggested that the Anti-Looting monies be left alone, but take $250 from ARC to fill in the extra. Carolyn had
no objection to the money being moved from that committee, and a motion was passed on approving $750 for the TAS Field School Native American initiative. This amendment and the budget were unanimously approved.

There were two by-laws changes discussed: the name change for the Webpage Committee and Article 6.1 terminology change. The Webpage Committee asked at the last meeting that the name of the committee be changed to the Communications Committee. An amendment to the by-laws to place this committee with its name change in the by-laws was motioned. In addition, the wording of Article 6.1 stating that “membership will be notified 15 days by mail…” was suggested to be changed to delete the words “by mail.” Since nearly all of CTA business is now being conducted electronically, this no longer applies. There was no discussion on either topic and the motion to make these changes to the by-laws easily passed.

Lain Ellis gave a brief synopsis of the results the discussion and decision made at the Antiquities Advisory Board meeting of TxDOT’s proposal to deaccession a collection of 71,000 flakes from their collection. TxDOT proposed taking a random sample of flakes to finally curate rather than continue to curate the entire collection. Mark Denton added that this request finally got the attention of the AAB and new decisions were discussed. These new decisions will be presented in the next THC newsletter (which will be all electronic). TxDOT’s request was within the range of the new policy and the discussion of what to do with redundant diagnostic materials will soon hit the THC staff. The discussion will keep curation issues alive, therefore keeping CRM archaeology alive in Texas.

Clell asked the membership if the use of passwords to get the newsletter was really working; he didn’t think so. It was proposed that we abolish the password-protected newsletter. There was no discussion and it was passed unanimously.

THC Announcements: [Due to time constraints, these were presented after lunch and before the Historic Session of papers. The Historic session began after 2:00.]

Mark Denton indicated that the state budget crunch didn’t look terrible for THC, but the History Program has been hardest hit. There are no lay-offs planned, and there are four positions now open which will not be filled during the hiring freeze. Two archeologists may help out in the History Program temporarily, which may impact the Archeology Program a bit. The new fiscal year begins on September 1st, so hopefully the hiring freeze will be gone by then. John Nau would like to see economic development, so heritage tourism will be pushed even harder. He also mentioned that the Texas Preservation Trust Fund is not in jeopardy at this time. There is nearly $11 million in the Fund currently, though some of these funds may be redirected toward curatorial facilities.

The censure due to Antiquities Permit violation by a PI was discussed. Several years ago, the rules for addressing permits obtained after a project started were put in place. Once a year warnings are given and the Antiquities Advisory Board is made aware of the occurrence. There was more than one occurrence in a year and therefore censure was applied. The censured PI no longer lives or works in the state of Texas, but the investigative firm is also responsible. The firm has not been censured. Elton Prewitt noted that censure of the firm would depend on the circumstances, but it would be examined individually.

Mark also announced that the collections management policy document was approved, though it was not on the AAB agenda. The document only applies as an internal THC policy as it is currently approved. This document will become a new amendment to Chapter 26 for discussion, possibly at the May meeting.

Elton stated that attending the annual THC meetings is a MUST to get issues addressed at the AAB and THC. We need to speak out as archeologists. All of the committee meetings are public meetings, an individual just needs to sign up to speak on any issue as long as it’s on the agenda. He also mentioned that Eileen Johnson’s 6-year term expired in February, and she’d been asked to serve for another 6 years. John Nau is asking the governor to re-appoint her to the Commission, but he had no news as to whether this would happen.

As time was running out, Clell Bond asked for a move to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 12:50 pm.
Articles and Updates

We start the Articles and Updates section with a sample of abstracts from the afternoon Historic Archaeology session at last spring’s CTA meeting. If you weren’t able to attend, you missed some interesting and well-presented papers. Following is some important information from the THC. This has been distributed to various people at various times in various formats. Please be sure to review this information in order to facilitate the review process. As promised, Eric Schroeder presents a simplified version of his site probability model. (Be sure to see the Announcements section about the TxDOT workshop to be held at Fort Worth. It’s an opportunity to pursue this line of reasoning a bit further.) Steve Black then describes the latest additions to <TexasBeyondHistory.net>. If you haven’t reviewed these new pages, this should convince you. An example of immediate gratification, the CTA approval of funds for the TAS Native American Scholarship fund helped the program achieve its desired goals. A sample letter to a Native American group by Margaret Howard is followed up by an update article by Jonelle Miller. And finally, the (interim) results of research by Larkin Hood, recipient of the 2002 Student Research grant are presented. Ms. Hood is making steady progress towards her goal of gaining a better understanding of upper Texas coast hunter-gatherer interactions through the tracing of source sands incorporated into regional ceramics.

A Sample of Abstracts from Papers Given at the Spring 2003 CTA Meeting

Cutters, Choppers, Whackers, and Hackers: Archaeology, History, and our Cultural Memory of the Central Texas Cedar Industry

Kerri S. Barile

In Central Texas and beyond, the term ‘cedar chopper’ has become a trope for lazy and shiftless individuals. Recent archaeology, architectural analysis, archival research, and oral histories on cedar choppers and their camps, however, clearly indicate that the cedar industry was a carefully-organized and labor-intensive business; the cedar choppers themselves were industrious, hard working, and dedicated. This paper will suggest that the ‘othering’ of the cedar chopper has occurred in the past 100 years as they became marginalized in an increasingly class-conscious society. It is up to archaeologists and historians to erase our biased cultural memory and illuminate the importance and achievements of cedar workers in Central Texas history.

The Red River War Battle Sites Project: New Perspectives on the 1874 Indian Campaign in the Texas Panhandle

Bret Cruse

During 1998 and 1999 the Texas Historical Commission (THC) conducted archaeological investigations at four battle sites associated with the Red River War of 1874. Fought largely in the Texas Panhandle, the Red River War consisted of a series of battles and skirmishes waged between the U.S. Army and the Southern Plains Indian tribes that included the Comanche, Kiowa, Southern Cheyenne, and Arapaho. The war resulted in the defeat of the tribes and their removal to reservations in western Indian Territory.

The archeological investigations of the Red River War battle sites resulted in establishing the precise locations of the sites, determining approximate boundaries for the sites, and obtaining significant new data on the Indian Wars of the Southern Plains. Based on the number and types of cartridge cases recovered during the investigations, it appears that statements in the military accounts concerning the number of Indian combatants involved often were inflated, and statements concerning how well armed the Indians may have been exaggerated.
Archeological Investigations at the Colonial Capital of Texas: San Felipe de Austin, 41AU2

Marianne Marek

San Felipe de Austin was the headquarters and capital of the first Anglo colony in Texas. It was established in 1824 by Stephen F. Austin and flourished until 1836 when the Texans burned the town to the ground in order to prevent the advancing Mexican army from claiming it. This State Archeological Landmark has remained ignored and virtually undisturbed until a coalition of local organizations banded together and received two Texas Historic Preservation Trust fund grants to conduct investigations at the site. Archival research has identified the boundaries of the Colonial Town site, and shovel tests are demonstrating site integrity and pinpointing the location of colonial structures. Excavations are being conducted with the assistance of volunteers from local archeological and historical societies. The results of these investigations will be utilized to nominate the site to the National Register of Historic Places.

Concrete Airplanes & Subterranean Syrup Mills in North Texas

Alan Skinner

Archaeological surveys in north Texas recently recorded two historic sites with unexpected features. The first was what appeared to be a concrete watering trough that was in the shape of an airplane with a wingspan of more than 30 feet. Water had been maintained in the feature as it was a target used for training pilots to use their machine guns during World War I. The second was a sugar cane syrup mill that had a subterranean firebox, unlike other syrup mills in East Texas. Both sites were utilized in the first quarter of the twentieth century and both have heritage tourism potential.

Comments Regarding THC Reviewed Projects: Responsibilities of Contractors

Mark Denton, Texas Historical Commission

Restricted Site Information, Project and Site Plottings

The inclusion of plotted project and site boundaries with reports is a conversation we’ve all had many times before, but apparently the message didn’t get through to everyone so here’s the scoop one more time.

1) Each draft report submitted to the THC needs a figure containing a quad quality map plotting the project boundaries and all site locations (if any are recorded).

2) The map figure does not have to be integrated into the text of the draft report, it can be submitted as an attachment.

3) For the final reports, we need 19 copies without plotted site locations, but they should include some sort of project locational information (quad map quality is not needed and sometimes not appropriate if a site was recorded within a very small project area), and one copy with an attached quad quality map figure that does contain both the project boundaries and site locations (if any) plotted.

[Note: the 19 copies without the site plottings go to university libraries around the state, and the 1 copy goes into the THC’s library]

No Collection Policy During THC Reviewed Surveys

There have been a growing number of investigations being performed in which the PI proposes a “no collection” policy in association with survey level investigations, and for the majority of these projects the Review Section of AD has approved those proposals. However, I would request that you still fill in the permit application categories associated with curation just in case you do end up recovering artifacts after all. There is no commitment on the part of your company or agency to merely cite the potential curatorial facility on the application
and it helps decrease AD’s permit database record keeping problems. Please remember that you are responsible for explaining in your report whether you did curate something, regardless of whether you had a no collection policy prior to going into the field.

Dissemination of Restricted Data

Recently, Roger Moore sent the Archeology Division a letter containing a very good question. As a matter of fact, when Jim Bruseth, Dan Julien, Bill Martin and I sat down together to craft a response, the first thing we all expressed was wonder over why no one that we could remember had asked this question before. Rather than responding to Roger directly, we decided to repeat the question and response so that all of you in the CRM contract community could also receive our response.

The core of Roger’s question is about the issue of when is it appropriate and when is it not appropriate to share or give site-specific locational data to clients. He asked: “What are the standards for providing such information to clients in such cases? Also, have regulations been established for how to show sites and information about them in ArcView and other GIS systems? Specifically, how do such regulations, if any, apply in situations where we are sub-contracted through a non-governmental engineering/environmental company?”

While there are no specific regulations as to “how to show” restricted data, the Chapter 24 Rules associated with the THC’s Atlas database and all of our “Restricted Cultural Resource Information (RCRI)” do specifically discuss what is restricted and the legal responsibilities of authorized users. These rules provide a functional framework for the use of restricted information, but they do not provide details about what is basically ethical issues associated with sharing information that professional archeologists have access to. The fact is that the Chapter 24 rules regulate the THC and our use and distribution of sensitive “restricted” information more than they regulate outside third parties.

Owners of property that contains archeological sites have the right to have the specific site locational information about those sites. So, regardless of whether they request the information directly from the THC or through a third party, such as an archeologist or engineering consultant, we will give it to them. Once the information is in their hands, however, we no longer have control over that data and we realize that a city or county administrator may have to give up that information if requested under an open records request. There is nothing we can do about that situation. If a city or other governmental agency hires an archeologist to perform a survey, they and their engineering consultants obviously have a legitimate interest in and legal right to the data about site locations on the property in question. We believe however, that it is not necessarily appropriate for them or their engineering or environmental consulting firms to have restricted information on areas vastly outside of each specific project they are working on. If a governmental agency hires their own staff archeologist, then clearly he or she could compile a database of information on the entire county or beyond for planning purposes and that too would hopefully always be a legitimate and ethical use of that restricted data.

Roger’s question however, takes the issue a step further. What if an engineering consultant hires a staff or contract archeologist to compile a site database for them of several counties or the entire state, for the purpose of using that data for their consulting purposes? Or, to sell the data to other consulting firms or agencies. Is this a legitimate use? Would it be ethical or legal under Chapter 24 for a PI to gather and provide such data? We believe that such a situation is beyond the intent of the use of the Atlas database and that archeologists would be in violation of the agreement they have signed with us relative to their access to such data.

We hope that all archeologists will be able to explain the sensitive nature of this data and the need to restrict access to this data to help protect those sites. Hopefully, the creation of high probability or “sensitive zone” maps should be enough for your clients and their clients to still successfully plan projects without knowing exactly where all of the sites are. Once a specific project is planned, more specific information can be gathered and provided on an as-needed — (continued on page 20)
ACRA Conference, Dallas, Texas, Mid-September 2003

James Karbula

The American Cultural Resources Association (ACRA) annual conference was held at the Historic Stoneleigh Hotel in Dallas, Texas, on September 11-13, 2003. Representatives of CRM firms from across the United States convened in Dallas to gather information and to network over issues important to the future development of the industry. This year’s conference was hosted by Geo-Marine, Inc. and co-sponsored by SWCA, Inc. and Hicks & Company. The focus of numerous seminars was the business of Cultural Resources Management. One of the main attractions was the Plenary Session, Historic Preservation and the CRM Professional in the 21st Century. Mr. John L. Nau, III, Chairman of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation spoke at the session. Seminars were also held on various important topics for the industry, including Archiving in the Digital Age, Curation in the 21st Century, The Training of Professionals for the Future: The Role of Graduate Programs, Internships and Continuing Education, Winning and Maintaining Federal Contracts and Federal Outsourcing. There was also a very interesting session on Native American Sovereignty and the Consultation Process. In addition to Chairman Nau, guest speakers included representatives from the National Trust, the Office of the General Counsel, the National Park Service, US. Army Corps of Engineers, the Society for American Archaeology, SHPOs, universities and private firms from across the nation. The conference was well attended and a great success. As ACRA representatives, we will attempt to keep the CTA abreast of the important developments from the conference as well as any national legislative issues affecting our profession.

Be a part of the future of the cultural resources industry. Join ACRA today! Information on company memberships, benefits and conferences can be obtained on-line at <http://www.acra-crm.org>.

A Precedence-based Model for Determining Site Probability and Survey Methods

Eric Schroeder

For years CRM professionals have belabored the question of whether an archeological survey is needed, and if so what would be considered a reasonable level of effort to identify archeological sites within a given impact area. The question of whether a survey should be conducted or not is often in the hands of the agency official where it is usually decided based on a slew of reasons ranging from scientific to political. In those cases where an archeological survey is recommended, the justification is often based on vague generalities such as in the statement “the area possess a high probability for the occurrence of significant archeological sites.” Statements such as this are difficult for project sponsors and consultants to interpret and tend to promote animosity among the parties involved. The private consultant is not an innocent party to these matters primarily because we have failed to provide the industry with a sound, researched justification for site probability.

To better understand where we are now with this issue we will look at how we got here. Sometime in the late 1990s the CTA and the THC put much thought into the development of survey methods. Later, after much deliberation, a compromise was reached and a “one size fits all” approach to survey became the state policy. Although the “Minimum Survey Standards” are a good first attempt at standardizing the level-of-effort for compliance projects, the main issue I have with them is that they are only applied to small survey areas. I am referring, of course, to the 200 ac or less project area size condition. I understand that the 200 ac limit concept came about as a fiscal compromise, because after applying the methods developed to the larger project areas, project costs quickly became excessive and beyond that considered what the industry could bear. I think that this result was largely due to the vague definitions given for site probability (i.e., high, moderate, and low), and the lack of empirical data to justify a survey as well as its scope.

One method that I have been using to remedy this situation is what I call a Precedence-based
Model. This model relies on a rather robust records search and the analysis of this data to better define site probability within a given project area. It is based on the processing of background information rather than simply regurgitating recorded information on nearby or known sites within the survey area. It starts with the characterization of the project area in terms of its geology and hydrology. Key resources used to accomplish this task are the Geologic Atlas of Texas (Bureau of Economic Geology), and the National Wetland Inventory Maps (U.S. Geological Survey), respectively. The Geologic Atlas is an excellent means of determining the geology of the project area, but be advised that it shows the mapped units at a 1:250,000 scale, and therefore some details of your project area may not be visible. The National Wetland Inventory Map will help you characterize any drainages within your project area.

Once you’ve characterized your survey area in this manner you then examine the TARL site maps and the Texas Historic Sites Atlas, searching for areas having similar natural characteristics but that also contain recorded archeological sites. Pull the site forms from the county site records and tabulate the site data in accordance with Table 1 until you have a sample size that you feel comfortable about drawing conclusions from.

Once you’ve tabulated the site data in this manner, then you look up the soil types that comprise your project area and compare this with the soil types listed on your record search form. By comparing this data you can not only determine if a survey is warranted but arrive at a more justifiable way of evaluating site probability as well as the probability for significant sites within a given project area. For instance, in the example provided in Table 1, I would argue that there was a high probability for the occurrence of significant archeological sites if my project area contained ErG soils. The main reason being that there is a trend of significant sites recorded in a similar location, and that this established precedent strongly suggests that the same caliber of site may likely exist within my project area. Furthermore, the fact that previously recorded sites have documented evidence of a subsurface expression would dictate that I conduct subsurface testing of ErG soil areas within my project area.

Although I have presented a rather simplified example of this method, I think you can see that it provides a more empirical means for determining the need for a survey as well as where to focus your identification efforts regardless of the size of the project area.
The summer of 2003 saw the addition of two extraordinary sets of integrated theme exhibits to www.TexasBeyondHistory.net, the public education website created by the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory at UT Austin in partnership with the Texas Archeological Society, Council of Texas Archeologists, Texas Department of Transportation, Texas Historical Commission, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, Amistad National Recreation Area (NPS), and the Department of Anthropology at UT Austin.

“Integrated theme exhibits” really doesn’t convey the magnitude of these projects. The Frontier Forts exhibits consist of nine separate exhibit sections plus sections for kids, teachers, and acknowledgments. There are over 450 images representing an unprecedented collection of historic and modern photographs, artwork, maps, and documents. The five core exhibits on the Tejas theme contain almost 700 separate images, including some 480 archival and modern photographs, 70 maps, 57 technical drawings, 52 paintings, and 17 primary documents. Special sections for kids and teachers round out the exhibits.

http://www.texasbeyondhistory.net/forts/

Nineteenth-Century Forts and the Clash of Cultures on the Texas Frontier (Figure 1) was the brainchild of TBH Associate Editor Susan Dial and TBH Contributing Editor and military history buff and writer Steve Dial. For more than a year, Susan and Steve have devoted many weekends to traveling around the state visiting forts, acquiring information, and taking photographs. Steve wrote the text of most of the sections (historians Robert Wooster and Ty Cashion each contributed a section), while Susan directed the project, wrote the captions, edited the exhibit, and handled the unbelievably time-consuming task of acquiring and/or creating 400+ forts-related images and getting permission to publish them.

The newest (and final) Frontier Forts addition is “Meet the People of Fort Griffin and The Flats,” an interactive exhibit that allows kids of any age to explore Fort Griffin and its companion town called “The Flats.” There you’ll meet 17 historical characters and find out why they were visiting (or living in) the Flats. The character dialogue was researched and written by award-winning children’s author Lisa Waller Rogers, while the vivid bird’s eye view of the town and the individual illustrations of each character were created by artist Charlie Shaw.

Funding for the Frontier Forts project was provided through grants by the Summerfield G. Roberts Foundation, the Texas Preservation Trust Fund (Texas Historical Commission), the Houston Endowment, and the Dian Graves Owen Foundation, as well as individual donations from TAS and CTA members.

http://www.texasbeyondhistory.net/tejas/

Tejas: Life and Times of the Caddo (Figure 2) provides an intimate look at the Caddos’ long and distinguished history, at ancient and living Caddo tradition, and at the tribe’s many contributions to the cultural heritage of Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Oklahoma. The Tejas exhibits explain who the Caddo are, who they were, where they came from, and what Caddo life was like at different points in time. There is also a special exhibit for kids called “World of the Caddo” (written by Susan Dial) as well as a resource page for teachers. Other special features include galleries of modern and ancient Caddo pottery with images that can be rotated 360° (the work of Sharon Mitchell) and the Caddo Map Tool, an interactive, layered map with dozens of linked images and characterizations.

The Tejas exhibits were envisioned and directed by TBH Editor Dr. Steve Black. The writing was done mainly by Black, Dr. Timothy K. Perttula, Consulting Archeologist for the Caddo Tribe, and Cecile Elkins Carter, historian and Caddo tribal member. Dr. Dee Ann Story helped with the writing of the Caddo Ancestors
exhibit and provided much-needed advice throughout the exhibit preparation process. Over 50 other individuals and organizations contributed content and help to the project.

The project was launched in 2002 with grants from the Texas Council for the Humanities and the Houston Endowment. The Temple-Inland Foundation provided additional major funding that sustained the project and enlarged its educational components. The Texas Archeological Society and the Council for Texas Archeologists, and individual members of those organizations have helped support the project as have other TBH partner organizations including the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department and the Texas Historical Commission.

By the time you are reading this newsletter, there should be a third theme exhibit up on TBH entitled “Plains Villagers of the Texas Panhandle.” Check it out. And do let us hear from you — we count on your feedback and continued support for this ambitious project.

Bill Martin recently heard from other SHPOs (state historic preservation officers) around the country and confirmed what TAS and CTA members have been telling us: there isn’t another archeology website anywhere in the country that can hold a candle to TBH.

We at TBH are pleased to report that it looks like we will be working with three separate CRM contractors during the next six months or so to create exhibits based on CRM projects. In all three cases, it has been the sponsor who has instigated (and funded) the effort. We would like to encourage CRM contractors to take the initiative and sell your sponsors on the idea of funding TBH exhibits. The cost is a small fraction of the total budget, but the positive public exposure bang for the buck is far greater. Consider this: if you are lucky, perhaps 100 - 200 people will read (or at least thumb through) your next CRM report over the next two decades. TBH now gets over 2,000 hits per day (downloaded pages). Technical obscurity or public awareness?
basis. Your clients need to also understand that having the raw data about where sites “have been recorded” does not in and of itself mean that they have all of the necessary information. Only archeologists working together in consultation with the THC can come up with the final answers they need about whether a survey is needed. Is the site important? Does it still exist? What is the likelihood that other sites could exist on similar topography close to the recorded site or project area? And, what needs to be done?

Due to the loss of a staff reviewer, increased workloads, and a vast increase in the number of requests for expedited reviews, the staff of the State and Federal Review Section of the Archeology Division (AD) of the THC will no longer be able to expedite reviews of projects (including, reviewing reports and other documents). Therefore, please advise your clients that all projects will be reviewed in the order in which they are received at AD. Furthermore, please be advised that appointments must be made in advance for any proposed meetings with the staff for the purposes of discussing projects and in most cases any agreements reached in association with these meetings must be followed up by a written request for concurrence from the outside party to the AD staff.

Give us a call or tell your clients to give us a call if you or they have questions.
April 11, 2003

Donna Stern-McFadden
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
The Mescalero Apache Tribe
P. O. Box 227
Mescalero, New Mexico 88340

Dear Ms. Stern-McFadden:

In June of 2003, the Texas Archeological Society (TAS) will begin a new program of inviting participants from Native American groups to attend the TAS Field School. This program is sponsored by TAS, with assistance from the Council of Texas Archeologists. We hope that the program will help TAS members to get to know the native people whose traditions and lifeways are tied to Texas archeological sites. This letter serves as an invitation for two members of the Mescalero Apache Tribe to be our guests at the TAS Field School on June 7-14, 2003.

TAS Field Schools are held annually at significant archeological sites across Texas, and are directed by some of the state’s outstanding archeological scholars. Field Schools provide an opportunity to learn the basic principles of excavation by working side-by-side with professional and avocational archeologists.

This year’s TAS Field School will be held at the Spanish colonial Presidio San Saba in Menard, Texas, located about 60 miles southeast of San Angelo. Drs. Grant Hall and Tammy Walter of Texas Tech University will direct work at the presidio, which was occupied by Spanish and native people between 1757 and 1770. Excavations will take place in the courtyard, where soldiers, traders, native people, and their families spent their daily lives. There is no specific intention of excavating in the cemetery that was established at this site, but because its location is unknown, human remains could be encountered unexpectedly.

The Field School is fully described in the enclosed issues of Texas Archeology newsletter, and registration forms and waivers also are enclosed. TAS Field School is an ideal activity for families and persons of all ages who are in relatively good health. Informative lectures and activities are part of the field school, and special instruction is offered for newcomers. There also is an educational
program for children between the ages of 7 and 14. The newsletters provide more details on these programs.

TAS will support almost all field school costs for the two invited participants from the Mescalero Apache Tribe. Each participant will be registered as a TAS member for 2003, and will receive the *Bulletin of the Texas Archeological Society* and *Texas Archeology* newsletter. Each participant also will receive a check for $100 to assist with transportation costs to Menard. The Field School registration fee will be waived for the two participants, and each participant will receive their own dig kit containing the tools needed for excavation.

Lodging space will be provided in the TAS campground, located near the archeological dig. Participants must supply their own tent and camping equipment; a list of recommended equipment is available. Rest facilities consist of port-o-cans and open-air showers. Although trailer hook-ups and motel lodging are available in Menard, TAS will not be able to cover the cost of those facilities.

Breakfast and dinner meals from the TAS camp kitchen will be provided at no charge to the native participants invited to the Field School. While participants must provide their own lunches, TAS will donate one bag of ice per day to keep their coolers iced down. Menard has several grocery stores where participants can buy food and other supplies.

The Mescalero Apache Tribe is one of seven native groups who are being invited to send participants to this TAS Field School, due to their traditional ties to the region around Menard. We are hopeful that two members of the Mescalero Apache Tribe will be able to accept the warm hospitality that TAS wishes to extend.

The two persons who accept this invitation on behalf of the Mescalero Apache Tribe should fill out the enclosed Field School registration forms labeled with the tribe name, and sign the attendance agreement. They also must complete the TAS membership applications labeled with the tribe name. The Field School registration forms should be mailed to the Midland address on the form, and the membership applications go to the TAS office in San Antonio. TAS will cover registration and application fees for the two participants.

Please contact me if you have any questions about this invitation or TAS Field School. My daytime telephone is 512/389-4875, evening telephone is 512/453-4348, cell phone is 512/940-2406, and email is margaret.howard@tpwd.state.tx.us. We look forward to sharing the TAS Field School experience with you in June 2003!

Sincerely,

Margaret Howard
Immediate Past President
Texas Archeological Society
NATIVE AMERICAN SCHOLARSHIP
PROGRAM A SUCCESS!

Jonelle Miller

Once upon a time, an archeologist had a vision of the value and benefits for TAS members and Native Americans to join hands and work together to achieve better communication and understanding. To bring this about, Margaret Howard worked with TAS to initiate the pilot program for Native American Field School Scholarships, which cover TAS membership and field school expenses for recipients. Funding for this program in 2002 came from the Council of Texas Archeologists, Carol Macaulay, Prewitt and Associates, Texas Parks and Wildlife, and TAS.

Margaret wrote to seven different tribes, inviting each of them to send two attendees to the 2003 Field School at Presidio San Saba in Menard, Texas. The following individuals joined us for a wonderful field school experience: Michael Yokesuite, Comanche, from Indiwhoma, OK; Cody Hernandez, Tap Pilam, from Comfort, TX; Dewey Tsonetokoy, Kiowa, from Carnegie, OK; and father and son Jesus Reyes, Jr. and Julian Reyes, Tap Pilam, from San Antonio, TX.

These participants were interested in attending the TAS Field School to advance their archeological training. Michael rearranged his firefighting schedule in order to attend Field School. He is actively interested in representing the Comanche Nation, and enjoys attending various powwows. Working with youth groups to preserve and share Comanche culture and tradition is very close to his heart. Now Michael says he is hooked on archeology, and he wants to return to Field School to present an informative program about face paint and warriors.

Dewey considered attending field school as an opportunity to learn and expand his horizons. In the past, Dewey has worked as a ranger at Hueco Tanks State Historic Site, and he also has done CRM survey work for the BLM. He is most interested in Kiowa cultural preservation, and finds recruitment of youth to be very challenging in today’s world. Dewey works closely with the Kiowa in trying to preserve and promote tribal history. He expressed a lot of satisfaction in learning how to excavate, and enjoyed viewing the Paint Rock pictographs.

Jesus is studying anthropology at UTSA, and had taken part in the TAMU-Corpus Christi field school last summer, along with his son Julian. Jesus and Cody are both working to preserve Tap Pilam traditions and language in the face of increasing urbanization. They participated in the survey as well as excavation, and enjoyed the family activities related to Field School.

Michael Yokesuite
All of the Native American scholarship recipients agreed that their TAS field school experiences were rewarding, and are looking forward to sharing their stories with their friends at home as well as returning to another TAS field school. TAS members also enjoyed the opportunity to work alongside and visit with our Native American guests. You can get involved with this new program! To volunteer for the team that will support next year’s Native American Field School scholarships, contact Margaret Howard at margaret.howard@tpwd.state.tx.us.
Greetings from the archaeology lab in Raitt Hall on the University of Washington campus (Figure 1)! As some of you folks may remember, I was awarded a CTA Student Research grant in March of 2002 to aid me in conducting my dissertation research on hunter-gatherer ceramic vessel use and production using three previously excavated collections from sites on the upper Texas coastal plain: Mitchell Ridge (41GV66, Block Excavation), Little Bethlehem (41AU38), and Honeycomb (41LB4). I am happy to report that a portion of my CTA award has now been spent creating petrographic grain mounts of source sands I collected during the summer of 2002. This report is the second part of a two-part series on the progress of my research. In this report, I detail in writing and photographs my mineralogical characterization of sands I have collected from river drainages of the upper Texas coastal plain (Hood 2003). I also describe the methods I am using to characterize over 10,000 sherds from three archeological sites in order that I may select appropriate sherds for thin sectioning and petrographic analysis.

**Setting the baseline: minerals of the upper Texas coastal plain**

The intent of one aspect my research is to determine how ceramic vessels were moved about the upper Texas coastal plain using petrographic sourcing techniques. In order to determine if wares moved in and/or out of the upper Texas coastal plain cultural area, potential source sediments first had to be characterized to determine a baseline of local minerals. Six petrographic grain mounts were created using sands collected from Mitchell Ridge, the Lower Brazos River in Austin County, the Middle Trinity River in Polk County, and Honeycomb. The results of the grain mount analysis reveal a local mineral suite very similar to that observed by Hsu (1960). More importantly, these grain mounts provide a permanent reference tool for visually comparing local minerals with mineral inclusions in ceramic thin sections.

**Mitchell Ridge**

Minerals observed in two thin sections include: kyanite, quartz, staurolite, hornblende, garnet, epidote, zircon, and tourmaline. Figure 2 features clear-colored kyanite, greenish-colored epidote, and brown tourmaline, as well as some garnet. The opaque, angular grains have a reddish tint to their edges and are thus most likely hematite. Highly rounded opaque grains appear in most of the grain mounts (see upper left area of this photo for one example), but neither I nor the sedimentary petrologist I’m working with at UW can figure out what they are — I’d love to hear from those of you who are familiar with upper Texas coastal plain sediments!

**Middle Trinity River, Polk County**

Minerals observed include: staurolite, kyanite, and zircon, as well as tourmaline. Figure 3 is a close-up of kyanite from the Middle Trinity with its distinctive 90° cleavage planes.

**Lower Brazos**

Minerals observed include: garnet, kyanite, tourmaline, epidote, and staurolite. Figure 4 shows a nice example of highly rounded tourmaline (the elongate, brown crystal, left center). Note the prevalence of angular, opaque hematite grains, as well as more examples of the mysterious rounded opaque grains.

**Honeycomb**

Sediments sampled from Honeycomb contained quartz and hematite and are not pictured here.

**Sampling the sherds**

Since it is impractical and unethical to create thin sections of all sherds from Mitchell Ridge, Little
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Bethlehem, and Honeycomb, a representative sample of sherds from each site will be thin-sectioned for petrographic analysis. In order to obtain a sample with minimal bias, sherds are currently being characterized in terms of size, body type, culture historical type, types and sizes of inclusions, firing characteristics, surface treatments, and use wear such as pitting, sooting, and scratching. Once this initial characterization is complete, sherds will be selected for thin section analysis.

This initial characterization is a prodigious amount of work in and of itself, and would not be going nearly as smoothly if not for the help of three dedicated University of Washington undergraduates: Marie Watson, Hannah Tam, and Michael Shropshire. Marie and I worked together to sort and label over 7,000 sherds (Figure 5). In addition, we re-bagged sherds in conservation-quality bags per agreement with TARL. We also weighed and re-bagged sediments from the original 1974 Little Bethlehem test excavations. Hannah (Figure 6) and Michael (Figure 7) have helped me collect various attributes on over 2,000 sherds.

What next?

My preliminary findings concerning my initial characterizations will be presented in the “Beyond Typology: Ceramic Analysis in the Southeastern United States” Symposium at the annual Southeastern Archaeological Conference this November. If you’re going to SEAC in Charlotte, I’ll see you there! By December I plan on having completed preliminary observations on sherd thin sections, and hope to present those at the SAA annual meetings in Montreal — stay tuned! But right now, it's back to the lab — I have my work cut out for me! As always, I’d love to hear comments from any interested folks out there — please email me at: <Lnapua@u.washington.edu>.
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Announcements

Archeologists Convene in Fort Worth

The Texas Archeological Society convenes its annual meeting October 24-26, 2003 at the Ramada Plaza Hotel, Fort Worth (817) 335-7000. Archeologists, avocational and professional, from around the state will attend symposia, poster sessions and social events. The schedule begins on Friday morning with meetings of the Society, the Council for Texas Archeologists and the Texas Historical Commission Stewards. In the afternoon, presentation of research papers will begin.

An Evening with Archeologists, a free public forum October 24, 7 PM, will feature internationally known authors/archeologists, Michael and Kathleen Gear who will correlate archaeological research to their fictional accounts of prehistory. The Gears are the authors of over 30 novels. The latest, People of the Owl, is set four thousand years ago at Poverty Point. When they are not writing, they manage Wind River Archaeological Consultants and raise bison in Wyoming. For more information, visit their website at <http://www.gear-gear.com>.

Artifact identification by Texas archeologists of renowned Harry Shafer, Elton Prewitt, Dan Potter, Alan Skinner, and Randy Moir will follow the Gears’ talk. Everyone is encouraged to bring artifacts for identification. Evening with Archeologists is made possible in part by a grant from the Texas Council for the Humanities, a state program of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

On Saturday, October 25, research reports resume with several sessions devoted to introductory topics and workshops for new members wanting to learn about new techniques or the prehistory of the local area.

At the Saturday evening banquet, Dr. Stephen Lekson, University of Colorado, Boulder, will present his ideas on the Chaco Meridian: Centers of Political Power in the Ancient Southwest (also the title of his recent book). Dr. Lekson has lead over 18 expeditions in the Four Corners area, Chaco Canyon, the Mimbres region, the Rio Grande, and the Hohokam area of southeastern Arizona.

To register or learn more go to www.txarch.org or call 800 377-7240.

Photos

The Council of Texas Archeologists continues to solicit images of CTA functions, digital or otherwise, for the CTA Archives. Please contact David O. Brown or Doug Boyd if you have any media of interest.

THC Announcements

The THC Archeology Division will not publish a fall edition of the newsletter Current Archeology in Texas so that its limited resources can be used to complete reports in the THC Archeological Reports Series. The division therefore submitted a few announcements that would normally appear in Current Archeology.

Awards of Merit. At the May 2003 quarterly meeting of the THC Archeology Committee, Awards of Merit in Archeology were presented to: (1) Dr. Britt Bousman and the Center for Archaeological Studies at Southwest Texas State University (now Texas State University at San Marcos) and the Adjutant General’s Department of Texas, for their investigations at Camp Swift; and (2) Dr. James Karbula and Hicks & Company for their investigations at Guy Town in downtown Austin (Figure1). Congratulations to these award recipients!

Texas Archeology Month. By now you have probably received the Texas Archeology Month 2003 Calendar of Events mailed out in early September. If not, you can see a PDF of the printed calendar or a Word file (to which events can be added as the THC hears about them)
on the THC web site, www.thc.state.tx.us. You’ll find a link to the 2003 calendar on the “Texas Archeology Month” page. Or, you can request a printed calendar from Donna McCarver at 512/463-6090; donna.mccarver@thc.state.tx.us; or Donna McCarver, Archeology Division, Texas Historical Commission, P.O. Box 12276, Austin, TX 78711-2276.

The THC would like to offer a sincere thank-you to all the volunteers who organize and run the TAM events. And many thanks to the individuals and organizations, including the Council of Texas Archeologists, who came through again this year with monetary contributions. Although the THC coordinates TAM with the help of the CTA and TAS, printing costs for the TAM Calendar of Events are covered entirely by donations.

**La Salle Odyssey.** The year 2003 marks the opening of the La Salle Odyssey, a series of museum exhibits in six coastal Texas counties. Together they tell the story of French explorer La Salle’s unlucky expedition to the New World in 1684–1687.

THC archeologists discovered the wreck of La Salle’s ship, the Belle, in 1995 and, with the help of archeological stewards and volunteers, fully excavated it from the bottom of Matagorda Bay in 1996 and 1997. They recovered the hull of the vessel and approximately one million artifacts, many of which are on display for the first time in the La Salle Odyssey exhibits. From 1999 to 2002, THC archeologists, stewards, and volunteers excavated Fort St. Louis near Matagorda Bay, the settlement La Salle established after putting ashore on the Texas coast. A number of the artifacts recovered from Fort St. Louis will also be on display in the La Salle Odyssey museums. The Conservation Research Laboratory at Texas A&M University has the ongoing responsibility of conserving artifacts from both projects, as well as the hull of the vessel.

The following exhibits are part of the La Salle Odyssey:

- **Texas Maritime Museum, Rockport.** “The Ships, the Life, the Crew.”
- **Texana Museum, Edna.** “The Karankawa Indians of Coastal Texas.”
- **Matagorda County Museum, Bay City.** “The Belle.”
- **Calhoun County Museum, Port Lavaca.** “Colonial Texas.”
- **Corpus Christi Museum of Science and History, Corpus Christi.** “Cultural Encounters.” Opens in May 2004.

**La Petite Belle, Palacios.** A half-scale, seaworthy reproduction of the original Belle. Opens in the summer of 2004. SPEAKERS BUREAU for Texas Archeology

The Texas Archeology Society is in the process of creating a Speaker’s Bureau. The speakers will be available to make presentations about archeology
to adult audiences in various community organizations, archaeological societies etc. We will post your availability on the TAS website (www.txarch.org) so that people may contact you directly. If you are interested in being a member of the TAS Speaker’s Bureau, please complete and mail or email the completed form to Sandy Rogers at the address shown on the form.

**TAS Speaker’s Bureau**

Send Completed Form to:
Sandy Rogers  TAS Communications Committee
3011 Hwy 30 West, Suite 101
Huntsville, TX 77340 email: sojourne@txcom.net

Name________________________________________________________

Address_______________________________________________________

Phone________ email________ website________

Affiliation(s)____________________________________________________

Presentation topic (s) and minutes in length
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________

Setup Requirements (AV, room) ________________________________________

What geographic areas can you serve?_____________________________________

How far are you willing to drive?___________________________________________

How would you like to be contacted by the public?
Phone____________________ Email______________________________

Will you require compensation for any expenses?__________________

Will you charge a fee?________________
San Felipe de Austin
Archeology Open House
Saturday, October 4th, 2003
9 am – 4 pm

San Felipe de Austin was the Capital of the first Anglo Colony in Texas. Established by Stephen F. Austin in 1824 and burned to the ground in 1836 during the Texas War for Independence from Mexico. During the Colonial era, San Felipe de Austin was the second largest city in Texas, second only to San Antonio in commercial trade.

Tour archeological excavations of 1830s capital of Stephen F. Austin’s Colony

Texas Historical Commission Information and Magnetometer Survey
Local Archeological Society Information

Children’s Activity

Location:
San Felipe de Austin Historic Park
FM 1458 at Brazos River Bridge,
San Felipe

Free Admission
For more information, contact:
Fort Bend Museum Association 281-342-1256

Excavations directed by Marianne Marek, M.A.

A Texas Archeology Awareness Month event
The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) issues contracts for a large volume of archeological work. TxDOT’s archeological program has unique features that reflect its approach to managing archeological resources under the National Historic Preservation Act, the Antiquities Code of Texas, and other state and federal laws. The workshop will address three aspects of doing business with TxDOT as an archeological contractor. Topics to be discussed will include:

The Houston PALM (Potential Archeological Liabilities Map) and the Houston Historic Overlay

Dr. James T. Abbott will discuss the development and application of a map that can be used to evaluate the likelihood of encountering intact archeological deposits. Then a representative from PBS&J will discuss the historic map GIS system called the Houston Historic Overlay, recently developed for TxDOT by that firm. This historic overlay can be used to identify locations with high probability to contain historic archeological sites.

Research Design for TxDOT Projects

Dr. Lain Ellis will discuss TxDOT’s requirements for implementing problem oriented research designs for TxDOT data recovery projects. The discussion will focus on TxDOT’s expectations for research designs that fulfill research requirements established in consultations between TxDOT, SHPO and other consulting parties under state and federal laws.

The Semantics of Regulatory Recommendations

Dr. Owen Lindauer will discuss the need to make recommendations that adhere closely to the language of regulations of the National Historic Preservation Act. The discussion will identify the specific language of regulatory compliance that will assure that consultant recommendations are unambiguously stated in an appropriate and relevant regulatory framework.

If time permits, there will be an opportunity for general questions and answers.
2003 CTA Members

Please contact Missi Green for corrections or additions.

Abbott, Jim
Acuna, Laura
Alvarado, Luis
Anthony, Dana
Athens, William
Austin, Stephen P.
Banks, Cynthia
Barile, Kerri
Baylor University, Strecker Museum
Bettis, Allen
Black, Steve
Blakistone, Tricia
Bond, Clell
Bousman, C. Britt
Bradle, Michael
Brosowske, Scott
Brown, David
Brownlow, Russ
Budd, Jon
Bush, Leslie
Bussey, Stanley
Clabaugh, Patricia
Clark, John
Clark, Reign
Cliff, Maynard
Cloud, Andy
Cooper, Eben
Cruse, Meg
Cruse, Brett
Davis, Gene
Denton, Mark
Dixon, Boyd
Dodge, Aina
Donachie, Madeleine
Durrant, Gwen
Ellis, Lain
Enright, Jeff
Fields, Ross
Foster, Eugene
Fox, Daniel
Gadus, E. Frances
Gaither, Steve
Galan, Victor
Garcia-Herreros, Jorge
Gardner, Karen
Gearhart, Robert
Gibson, Connie
Glander, Wayne
Godwin, Molly
Green, Melissa
Hays, Sterling
Henley, Jennifer
Hickman, Barbara
Hood, Larkin
Howard, Margaret
Hubbard, Richard
Hughes, Jean
Hughes, James
James, Stephen R.
Jarvis, Jonathan H.
Jones, Doug
Jones, James Terry
Julien, Dan
Kalser, Ardi
Karbula, James
Katz, Paul
Katz, Susana
Kennotsu, Nancy
Kibler, Karl
King, Frank
Klinger, Timothy
Latham, Darren
Lindauer, Owen
Linder-Linsley, Sue
Lintz, Christopher
Mahoney, Richard
Malof, Andrew
Marek, Marianne
Marie, Ruth
Marroquin, Raul
Martin, Bill
McGregor, Dan
McMakin, Todd
McMurtrie, Chelsea R.
McNatt, Logan
Meade, Tim
Mecado Allinger, Patricia
Miller, Kevin
Minnichbach, Nicole
Moore, Roger
Moore, William
Morley, Eric
Nash, Michael
Nash, Sean
Nelson, Bo
Nickels, David
Nightengale, Laura
O’Kelly, Lynne
Oksanen, Eric
Owens, Jesse
Perttula, Tim
Peter, Duane
Pine, Jeremy
Prewitt, Elton
Price, G.R.Dennis
Prikryl, Daniel
Prilliman, Keith
Quigg, Mike
Ralph, Ron
Ricklis, Robert
Ringstaff, Amy
Ringstaff, Chris
Russell, M. Kelley
Sanders, Calvin
Schroeder, Eric
Shaller, Rolla
Sherman, David
Shortes, C. Russ
Sills, Elizabeth Cory
Skiles, Bob
Skinner, Alan
Spock, Carolyn
Strutt, Michael
Sundborg, Gregory
Tennis, Cynthia
Thoms, Alston
Tine, Angela
Tomka, Marybeth
Tomka, Steve
Trierweiler, Nicholas
Victor, Sally
Voellinger, Melissa
Voellinger, Leonard
Weinstein, Richard A.
Wernecke, D. Clark
West, Laura
Wheat, Pam
Whitsett, Hayden
Williams, Jeff
LIST OF COMMITTEES

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

COMMITTEES

Auditing
Alan Skinner
arcdigs@aol.com
Contractor’s List
Jorge Garcia-Herreros
jherreros@bheen
Meg Cruse
mecruse@pbsj.com
cta-contractor@c-tx-arch.org

Governmental Affairs
Kerri Barile
kbarile@swca.com

Multicultural Relations
Alston Thoms
a-thoms@tamu.edu
Nominating
Ron Ralph
ronralph@texas.net
Public Education
David Brown
david.brown@mail.utexas.edu

Accreditation and Review
Pat Clabaugh
pclabaugh@tamu.edu
Membership
Karl Kibler
kkibler@paiarch.com
Communications
Sue Linder-Linsley
slinder@mail.smu.edu
Survey Standards
Marianne Marek
marianne@nstci.com
AntiLooting
Todd MacMakin
Todd.McMakin@tpwd.state.tx.us

TLCA
NA
Curation Task Force
Karen Gardner
kgardner@paiarch.com

History
Doug Boyd
dboyd@paiarch.com

Ethics and Standards NA

Laboratory and Curation Alliance NA

OFFICERS

President
Clell Bond
clbond@pbsj.com
President-elect
Kevin Miller
kmiller@swca.com
Secretary-Treasurer
Missi Green
mgreen@geo-marine.com
cta-members@c-tx-arch.org
Newsletter Editor
Andy Malof
amalof@lcra.org
TO:

Council of Texas Archeologists

Membership and Renewal Form

☐ Address correction only (see below).

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

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

Total amount remitted to CTA $ __________

Name (please print): ________________________________
Company/Institution: ________________________________
Address: __________________________________________
City/State/Zip: ______________________________________
Phone: ____________________ FAX: ____________________ e-mail: ____________________

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