



THE UPAC NEWS

Published by the
Utah Professional Archaeological Council

Published Quarterly
December 1992

Steve Simms, President
Signa Larralde, Editor

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Fall Meeting Notes: The fall business meeting of UPAC (November 6) had its moments of both passion and boredom, but a number of issues were discussed and/or acted upon.

The Saturday current research slide shows included more presentations than usual, as well as some new players. Thanks to Stan MacDonald for organizing the current research session and thanks especially to the people who presented for the first time.

Since only a few weeks have passed since the meeting, I can only mention some of the action taken and indicate a few areas in which I hope discussion can continue at the next UPAC meeting to be held in Cedar City on March 12-13, 1993 (Yes, March - the date has been pushed back by popular demand).

State Lands Rules: UPAC members agreed to support the proposed rules for the Utah Division of State Lands (these rules were printed in the Sept. 1992 issue of the UPAC News). Members also desired some comment on the rules to identify certain passages that remain subject to interpretation and will be worthy of monitoring by UPAC. I will write a letter to the Division in support of the rules and include the additional comments desired.

Student Members: A motion was passed to put the question of whether to provide full voting benefits to student members on the ballot. Balloting is necessary because this

action will modify the bylaws. The change would enable student members to receive both the journal and UPAC News for \$12,00/year. This would apply to everyone currently registered as a student, whether located in Utah or elsewhere.

A ballot for all voting members is enclosed this issue. Please vote on the bylaw change, as well as for two UPAC officers, and return your ballot to Julie Howard by January 15.

New Fellow: Dr. Richard Thompson was unanimously voted as a UPAC Fellow, joining a small list of archaeologists of notorious service to Utah archaeology. A letter will be going out, and there will be a biography of Dr. Thompson in an upcoming issue of the News.

Interim Editor: Kevin Jones will be the interim editor for the journal, Utah Archaeology, through the publication of the 1993 issue. The membership voted that we would defer nomination and election of a new editor until the Fall 1993 meeting to ensure that there is smooth production of the next issue and to allow time for individuals interested in the nomination for editor to inquire about the necessary support required to edit the journal.

CRM Abstracts: A decision was made to include a new section in Utah Archaeology devoted to abstracts of cultural resource management reports that would be of interest to a wider audience of archaeologists and perhaps the public. This seems like one small way UPAC can join the national effort to make it easier to

find out about some of the excellent archaeology that receives limited distribution and citation in bibliographies.

Future issues of the UPAC News will solicit abstracts for the 1993 issue, and some selection criteria may need to be devised if the number becomes great. Consider writing an abstract of a significant CRM report you have done and provide information on how the report can be obtained. Send these to Kevin Jones or wait for further details, probably by Spring, 1993.

Creative Mitigation: There was an interesting and at times, a lively discussion on the topic of "creative mitigation." This is one of those philosophical issues that may or may not be transformed into action, but is one that makes us think about the condition and future of archaeology as it has evolved since the 1970s. These kinds of issues are good to keep on the table in an organization like UPAC, because they maintain thought and dialogue about the future of our profession.

Therefore, I would like to continue this discussion at the meeting in St. George by having a few people with deeply held positions or experience in "creative mitigation" deliver brief statements of position or perspective.

I will be calling a few people to do this and will be seeking diverse views. If you wish to present a position statement, give me a call.

After the position papers are presented, the discussion can be opened to the membership, who will then have several viewpoints serving as points of departure for discussion. [See also position papers presented in this issue and the February issue of UPAC News.]

Antiquities Task Force: There was considerable discussion about the Antiquities Task Force within the Utah Division of State History. The questions under consideration are shown on the memorandum from Wilson Martin included in the back of this issue of the News.

The next meeting of the task force is

on December 11, so if you have any opinions, call me, Betsy Tipps, David Madsen or Sue Miller. These are UPAC members who sit on the task force representing various interests, but any of them could inform you of what has gone on and can listen to archaeologists who call about the work of the task force.

Spring Meeting: Plan to attend the March 12-13 meeting in Cedar City.
--Steven Simms

FALL MEETING MINUTES

Highlights of the fall meeting are described in the President's Message. For a copy of the full text of the fall meeting minutes, please contact UPAC Secretary Julie Howard at (801) 259-8193. A fall treasurer's report as submitted by Evie Seelinger is appended to this issue.

SPRING MEETING PLANS

The UPAC Spring meeting will be held on the Southern Utah University campus in Cedar City (not St. George as previous planned), on Friday March 12 and Saturday, March 13, 1993.

The business meeting will be held on Friday afternoon beginning at 1 p.m. and a symposium on the Virgin (Western) Anasazi will be held Saturday morning beginning at 8 a.m. We are also trying to arrange a dinner Friday night and field trip Saturday afternoon after the symposium.

The symposium will be held in honor of Dr. Richard Thompson's work in the Western Anasazi area. Symposium participants thus far scheduled are Dick Ambler, Gardiner Dalley, Bob Euler, Joel Janetski, Margaret Lyneis, Doug McFadden, Barb Walling, and Karen Wise. Anyone wishing to participate in the symposium should contact Diana Christensen at (801) 673-3545. More details and a sign-up sheet will be included in the next newsletter.

PAY 1993 UPAC DUES!

It's that time of the year again. Please send 1993 UPAC dues of \$25 for voting members and \$12 for student members to treasurer Evie Seelinger.

* * * * *

THREE VIEWPOINTS ON ALTERNATIVE MITIGATION

[Editors note: Duncan Metcalfe, Alan Schroedl, and David Madsen were asked to write viewpoints on alternative mitigation for this issue of UPAC News. Everett Bassett's viewpoint will appear in the February 1993 issue, along with a viewpoint from a federal archaeologist. If you would like to contribute a viewpoint or to respond to the ones below, please send your text to the editor.]

Duncan Metcalfe, University of Utah Anthropology faculty:

I've been asked to express my views on the concept of alternative mitigation. This is a difficult task because very little has been presented in writing about the concept by its various proponents. What is available comes from early drafts of the Division of State History's proposed rules and an early draft of the Programmatic Agreement (PA) between the Division and several federal land managing agencies. Most of what's in the rumor mill is insubstantial and provides no firm basis on which to build or evaluate policy.

From the 1991 version of the proposed rules for the Division of State History, alternative mitigation is defined as:

a plan which develops, explores, excavates or appropriates sites not directly affected by the proposed project in lieu of full excavation of the affected sites. For the purposes of alternative mitigation, exploration/excavation/appropriation includes educational/scientific development of a site or specimens."

More information is provided later in the draft in a section titled "Alternative Mitigation/Excavation."

An alternative excavation/mitigation plan may be authorized if the division [of State History] finds the following:

1. The alternative plan generates greater scientific or educational benefit in comparison to the standard exploration/excavation/appropriation of the original affected site.
2. The overall costs of the plan are comparable to costs of the standard exploration/excavation/appropriation.
3. The division may impanel a third party professional body to review the plan. The results of the review will be reported to the board [of State History].

The only other written source of information I've been able to track down is Appendix VI of the draft PA between the Division of State History and several federal agencies, distributed at the Spring 1992 UPAC meeting. Titled "Management Protocol for a Process to Facilitate Alternative Mitigation," the only statements of substance are in a section called "Standards and Guidelines," which states:

1. Choose a decision making system, or use the system outlined above. If there is need for formal facilitation/mediation, an outside facilitator/mediator should be used to develop alternative mitigation plans.
2. The selected alternative must be acceptable to the federal land managing agency and the company paying the mitigation (if any).

These statements are clearly very broad, and correspondingly uninformative. In the absence of a well-articulated, written statement about alternative mitigation that specifically outlines its goals and implementation, illustrated by specific examples, it's hard to tell what the concept implies.

In the best of all possible worlds, alternative mitigation might allow

archaeologists faced with a narrow corridor of direct disturbance running through an unproductive section of a site to expend some of their efforts outside of the corridor, core a nearby bog to reconstruct the past environment, and conduct a survey to locate the lithic sources utilized by the inhabitants of the site. I suspect all would agree that greater flexibility in developing and executing research designs is beneficial.

On the other hand, I can also imagine a much darker, more disturbing scenario. Suppose the next Director of the Division of State History has little interest and no sympathy for archaeological research, but is eager to develop the Division's missions related to education and public outreach. As a consequence, whenever two or more alternatives for mitigation are proposed, the Director's staff invariably chooses the alternative that includes the most significant investment in education or museum development, irrespective of its scientific merit and regardless of its implications for the archaeological record. Obviously a fictitious example, but a possible one given the broad and vague statements currently available concerning alternative mitigation.

The Division is asking members of the local professional community for comment, if not agreement on an incompletely articulated policy, the implications of which are a matter of speculation and controversy. The Division (and relevant federal agencies) can take an important step toward improving the situation by offering a full statement including its goals, implementation, and safeguards. Ideally the statement would include examples illustrating the range of implications flowing from the adoption of alternative mitigation. Such a statement would also be a significant step toward ending the vitriolic and inflammatory rumors which have abounded over the past year. Absent such a statement, the local professional community might well be justified in maintaining its increasingly skeptical perspective about the Division's goals, policy and commitment to its basic mission.

David Madsen, Antiquities Section, Division of State History:

To start with the obvious, there is no "right" way to excavate an archaeological site. There are an infinite number of approaches which can be employed, and which vary depending on the nature of the questions asked. At any particular site some questions are certainly more appropriate than others but many questions, while markedly different, may be of relatively equal utility. Not all of these questions can be addressed in a single project. Indeed, many are contradictory and in addressing one, others may be excluded. That is, there are viable "alternatives" to every project, and, in our view, what Alternative Mitigation is all about is being able to compare and evaluate these viable alternatives and select the one which may be most appropriate to the site(s) at hand.

Note that in my view of Alternative Mitigation, the alternatives to be evaluated are those most appropriate to the site, not those that may be most viable for any particular set of regulatory rules. That is, evaluations must be based on archaeological parameters, not on developmental parameters. That, in turn, necessarily means that mitigation projects must be directed at a site as a whole, not just that portion of a site within a construction zone or a right-of-way. The "area of potential effect" is just that; it is the area potentially affected, not merely the limits of a pipeline trench or a road construction zone. What is affected is the site; when a site's integrity is disturbed or destroyed the entire site is affected.

In my view there is no essential difference between a mitigation project and a research project. The design and evaluation of the project should, above all, consider the site as a whole, with little or no consideration for such arbitrary boundaries as the limits of construction zones. Put another way, Alternative Mitigation will allow archaeological recovery projects to treat sites as if the impending highway or transmission line did not exist. The treatment would be the

same as that used when approaching the site from a research standpoint. To employ a current example, should a highway project endanger a site with Clovis points on the north side of the right-of-way, other tools and lithic debris within the ROW, and an associated bog to the south of the ROW, an appropriate research/ mitigation design would include an investigation of the points and the bog rather than just the ROW lithic material alone.

By focusing on sites holistically, by remembering that the APE is the area of the site that is affected, and by recalling that sites may be investigated in a number of different, often competing, manners, we can begin to be much more effective with our cultural resource management programs. To understand how this might work, consider, for example, a couple of alternative treatments for the often large, but also common, surface lithic scatter. One might be the traditional treatment which involves the surface mapping of all the larger items and the excavation of a variety of test units to determine if there are any subsurface features. Another might involve an investigation of site structure based on the differential distribution of larger and smaller elements. Yet a third might focus on lithic technology and on-site work limited to collecting a sample of tools, flakes, and shatter, but including an additional sample of materials from the quarry the toolstone was taken from. In other words, there are a number of alternatives, including off-site work, that should be competitively evaluated. The most viable alternative can then be selected.

Alternative Mitigation, in the sense I use the term here, carries with it a number of potential problems. Not the least of these is that if mitigation designs and research designs are essentially the same thing, then CRM projects must be able to compete with designs that are funded by granting institutions such as NSF. Many commonly used mitigation plans are essentially ways of collecting and cataloging information [e.g., Problem Domain I - Chronology; Problem Domain IV - Subsistence], and do not consist of testable ideas derived from higher order theory. As such, they would have trouble competing with normal research designs, and there may be some concern that competing on this level will entail a lot more work. There may also be the fear that competing proposals will be evaluated by some deranged kook in the Antiquities Section and would not receive a fair reading. We cannot provide a solution to the former concern; in evaluating and selecting competing alternatives, one will always be selected over another. We can, however, ensure that the evaluation and selection process is a fair one. There is no reason that UPAC must leave the development of a selection process to government agencies. UPAC can develop a process which involves UPAC members on an evaluation team, and can insist that management and permitting agencies adopt it. There is no reason to oppose adoption of alternative mitigation programs because of the fear that some off-the-wall archaeologist will be the final arbiter. UPAC can structure a process it feels comfortable with.

There is also the fear that non-archaeological management concerns may begin to drive the selection of mitigation alternatives; that a tourism oriented manager will decide that the money to be spent on an archaeological recovery operation could be better spent on a museum exhibit. However, the fear of a rogue manager choosing a favored idea is much like the fear of an off-the-wall archaeologist selecting the appropriate alternative. UPAC merely has to create a selection process that will prevent that from happening. UPAC can make Alternative Mitigation work; the real question is does it want to.

Cookbook archaeology is easy. A contractor [or the management agency for that matter] knows exactly what has to be done, how long it will take to do it, how many people the job will take, and how much it will cost. Unfortunately, they also know exactly what the results will be. Given a good site description, I can produce the results of the average mitigation project in my office without ever going into the field. I can describe the lithic tools, the subsistence remains, the chronology, with a relatively high degree of accuracy. There may be an occasional surprise, but not enough to warrant the expenditure of millions of dollars of both public and private funds annually. We already know that Rose Springs points are common at Fremont sites, and that Fremont folks ate rabbits

