



UPAC NEWS

Published by the Utah Professional Archeological Council

Published Quarterly
February 1993

Steve Simms, President
Signa Larralde, Editor

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

The UPAC Spring meeting in Cedar City is only a few weeks away (March 12 and 13). The spring meeting is important to UPAC because it moves attention away from the Wasatch Front and reminds everyone that UPAC is a regional organization.

The symposium this year will focus on the Western Anasazi region and I know Diana Christensen and others have been working to make this an interesting meeting. So, try your best to attend, especially all the archaeologists from the Front. Hey, I have to practically drive from Idaho, so those of you in other state outliers can make it too!

In keeping with the new format, the Spring meeting will include a business meeting. I am assembling the agenda now, so if you have a topic for discussion or action, please give me a call or drop a line.

Items on the agenda include a report on a proposal for reorganization of the Division of State History. There will also be more on "Creative Mitigation."

--Steven Simms

ELECTION RESULTS

The UPAC membership voted in Duncan Metcalfe as Vice President for Government Affairs and Dennis Weder as Secretary in the late fall election. The membership voted to change the bylaws to allow student members to receive UPAC publications with their membership.

SPRING MEETING PLANS

The UPAC Spring meeting will be held on the Southern Utah University campus in Cedar City (not St. George, as previously announced) on Friday March 12 and Saturday, March 13, 1993. The business meeting will begin at 1 p.m. on Friday, March 12, and a symposium in honor of Dr. Richard Thompson's work is scheduled for 8 a.m. until noon on Saturday, March 13, 1993.

Both meetings will be held in the R. Haze Hunter Conference Center (Room 212) on the northeast side of the Southern Utah University campus in Cedar City, Utah (see map attached to this issue).

Scheduled speakers at the symposium on Saturday include Richard Ambler, Gardiner Dalley, Robert Euler, Joel Janetski, Margaret Lyneis, Doug McFadden, Heidi Roberts, Barbara Walling Frank and Karen Wise. We plan on publishing more extended and formal versions of these presentations at a later date. We will also conduct a field trip to at least one of the Virgin Anasazi sites presently being excavated in the area on Saturday afternoon. More information on this field trip will be provided at the symposium.

An open house will be held at Marian Jacklin's home in Cedar City Friday evening after the business meeting for all who want an opportunity to talk to fellow archaeologists. Directions will be given at the meeting. BYOB.

--Diana Christensen

DR. RICHARD THOMPSON NAMED UPAC FELLOW

At the upcoming spring meeting in Cedar City, UPAC will make Dr. Richard Thompson a Fellow member of the organization. Dr. Thompson's academic background includes a BA in history from San Jose State University, and MS and PhD degrees also in history from the University of Wisconsin. Following the PhD he taught history at Ohio University for three years. Ric then came to Utah in 1960 where he became an assistant professor of history at Southern Utah State College, now Southern Utah University.

He has taught nearly 30 years at the university, both history and anthropology/archaeology classes, in the Department of Social Sciences. His initial interests in archaeology were with the Parowan Fremont at Evans Mound. Later he focused on the Virgin Anasazi which became his major emphasis.

His administrative achievements during his teaching career are many. Ric spent four years as the President's Assistant for Academic Affairs, and three years as Coordinator of Research. He was chairman of the Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences, and chairman of the Department of Social Sciences. In 1974 he formed an archaeological consulting group known as Intersearch (International Learning and Research, Inc.). Ric and several of his students completed archaeological inventories for various development companies throughout southwestern Utah. Funds from Intersearch were then used to begin publication of the Western Anasazi Reports which provided an outlet for reporting ongoing Western Anasazi research in southwestern Utah. Ric has been a member of the Utah Antiquities Committee and was president of UPAC in 1983 and 1984. He has over 75 papers and/or publications to his credit over the last 40 years.

He directed field classes and schools in the Grand Canyon area, at Tuweep National Monument and The Cove in the late 1960s and early to mid-1970s. From 1978-88 Ric directed field schools on Little Creek Mountain where surveys and excavations were undertaken. His field school excavations moved to Colorado City in 1990 and currently operate during spring and summer terms.

In addition to directing the field schools Ric also has been the curator of the Museum of Southern Utah at SUU for over 24 years. The museum houses collections from numerous archaeological projects conducted on the Arizona Strip and southwestern Utah. Ric was named Professor Emeritus at Southern Utah University in 1986.

To sum up Dr. Richard Thompson's work in a few lines is difficult, with his contributions to promoting archaeological studies in the state being quite numerous. Perhaps equally as important are the number of students whom he has trained and influenced during his years in the profession. Many of these students have continued in archaeology and work with state and federal agencies, museums, or private consulting firms throughout Utah.

-Lorna Beth Billat
OPA/BYU

UTAH ARCHAEOLOGY **CALL FOR PAPERS**

We are ready to begin work on our journal Utah Archaeology 1993. The most important element in producing a high-quality journal is receiving high-quality submissions, so please dust off that gem you've been laboring over. Get going on that article you've been meaning to write.

Remember, we have a new section called "Notes," which is perfect for a short description or observation. Also, we

want to expand the reviews section, so if you have any suggestions for books to review, or, even better, if you would like to review a book, please get in touch.

As we discussed at the UPAC meeting this fall, we would like to include abstracts for major, important, or interesting CRM reports. If you have completed such a project within the last year or so, please write a detailed, summary-type abstract and send it in. Let's continue the tradition of excellence Joel and others have worked so hard to achieve. Send all correspondence and submissions to:

Kevin Jones, Editor
Utah Archaeology
Antiquities Section
300 Rio Grande
Salt Lake City, UT 8410
phone 801 533-3524

ISTEA UPDATE: Enhancement Advisory Committee Holds First Meeting

The Enhancements Advisory Committee held its first meeting last week to discuss implementation of the Enhancements Program authorized by the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991. As noted in Susan Miller's recent UPAC News article, ISTEA directs the government to expend 10% of the allocated Surface Transportation Program funds between 1992 and 1997 to enhance transportation projects. Utah's budget will be between \$3 and \$4 million annually.

Enhancements will be in three broad areas—pedestrian and bicycle facilities, scenic and environmental, and historic and archaeological preservation—and apply only to the specific activities listed in the ISTEA legislation. For the historic and archaeological preservation category, these activities are (1) acquisition of historic sites, (2) historic highway programs, (3) historic preservation, (4) rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures, or facilities, including historic railroad facilities, and (5) archaeological planning and research.

Although projects can be organized and executed by government or private groups, they must be sponsored by a public agency. Projects must provide a minimum of 20% matching funds in the form of cash or real estate. At present, it appears that federal monies cannot be used for the hard match funding. Enhancement money cannot be used for project planning or design, nor for mitigation activities that would be already required as a result of a transportation project. Project sponsors must provide for ongoing maintenance and operation of any and all facilities developed under an enhancement project. It has not been determined whether enhancements funding can be used for any necessary environmental compliance activities.

The Enhancements Advisory Committee was established by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) to develop application, award, and other policies, review applications, and make recommendation to the Transportation Commission regarding the expenditure of transportation enhancement funds.

The committee is made up of 14 individuals, including several UDOT employees, a landscape architect, the State Trails Coordinator, members of the Utah Community Forest Council, the Wasatch Front Regional Council, the mayor's bicycle committee, and the Utah Professional Archaeological Council (UPAC).

We are fortunate to have two archaeologists on the committee: Susan Miller is the UDOT Archaeologist, and I am representing UPAC as the Vice President for Government Affairs. Once the early planning and organizational meetings are complete, meetings will be open to the public.

Our first meeting was primarily introductory and organizational, but things should start to move more rapidly as meetings will be held biweekly for the next few months. We are currently working on the application procedures and hope to have the application form and paperwork ready for distribution in early March. Providing we receive suitable applications, we will recommend enhancement programs for the 1992 and 1993 funds (approximately \$7 million), hopefully by April or May of this year.

We encourage each of you to consider appropriate projects and submit proposals once the application procedures have been finalized. This is a great opportunity. If you would like more information, please contact Susan Miller at 965-4157 or me at 467-5446.

—Betsy Tipps

PREHISTORY WEEK MAY 1-8

Our annual celebration of Utah's rich natural and cultural history will be the occasion for numerous presentations, field trips, demonstrations and lectures in communities throughout the state. Formerly called Archaeology Week, Utah Prehistory Week is a time to learn about and appreciate Utah's fabulous past—from trilobites to dinosaurs, mammoths to rock art, pueblos to wagon trains.

A poster designed by Radford Cuch of Salt Lake City was selected in a statewide contest and will be published to promote Prehistory Week. A brochure will be available listing activities throughout the state. For information on events in your area, contact the Division of State History, Antiquities Section, at 533-3524. Local papers will also be a good source of up-to-date information on regional Prehistory Week happenings.

Utah Prehistory Week is sponsored by the Division of State History, UPAC, the Utah Statewide Archaeological Society, the Utah Friends of Paleontology, and numerous state, federal and citizen groups. It has become one of the premiere events in the state each spring and even greater participation is expected by community organizers this year.

—Kevin Jones

PAY 1993 UPAC DUES!

Please send 1993 UPAC dues of \$25 for voting members and \$12.50 for student members to treasurer Evie Seelinger. A list of people who have paid their 1993 dues is appended. If your name is not on this list, **please pay your dues!** This is the last issue of UPAC News that will be sent to those who have not paid 1993 dues. (I promise I'll pay my own before the next issue comes out!)

—the Editor

APPROPRIATION FOR INDIAN BURIAL REPOSITORY

House Bill 368, sponsored by Eli H. Anderson and Rob W. Bishop, is the culmination of a considerable amount of effort on the part of archaeologists, Indians, and state officials to find an appropriate place of reburial for Indian remains recovered in Utah.

Of particular importance for archaeology is the creation of a burial vault where interment can take place. It is important that human remains be protected in perpetuity, rather than reburied in places where their long-term protection cannot be assured.

You may wish to contact your legislator urging support of this important piece of legislation, which has wide support from the Native American community. The text of the bill is appended to this issue of UPAC News.

'FOWLER' AMENDMENT TO NHPA

George Bush signed the Fowler (AKA Bennett-Fowler) Bill into law on October 30, amending the National Historic Preservation Act. A summary of the amendments plus commentary by Peter Eidenbach, Vice-President of NMAC, UPAC's counterpart in New Mexico, is appended. Comments about and reactions to the amendments from Utah archaeologists will gladly be printed in UPAC News. Thanks to NEWSMAC for this article.

ANOTHER VIEW OF ALTERNATIVE MITIGATION

[Editors note: Everett Bassett of Dames and Moore and Marian Jacklin of the Dixie National Forest were asked to write viewpoints on alternative mitigation for this issue of UPAC News. Unfortunately, Marian Jacklin was unable to contribute a piece due to unexpected work obligations.]

* * *

Everett Bassett, Dames and Moore:

Whenever the specter of creative (or alternative mitigation) is raised among a group of archaeologists, it immediately becomes clear that there are at least as many perceptions of what the term means as there are archaeologists. This gamut of perceptions was well represented by the position papers presented in the last issue of the UPAC newsletter. These ranged from the benevolent (Madsen) to the wary (Metcalf) to the horrified (Shroedl and Tipps). While I agree in principle with the draft 1991 programmatic agreement, its vagaries and lack of safeguards resulted in an unusable document. Obviously, any further discussion of creative mitigation must include a more thorough definition as well as concrete examples of how it might work.

My own perception of creative mitigation might seem limiting to some, but I feel it is an appropriate one for Utah, especially in the near future. That is, I suggest it can be implemented now, without the need for a completely revamped 106 process. The approach I propose would be especially useful, not on a site by site basis, but on those few extremely large projects done each year in Utah. It is here where the most money is spent, and where the most is wasted. Where large numbers of similar sites, or small portions of large sites are to be affected within the same area, overall research efficiency is usually reduced. The larger the project, it seems, the fewer research bangs are obtained for the bucks expended - and sometimes, incredibly large numbers of bucks are at stake.

On these projects, carefully thought out research strategies should be developed, but their scope would be expanded and they would be targeted only at those locations having the greatest potential for addressing research questions. For example, a project identifying four significant sites within an area of potential effect would probably continue, as is done now, to have a moderate amount of data recovery done at each site. However, a project that includes 50 significant sites might have a large amount of work done at twelve sites, a moderate amount of work done at ten sites, and no additional work, following testing, at the remainder of the sites.

In addition, sites outside of the direct impact zone could be excavated; data could be collected, for that matter, from any place it exists if it efficiently complements the original data and addresses questions stimulated by it. Also, a portion of the total budget, say not more than 5%, could be used for signage, exhibits, or education programs. However, it would be inappropriate to expend this money in regional areas or on a data sets other than those associated with the project. Under this system there would be no "General Education Fund" or "Pioneer Museum" to drain away resources. On the other hand, we must recognize that we have an obligation to

public archaeology that can be, at least partially, met in this manner.

In this way costs to the proponent would not be increased (in fact they would probably decrease - like Madsen I believe good archaeology need not always be expensive) and in addition, the proponent would get some valuable "PR" mileage out of the public programs. On top of this, scheduling would be less of a concern since fewer sites would be worked on and a greater proportion of the work might take place outside of direct construction zones. For the archaeologist, there would be more incentive up front (more flexible research designs allowed) and less stress down the home stretch (fewer scheduling hassles). More importantly, the overall quality of the data would be improved.

This system would obviously require a thorough testing program up front, and an extensive construction monitoring program on the back end. In addition, there should be a greater effort made early on to work with the proponent to avoid cultural resources in the first place. It is my experience that when time and money savings are emphasized, rather than just site significance, project engineers are more than happy to avoid sites.

Fears have been raised (Shroedl and Tipps) that proponents would fight the system or, alternatively, use it to their own advantage by "buying off" archaeology. These are both valid concerns. However, it is my experience with other resources that proponents are willing to accept alternative forms of mitigation such as wetlands banking or contributions to buy desert tortoise habitat, especially if consistency is maintained in the planning process and schedules are adhered to.

Would the proponent be "buying off" archaeology? Sure. But that is precisely what is done under the present system. No matter how hard we try to convince project engineers of the importance of archaeological sites, their concerns will always be "How much will this cost?", quickly followed by "How soon will I be able to build my project?". It will be the responsibility of the appropriate agencies to assure that archaeology and not the archaeologists are being bought off.

There is nothing to prevent us from implementing such a system now except our own perceptions of how cultural resource management must work. Nowhere does it say that project mitigation must be confined to the direct impact zones or that impacts to all individual significant sites must be mitigated. The regulations only require agency officials to *take into account* the effects of their undertakings on significant cultural resources and *seek ways to avoid or reduce* any identified adverse effects. How flexibly this mandate is interpreted is entirely up to the participating agencies. Unfortunately, the philosophy of some federal land management agencies appears to be driven more by the custodial protection needs of individual properties than the overall information values that make most archaeological sites significant (National Register criterion "d") in the first place. We need some balance here; presently the implementation of section 106 is neither efficient nor effective.

Furthermore, I do not believe that either research designs or professional archaeologists' investigative directions or interests should be dictated by committee. Not only is this approach insulting to principal investigators and agency professionals alike, but considering the politics

of high-cost projects, untenable to proponents as well. What is needed, I believe, are principal investigators who are given free rein as well as the agencies' encouragement and support to initiate innovative research. *Principal Investigators* should be just that.

Is this approach new? Not really. I cite just two examples. The Arizona Projects Office of the Bureau of Reclamation has developed and has been implementing an approach over the last 15 years which attempts to meet the vision and spirit of antiquities legislation as well as the letter of the law. The Bureau's ongoing Roosevelt Archaeology Project is a good example that includes directed research, common-sense targeting of sites, public archaeology, and positive interaction between academic and CRM professionals. My second example is the Kern River Project as it was implemented in Wyoming - where a number of identified sites were targeted for an intensive investigation in order to fully realize their potential, rather than gathering lesser quantities of data from numerous sites.

Similar programs are possible in Utah when implemented by agency personnel having the enlightenment, initiative and (most of all) perseverance to push them through. The regulatory system may be complex, but it is not restrictive with regard to developing innovative mitigation approaches. While Memoranda of Agreement with the Advisory Council might legitimize this approach in the minds of the archaeological community and spell out the issues in greater detail, nothing can be accomplished without a consensus on the validity of the approach.

NAGPRA UPDATE

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Review Committee met for the third time on October 8-10, 1992. The Committee concurred with the Departmental Consulting Archaeologist plan to submit the revised version of Draft 4 as proposed regulations for publication in the Federal Register.

Ms. Tessie Naranjo was unanimously elected as the Committee's Chair for a one-year term.

The Committee discussed dispute resolution procedures. It foresees that most disputes will be resolved at the local level but continues to work on procedures for resolving disputes that reach the Committee level. The next meeting is scheduled for February 1993.

Some letters of notification and listing of culturally affiliated human remains and associated funerary objects have been received by the Committee and published in the Federal Register.

For additional information regarding NAGPRA, contact C. Timothy McKeown, NAGPRA Program Leader, Archaeological Assistance Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37217, Washington, DC 20013-7217; telephone (202) 343-4101.

--abstracted from Federal Archeology Report 5(4):28.

OBITUARIES

Emil W. Haurly died at his home in Tucson on Saturday, December 5, 1992 at the age of 88, thus ending an era in American archaeology.

Haurly chaired the University of Arizona Department of Anthropology and directed the Arizona State Museum from 1938 until 1964, and he kept on teaching until 1979, when he retired at age 75. He continued to hold the post of Professor Emeritus.

On the evening of his death, the Museum's current director, Raymond H. Thompson, praised Haurly as "one of the real giants in the world of archaeology in an international as well as a regional sense. He had extensive experience in the southwestern United States that gave him knowledge no contemporary scholar has."

--Glyphs (Newsletter of the Arizona Archaeological and Historical Society) 43(7):1.

James A. Lancaster died last November in Cortez, Colorado at the age of 98. His death has also been described as ending an era in Southwestern archaeology.

Ian Thompson, a columnist for the Sunday Durango Herald, observed in his November 8, 1992 column that "Al Lancaster was the last of the great archaeologists of this century to learn his profession outside the classroom . . . What he knew about Southwestern field archaeology, which

