



THE UPAC NEWS

Published by the Utah Professional Archeological Council

Volume 5, No. 4

November 1987

Alan R. Schroedl, President

Betsy L. Tipps, Editor

UTAH STATEWIDE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY CONTINUES TO GROW

Growth and development of the Utah Statewide Archaeological Society (USAS) continues. The accreditation program has been in full swing for some time now. Groups in the Salt Lake/Davis County, Uinta Basin, Dixie (Utah's own), Sevier Valley and Castle Valley chapters have completed the Introductory class, Level I. The inaugural Level II course (Artifact Identification & Analysis) and another Level I class were recently completed in the Salt Lake/Davis County Chapter. Initial Level I classes are underway in Utah Valley and the Weber Basin. Level II accreditation courses will be ready for the other chapters by the first of the year.

Level I accreditation certificates have now been awarded to 36 individuals (with about as many immediately pending). These students have devoted considerable time and effort to understanding at least a sketch of the growth and development of American Archaeology and the Utah prehistoric sequence. They have also been confronted with the Administrative section of Intermountain Antiquities Computer System (IMACS). The latter was a shock to some, as it no doubt was to most of us when IMACS was first introduced. The efforts of the students are applauded.

Some concern has been expressed by several Utah Professional Archeological Council (UPAC) members who have asked just what does the accreditation of amateurs mean? There is apparently some concern about the *apparent* increase in the number of available field workers and what this may mean to those who rely on contract work for their livelihood. I think most of us view accreditation as providing an opportunity for amateurs to obtain recognition for their efforts in archaeology and, of course, this can be obtained from either an arm chair or from work in the field. We have never suggested that the program would provide a quick and easy educational equivalent of what professionals struggle for years to achieve or that amateurs (now paraprofessionals) would eventually be in a position to compete on

the job market with professionals. All (or is that most?) of the various land holding agencies in the state do not, and I presume never will, accept cultural clearances by amateurs or paraprofessionals. Another, but related, sensitive issue is the use of cultural resource management projects for training students who are working on degrees in anthropology. Certainly, those institutions who are thus engaged must assume some responsibility for giving priority to such students over amateurs.

Fears that amateurs will compete with professionals on the job market seem unwarranted given the status of the majority of accredited members of USAS. Most are gainfully employed in other occupations/professions, while many who are retired are unable to tolerate the rigors of fieldwork for lengthy periods of time. This leaves (1) a few accredited individuals who are retired from regular employment and are able to cope with sometimes difficult working conditions and (2) those who are employed but are willing to use their regular vacations to provide assistance on field projects. Accreditation does mean that once a student has completed all formal coursework, including field practicums, he or she will have an opportunity to record sites on IMACS forms and receive Smithsonian designators. These forms will be reviewed and critiqued by the professional chapter advisors who will assume the responsibility for significance assessments. Again, such data should never be used in clearance work in lieu of actual professional surveys.

Finally, the efforts of chapter advisors and instructors should not go unnoticed. All have given much of their own time attending meetings, providing counsel to members or providing instruction in the classrooms. We have also received word that many of the District Managers of the Bureau of Land Management have openly indicated support of the program. Participation is solicited from those who have not yet had the opportunity to be involved or from those who have been either complacent or just plain unwilling. A roster of those

formally involved as USAS advisors and/or instructors is provided below, and, of course, many unmentioned others have also been involved on less formal levels.

Craig Harmon, Sevier Valley Advisor and Instructor; Jennifer Jack, Dixie (Utah's own) Advisor and Instructor; Joel Janetski, Utah Valley Advisor; Blaine Miller, Castle Valley Advisor; Pam Miller, Castle Valley Advisor; Blaine Phillips, Uinta Basin Advisor and Instructor; Steve Simms, Weber Basin Advisor; Kenneth Russell, Weber Basin Instructor; Shelly Smith, Salt Lake/Davis County Advisor and Instructor; Charmaine Thompson, Utah Valley Instructor; Jim Wilde, State Curriculum Advisor.

-La Mar Lindsay, USAS State Advisor

CHANGES PROPOSED IN UTAH STATE ANTIQUITIES LAW

Plans are currently being made by the State of Utah to integrate the Divisions of History and Archives into a single division responsible for records management and cultural resources. In the process, a number of changes involving the 1973 Antiquities Act will be made. Specifically, responsibilities given to the Antiquities Section in the 1973 act will be given to the division as a whole and all references to an Antiquities Section will be stricken from the statute authorizing the Division. This is consistent with the rest of the chapter; no sections are specified only programs and activities.

This continues a five-year process of integration in which an advisory antiquities committee, the position of state archeologist and permitting/project review have been absorbed within the Division of State History. Current plans call for continued attention to all legislated responsibilities and the integration process should not detract from the division's concern for the protection, preservation and explanation of the State's archeological sites. The proposed changes should actually enhance the archeological activities of the division since the division director rather than a state archeologist will be directly responsible for carrying out antiquities legislation.

THE UPAC NEWS

The UPAC News is a quarterly publication of the Utah Professional Archeological Council, 2212 South West Temple, #21, Salt Lake City, Utah 84115. Alan R. Schroedl, President (P-III Associates, Inc.), Betsy L. Tipps, Editor (P-III Associates, Inc).

The UPAC News is distributed free to all members of the Utah Professional Archeological Council and other interested parties. UPAC accepts contributions towards the publication of the newsletter at any time. Correspondence relating to subscriptions, membership or address change as well as information for publication in the newsletter should be addressed to: Betsy L. Tipps, Editor, UPAC News, c/o P-III Associates, 2212 South West Temple, #21, Salt Lake City, Utah 84115. Material for the next issue should be submitted by February 1, 1988.

A state archeologist will be appointed by the division director and his/her duties and responsibilities will be administratively defined, consistent with the statute. This could be the cause of some concern should the orientation and commitment of the division director change. Fortunately, Max Evans, the present director, appears genuinely concerned with archeology in Utah and the state's archeological program should not suffer with this legislative change.

-Utah State Historical Society

WINTER UPAC MEETINGS TO BE HELD IN SALT LAKE CITY

The winter meetings of the Utah Professional Archeological Council will be held on December 10 and 11, 1987, at the State Historic Preservation Office in Salt Lake City. The business meeting will be held on Thursday, December 10 and begin at 1:30 p.m. Tentative topics for discussion are:

Old Business

- Approval of the Minutes of the summer meetings
- Utah Archeology* publication, Joel Janetski
- Amateur Certification Program, Jim Wilde/
La Mar Lindsay
- Reburial Policy
- Report on the Division of State Lands and
Forestry Policy
- Report on State of Utah land transfer policy
- Archeology Week, Joel Janetski
- UPAC Membership and Amateur Status, Steve
Simms
- Status of the State Plan, Dave Schirer
- Highway 10 Update, Craig Harmon
- I-70 Update, Kenny Wintch
- Other business

New Business

- GIS Contract in San Juan County, Forest Ser-
vice/BLM/State History
- Reorganization of Antiquities Section
- Seismic Requirements, Asa Nielson
- Washington Lawsuits
- Election Nominations
- Summer Meetings Location and Symposium Topic

The symposium will be held on Friday morning, December 11 between 9:00 and 11:00 a.m. It will focus on the Utah Statewide Comprehensive Plan being prepared by the Utah State Historic Preservation Office. Anyone interested in making a presentation is encouraged to contact Gary M. Brown, UPAC Vice President for Research, who is organizing the symposium, as

soon as possible. Gary can be reached at (801) 467-5446 or by writing c/o P-III Associates, 2212 South West Temple #21, Salt Lake City, Utah 84115.

Summaries of current research will begin after the symposium (about 11:00 a.m.) and continue until finished. A slide projector and screen will be available for use. If you wish to make a current research presentation, or discuss some other issue at the business meeting, contact UPAC President Alan Schroedl as soon as possible at (801) 467-5446.

-Betsy L. Tipps

IMACS COMMITTEE MEETS IN SALT LAKE CITY

The Intermountain Antiquities Computer System (IMACS) committee held their semi-annual meeting in Salt Lake City on October 19, 1987. The meeting was attended by representatives from the Nevada, Utah and Wyoming State Historic Preservation Offices, several Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Archaeologists, one contractor and a representative of the IMACS administrative institution.

The committee discussed the possibility of producing a pocket-size IMACS manual that can be taken into the field. Alan Lichty, University of Utah and head of the IMACS Council, will conduct a feasibility study of producing the scaled-down manual.

The committee continued the discussion concerning adoption of two new forms, "Prehistoric Architecture Attachment" and "Prehistoric Stabilization Attachment." Lichty noted that no requests for copies of the forms had been received, despite a general announcement of their availability. After some discussion, it was agreed that the forms are unnecessary and they were dropped from further consideration.

Subject to final approval at the winter meetings, the IMACS committee decided to delete the categories "Primary Position" and "Secondary Position" from Topographic Location (Part A, #32), and the quantity codes in "Summary of Artifacts and Debris" (Part B, #7).

Definitions of flake types used in Part B, Item 9, were discussed at some length after it was pointed out that portions of the definitions are contradictory (i.e., presence or absence of cortex and size). The committee could not reach an immediate agreement on clarifying the definitions and agreed to discuss the issue at the winter meetings in Reno. Betsy Tipps, P-III Associates, Inc., agreed to collect comments from interested UPAC members and present revised definitions or a new classification scheme for discussion at the January meetings. Anyone wishing to comment on the lithic debitage flaking stages is encouraged to contact Betsy Tipps at (801) 467-5446 or by writing c/o P-III Associates, 2212 South West Temple #21, Salt Lake City, Utah 84115 by January 8, 1988.

There was considerable discussion about nonmember use of the IMACS data set and it was finally agreed that qualified nonmembers may download portions of the data set for a fee of \$50.00 plus \$0.05/site. These users will receive a discount of \$0.03/site for each newly encoded site they add to the system as part of their project. Requests for use of the data set by nonmembers will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis by members of the IMACS Council and the land managing agencies whose sites are involved.

-Betsy L. Tipps

FOUR CORNERS ARCHAEOLOGICAL FORUM TO MEET

The Second Annual Meeting of the Four Corners Archaeological Forum will be held at the San Juan County Museum and Library at Salmon Ruins, Bloomfield, New Mexico, on December 5, 1987. One of the main purposes of the forum is to keep archeologists working in the Four Corners informed of one another's work.

The morning session, lasting from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon, will consist of reports on the more important projects and research efforts conducted by each institution and organization represented at the meeting. Because this is the first of these "summary sessions", the organizers are inviting discussion of the general areas and kinds of work that each institution and organization has been involved with over the last few years.

The afternoon session will concentrate on work that may elucidate the general understanding of the ninth century in the Four Corners. While formally prepared papers are not necessary, the organizers suggest that participants examine their data and prepare their thoughts, observations, syntheses, etc., within a series of categories for general discussion. These categories are (1) settlement patterns, (2) subsistence patterns, (3) architectural and artifactual patterns, (4) significant change and continuity, and (5) agents and elements of change and continuity. The afternoon session will begin at 1:30 p.m. and continue until 4:00 p.m., after which the forum will adjourn to the bar.

The organizers are requesting that persons attending the meeting bring a short bibliography of those reports and papers that best describe, interpret and represent the ninth century in their area. These bibliographies will be compiled and distributed to members following the meeting. For further information concerning the forum, contact Peggy Powers, Division of Conservation Archaeology, (505) 632-2733.

EDITORIAL ON HIGHWAY 10

In an August supplement of the UPAC Newsletter, Craig Harmon and I provided information on the Forest Highway 10 project that was used, in part, for an article. The article's treatment of the information was only accurate up to a point and I feel that a clarification or two is in order.

The crux of the conflict between the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the Forest Service, on one hand, and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), on the other, has been the issue of whether a mitigation program should systematically sample all of an affected site. The FHWA has maintained that they are only responsible for direct, construction-related impacts within an arbitrarily defined 160-ft corridor.

The land managing agencies have argued that the entire site must be considered in the evaluation and mitigation program and that secondary impacts are a reality that must be addressed. Had a sample of the six hearths and plaza-type area at the Wide Hollow site (42SV1425) been excavated prior to a rather serious incident of vandalism last year, this information would not have been lost. It should be noted, however, that neither the Forest Service nor the BLM have advocated digging sites for the sake of digging sites. It is our belief that any systematic sampling program should be limited outside of direct impact zones and that sampling should be designed to preserve that which is preservable.

By hand-stamping a page and a half letter from the FHWA with a prefabricated concurrence stamp and signature, the Denver Office of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) has upheld the corridor approach of the FHWA. And the FHWA has used this cursory statement of concurrence as their primary justification for limiting archeological work.

On August 13, the Forest Service, BLM, Utah Department of Transportation, Utah State Historic Preservation Officer and FHWA met in Salt Lake to work out a compromise. The Forest Service proposed, as our compromise, that 33 m² be excavated outside of the 160-ft corridor to (1) mitigate the damage to the hearths and plaza alignment at Wide Hollow (25 m²) and (2) recover diagnostic artifacts from a bench above Pine Spring (42SV1844) which would help establish both temporal and functional interpretation for the portion of the site excavated within the construction corridor (8 m²).

The FHWA rejected both requests on the basis that the vandalism was not project-related and that the Pine Spring units would defy the wishes of the ACHP. When asked if the FHWA would permit this additional work if the ACHP concurred with the Forest Service, the FHWA representative said that he could not commit to that at this time.

On August 18, the Forest Service sent a very specific letter to the ACHP requesting their concurrence

with our opinion that the FHWA should be held responsible for mitigating the vandalism and the limited work at the Pine Spring site. As of November 5, with Metcalf now back in Colorado and the field portion of the mitigation project officially concluded, we have not received a decision from the ACHP. A telephone call to the Denver office early this fall was greeted with surprise by an ACHP staffer who was somehow under the impression that the Forest Service and FHWA has worked out all of their disagreements. The ACHP promised to meet with the FHWA by October 22 and get back to us with a decision. And of course, we have not heard from them. Needless to say, my opinion of the ACHP and their role in the preservation of America's cultural resources has suffered.

The Fishlake National Forest has requested special funds from our Regional Office to complete the work at Wide Hollow and Pine Spring. The BLM, in contrast, may yet have a battle on their hands. Prior to the initiation of the mitigation effort on BLM-administered lands, the BLM required that the FHWA sign a Letter of Consent document (for construction right-of-way privileges) that very specifically called for sites to be tested outside of the construction corridor. In what appears to be a very characteristic fashion, the FHWA signed the Letter of Consent and then promptly failed to issue Metcalf authorization to dig outside of the corridor.

A final point made in the UPAC newsletter needs to be amended. When the article stated that there has been "an apparent misuse of funds", it was not meant to imply that Metcalf Archeological Consultants (MAC) had misused those funds. The implication was that the FHWA could have spent their (our) money more wisely by the construction and administration of a well-defined, systematic sample of the affected sites. Instead, the mitigation work has been stringently limited by the terms of Metcalf's contract to the 160-ft construction corridor. For Mike to have done otherwise would have placed him in serious difficulty with the National Park Service, the contract administrator. Metcalf has shown, within his constraints, a willingness to work with both the Forest Service and BLM. I am appreciative of this.

In defense of MAC, the cost overrun can be attributed to the unanticipated amount of cultural features and depth within the corridor. As we all should have learned by this project, trowel testing may be an adequate means to determine the general presence of depth (i.e., "significance") at a site but is a lousy tool when trying to determine the extent of a site. Mike bid the project on the basis of trowel tests which suggested depths of 20 cm at most of the sites. When excavation units were opened, depth extended at some locations to almost 2 m.

In addition, seven wikiup-type structures and numerous hearths, not recorded by site surveyors, have been discovered within the construction corridor at the Wide Hollow site. And at the Round Spring site, pithouses, use areas, roasting pits and hearths have been located under as much as 3 ft of alluvium by backhoe

trenching. All of these events and discoveries have significantly escalated field costs.

In conclusion, the Forest Highway 10 project has pointedly highlighted the inadequacies of archeological mitigation projects. Good scientific methodology (and good common sense) have taken a backseat to rigid bureaucratic procedure and policy. Unfortunately, the victim of this struggle has been and will be an irreplaceable resource. The Fishlake National Forest, which I like to think fuels its programs on good, common sense management, has made a series of strong recommendations via a general management review. The preferred alternative would have the Forest Service assume all of the responsibility for the construction and administration of contract requirements on future highway projects. I look forward to the implementation of this alternative.

-Bob Leonard

UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION NEWS

At last summer's meetings, I informed the attending membership that Federal participation in the upcoming Interstate 70 (I-70) archeological mitigation projects in Emery County had been put "on hold" by the Utah Division of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), pending resolution of the Utah Department of Transportation's (UDOT) and Federal Highway Administration's difference of opinion regarding data recovery limits on mitigation projects. The disagreement between UDOT and FHWA over this issue was a by-product of the Forest Highway 10 controversy, which involved most cultural resource management agencies in Utah.

Policy Debate Settled. The controversy between UDOT and Utah Division FHWA is now essentially over; the two parties have "agreed to agree" on the issue of data recovery limits in cultural resource mitigation. FHWA has accepted UDOT's data recovery policy, contained in the (as yet unfinalized) *UDOT CRM Guidelines*. The UDOT policy is a compromise between the opposing positions of

(1) "If you clip it, you buy it. . ." (i.e., recovery of *all* data on site, whether or not the entire site is adversely affected) and

(2) "We are limiting data recovery to the *affected areas only*. . ." (i.e., mitigation of direct impacts only, without regard to recovering enough data to fulfill project research needs).

In a nutshell, UDOT's mitigation policy follows that of the Advisory Council of Historic Preservation (ACHP), "The 'affected area' addressed should be the *entire* area potentially subject to direct and indirect effect" . . . and "Minor work outside the affected area may be justified in order to make the work done within the area intelligible" (letter from Thomas F. King [ACHP] to

Evan De Bloois [U.S. Forest Service], dated September 26, 1986).

Obviously, this will require better coordination between all parties involved and special attention to the research potential of affected sites. The full statement of UDOT's policy is contained in the current version of the *UDOT CRM Guidelines*. UPAC members are invited to review the *Guidelines*; copies are located at (1) the Antiquities Section, Division of State History, (2) the UPAC President's place of business, and (3) the Locational and Environmental Studies Section, Utah Department of Transportation.

I-70 Project Update. The Request for Proposals (RFP) for data recovery at a number of sites within three segments of I-70 between Fremont Junction and the Ghost Rocks rest area will be released soon, probably in December. This will be a competitive solicitation for professional data recovery services. Offerors have the option of bidding on any one, two or all three segments. Professional permittees must have a written request for the RFP on file at UDOT in order to receive a copy of the RFP and, thus, be able to offer a competitive proposal. Awarded offerors will be requested to begin data recovery fieldwork as soon as possible next spring. All data recovery fieldwork should be complete by the end of the field season.

New Competitive Selection Process. It is my distinct pleasure to announce a new and improved competitive selection process for mitigation contracts. UDOT will no longer request submission of cost proposals from all prospective offerors. Now, prospective offerors will be requested to prepare both technical and cost proposals, yet submit only the technical proposals for competitive evaluation. During the evaluation process, technical proposals will be scored and ranked according to technical excellence. Subsequently, the chair of the Selection Review Board will request the offeror of the top-ranked technical proposal submit his corresponding cost proposal, and enter into cost negotiation. No other offerors will be requested to submit cost proposals at that time. If the cost negotiation is successful, then UDOT will award the contract to the top-ranked offeror. If not successful, the Selection Review Board will discontinue negotiations with the top-ranked offeror, then request the second place offeror submit his cost proposal and enter into cost negotiation.

This is an entirely new procedure, and I am unsure how well it will work. However, I feel it is a definite improvement for the follow reasons:

(1) Technical excellence becomes the only variable considered during the competitive review (i.e., the evaluation phase) and

(2) Cost becomes secondary, an item to be negotiated with only one offeror at a time (and one time only if negotiation with the top-ranked offeror is successful). As long as the top-ranked offeror's costs are reasonable, justified and in line with the level of work proposed in the corresponding technical proposal, then that offeror will be selected.

The signed contract will still be for cost reimbursement (i.e., UDOT will remunerate the consultant for the actual costs of performing the requested work, rather than a fixed sum total per se).

As always, UPAC members are encouraged to contact the UDOT Archeologist (801-533-4563) if they need more information or have any questions, comments or suggestions concerning UDOT's cultural resource management program.

-Kenny Wintch

CURRENT RESEARCH

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Vernal District Office, recently completed an intensive inventory of 1450 acres along the Big and Little Brush Creek drainages. The inventory was conducted by two BLM temporary archeologists, Shaun Doig and Robert Vance, both of Montana State University. The focus of the inventory was to collect data about prehistoric settlement systems in and along the primary drainages on the south flanks of the Uinta Mountains. A secondary goal was to collect data which would further the understanding of the differences and similarities between the Cub Creek and White Rock phases of the Uinta Fremont.

Doig and Vance recorded 45 archeological sites including two historic sites. Each site was recorded on 1987 IMACS forms, plane table mapped, photographed and, if applicable, samples for C-14 dating were collected. Site types included (1) Fremont villages, (2) Fremont rock art sites, (3) habitation sites with one or more structures, (4) mounds, (5) resource exploitation sites, (6) rockshelters, (7) lithic scatters, (8) historic Ute pony and wagon trails, and (9) historic coal mining sites.

One Fremont village site, 42UN1619, was tested by Doig, Vance, Phillips and members of the Uinta Basin Statewide Archaeological Society to determine if it was a stratified, multicomponent site. This site is situated on an early Holocene terrace along Little Brush Creek about 16 km northeast of Vernal, Utah. One cobble feature was selected for testing. A pie-shaped wedge was gridded and excavated by cultural stratum. A test trench was also utilized. These tests revealed that the cobble feature was indeed cultural rather than natural, and two pitstructures were situated beneath it. Two types of gray ware were recovered from these excavations. The artifact inventory was typical Uinta Fremont and two C-14 samples were collected from the cobble surface feature and the lowest pit feature. The feature had characteristics of the Cub Creek and White Rock phases. Site 42UN1619 covers about 20+ acres and has 35+ features. One cobble-lined pitstructure exceeded 13 m in diameter. Soil analysis from a single stratigraphic pit indicates that this site was located in a wooded environment rather than a sagebrush/grassland biome as at present. Further work is needed to substantiate this observation.

Another equally large Fremont village contained remains of wattle and daub structures. Preliminary examination of the clay fragments indicates that the structures were rectangular and exceeded 8 m in diameter! The pole and stick impressions were perfectly preserved so that leaf and bark impressions enabled the BLM area botanist to determine species of the structural members and possible season of construction. It appears that serviceberry (*Amelanchier* sp.) was used in construction. Leaf impressions indicate a spring time construction period based on leaf size and development.

A report on this project should be available by late spring of 1988. For further information, contact Blaine Phillips, Vernal District BLM office.

-H. Blaine Phillips, II

P-III ASSOCIATES, INC.

During the month of September, 1987, P-III Associates, Inc., conducted a cultural resource investigation of a 3.4-mi-long corridor along State Route 224 near Park City, Utah. The survey resulted in the recording of two historic sites (42SM157 and 42SM158).

Site 42SM157 is the earliest Euroamerican settlement in Summit County and one of the earliest in Utah (1850). It is a large, multicomponent historic settlement site which includes (1) the Snyder family graveyard (1874-1920), (2) the original pioneer fort location, now possessing only subsurface deposits (c. 1853-1855), (3) the assumed locations of Snyder's sawmill (c. 1853-1872), (4) the assumed location of a grist mill, currently under State Route 224 (c. 1853-?), (5) two historic trash dump deposits with surface materials suggesting use between 1880 and 1935, (6) the foundation and subsurface deposits associated with the Parley's Park Ward House (c. 1901-1950), (7) a small general store (now converted to a garage) which operated between c. 1890-1930, (8) a National Register potential wood frame house built c. 1885, (9) a wood frame house built c. 1885, and (10) the known general location of several early habitation structures. As a distinguishable entity with a known history, this site, the Snyderville historic/archeological site, meets *all* National Register evaluation criteria (36 CFR 60.6) and is considered extremely significant.

The second site (42SM158) is a small historic habitation/possible grist mill site with no extant structures remaining but does possess intact subsurface deposits. Site 42SM158 consists of a historic trash scatter of glass, ceramics and metal fragments. While the glass and ceramics suggest a domestic function for the site, four fragments of sandstone slabs scattered about the site exhibit at least one face ground extremely smooth, and may be fragments of millstones. Several water-worn cobbles occur on the site which may have been structural elements, since cobbles have obviously been cleared from the fields surrounding the site. Ten centimeters of deposition were noted over the upper smooth face of one of the possible millstones, suggesting a cumulative depth of at least 20 cm for the site.

In early June, 1987, P-III Associates, Inc., conducted a cultural resource investigation of the proposed 5300 South/Interstate 15 (I-15) Frontage Road connections just southeast of Murray City, Utah. The field inventory resulted in the discovery of a culturally significant historic trash dump (42SL104) primarily dating between 1890 and 1920. This trash dump is located on the northern edge of the now-abandoned "Carbon Irrigation Ditch." Because of the potential significance of this site, test excavations were conducted in October to determine the extent of the deposits and to determine if additional subsurface cultural deposits existed at other locations in the project area. Hand tests were excavated in looters' pits in order to determine the exact depth and integrity of cultural deposits on the site.

Numerous historic ceramic pieces were noted, including 20 fragments with white/fine paste, clear glaze, blue transfer print and flow blue attributes. At least 15 ceramic fragments have white/fine paste, clear glaze and clumped flower transfer prints. Most of these exhibit slightly raised, uncolored rim molding of patterned scrollwork.

At least 10 ceramic fragments with white/fine paste, clear glaze, plain patterns and unknown forms were also observed. Seven fragments of a crockery everted rim pot in fine dark cream/buff paste with interior and exterior dark brown salt glaze and no decoration were also noted. All appear to be from the same vessel.

At least 80+ fragments of light green, clear, aqua, dark green, brown and amethyst glass observed on the site, as were several whole bottles left in collectors' piles. All of the whole bottles possessed numerous internal bubbles (pre-1920) and presumably represent the less-desirable bottles found, and left, by bottle collectors. Approximately 10 fragments of clear window glass were also observed, one of which was apparently rectangular with edges beveled on one side. An ornate fragment of an embossed lamp chimney shade (gold and pink paint on raised relief) and an ornate, cut glass candy dish/ash tray (?) were similarly noted.

Overall, a primary period of deposition stretching from c. 1890 to 1920 would account for most of the glass and ceramic artifacts occurring at site 42SL104. Preliminary data suggest that the dump might have been discrete to an individual dwelling or dwellings which formerly existed just north of the site toward 5300 South.

-Kenneth W. Russell and Alan R. Schroedl

NICKENS AND ASSOCIATES

For the last 4 1/2 years, Nickens and Associates has been actively involved in prehistoric ruins stabilization projects in the northern Southwest through contract work with the National Park Service (NPS) (Rocky Mountain and Southwest regions), the Navajo Nation, San Juan County, New Mexico, the Utah State Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Forest Service and the Utah State Parks Department. To date, our firm has utilized well over \$1 million in the preservation of over 70

archeological sites and in the assessment and inspection of an additional 28 sites. Our work includes not only the stabilization of the standing architectural remains, but also active involvement with the various agencies to plan, program and coordinate ruins stabilization programs in their areas.

Our approach to stabilization is somewhat in contrast to the more traditional approaches that have been used for the last 90 years. Rather than viewing stabilization as a mere construction process, we have been approaching it from an archeological perspective in which equal concern is placed on preserving and conserving the resource for the professional as well as the public. Our intended goal has been to raise the level of stabilization from a noncontributing and ultimately destructive process to a valuable tool in the archeological data retrieval process and a more functional approach for cultural resource conservation strategies.

Two projects that serve as hallmarks for this approach include the nearly completed multiyear contracts with the NPS in Canyonlands National Park/Natural Bridges National Monument and Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. Since 1983, we have been successful in stabilizing over 54 archeological sites in those 3 NPS areas. To date, a total of 24 technical reports have been produced that document the stabilization activities and that provide significant baseline data. As of spring 1987, all field activities were completed under the requirements of each of these contracts. We are currently in the process of finalizing the last of the technical reports and are putting together the final project reports that synthesize all of the archeological data gathered as a result of the stabilization work.

As part of these NPS contracts, we are putting together guidelines and standards for conducting ruins stabilization projects. These guidelines are both philosophical and practical in nature and will hopefully provide the framework for future stabilization and site conservation work throughout the greater Southwest. To ensure that there is approval by the full spectrum of professionals dealing with archeological resources, we are in the process of forming a task force to review the document that is produced. Issues that are addressed in the guidelines include (1) the appropriate methods and techniques to be used in the stabilization process and (2) personnel qualifications.

-Paul R. Nickens

ANNOUNCEMENTS

NEWSLETTER SUBMISSIONS

The deadline for submission of current research reports, announcements, news items and letters to the editor for the next issue of the *UPAC News* is February 1, 1988. All submissions should be titled, typed and follow the current *American Antiquity* style guide.

1988 DUES PAYABLE AT WINTER MEETINGS

Dues for 1988 are DUE at the winter meetings or can be submitted to James D. Wilde, Treasurer, Utah Professional Archeological Council, Museum of Peoples and Cultures, 105 Allen Bldg., Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. Dues are: Institution \$25.00; Voting Member \$25.00; Student Member \$7.50; Associate Member \$7.50. Institutional Members and Voting Members will receive the new Utah Professional Archeological Council/Utah Statewide Archaeological Society publication, *Utah Archeology*.

NATIONAL PRESERVATION NEEDS BEING ASSESSED: ACTION NEEDED

The National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers (NCSHPO) is currently conducting a survey to assess historic preservation needs across the nation. The data collected during the survey will be used to justify each state's historic preservation appropriation; NCSHPO will also use the data to respond to specific information requests made to the National Park Service by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. All types of historic and prehistoric properties and all types of projects including those on nonfederal land are to be included in the assessment. Appropriate projects may include acquisition and development, restoration and rehabilitation, testing, excavation and stabilization of archeological sites, survey and preparation of educational materials. If you are aware of a cultural property in need of preservation assistance, fill out the "National Preservation Needs Assessment" form included with the newsletter and mail it to the Utah State Historic Preservation Office, 300 Rio Grande, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101 by December 15, 1987.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT HIRES ARCHEOLOGIST FOR SAN JUAN RESOURCE AREA

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) recently hired Dale A. Davidson to fill the Archeologist position in the San Juan Resource Area. Dale has an M.A. in Anthropology from Northern Arizona University and joins the Utah BLM after serving as a BLM District Archeologist in Lewistown, Montana.

RANGELAND PROGRAM SUMMARY UPDATE AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW

UPAC recently received a Rangeland Program Summary update for the Randolph Planning Unit Grazing Environmental Impact Statement. This update will be forwarded to Chas Cartwright, chairman of the ad hoc review committee for comment. Anyone interested in helping review the update should contact Chas Cartwright at Canyonlands National Park.

APPLICANTS SOUGHT TO HELP DEVELOP UTAH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Utah State History Preservation Office is currently seeking applications from qualified persons who wish to be involved in writing *The Utah Comprehensive Plan—Archaeology*. The plan will focus on seven temporal/spatial units. These are

1. Pleistocene and Transitional period throughout Utah,
2. Early Holocene and Neoglacial period on the Colorado Plateau,
3. Early Holocene and Neoglacial period in the Great Basin,
4. Late Holocene period on the Colorado Plateau,
5. Late Holocene period in the Great Basin,
6. Recent period on the Colorado Plateau,
7. Recent period in the Great Basin.

Each of these units will address the various expressions of six themes. The themes are (1) Subsistence, (2) Paleoenvironment, (3) Settlement, (4) Technology, (5) Social Organization, and (6) Ideology.

Requirements. Persons selected as authors will be expected to fulfill a three-year commitment. This will include participation on a planning committee and writing the Study Unit. The planning committee will meet at least two times a year, at its discretion, to define initial goals, review draft copies of individual study units and to incorporate any needed revisions into the plan.

Compensation. A \$4000.00 stipend will be provided for each of the study units upon their completion. In addition, the Utah State Historic Preservation Office will arrange to have the final copy of the Study Unit published.

Applications. Persons interested in authoring one of the Study Units should send a current vita and a cover letter stating qualifications for each Unit for which they wish to be considered. Vitas should be received prior to *January 8, 1988*, to ensure consideration. For further information or to submit applications, contact:

Attn: David L. Schirer
Utah State Historic Preservation Office
300 Rio Grande
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
Phone: (801) 533-6017

-David L. Schirer

UTAH MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY SPONSORS ANASAZI POTTERY WORKSHOP

This workshop will include hands-on instruction in the recognition of Anasazi pottery styles and types, their ages and regions of manufacture.

Instructor: Winston Hurst, Curator, Edge of the Cedars Museum

Time: Saturday, March 12, 1988; 8:00 a.m.-4:00 p.m.

Place: Utah Museum of Natural History, Room 305

Cost: \$36 museum members/\$38 nonmembers; preregistration is required.

FIELD TRIP TO CHACO CANYON

The Utah Museum of Natural History and White Mesa Institute are cosponsoring a field trip to Chaco Canyon National Monument in northwestern New Mexico. This camping trip will include a day-and-half in Chaco Canyon and visits to Chetro Ketl, Pueblo Bonito, Casa Rinconada and a hike to Pueblo Alto to view the road system built by the Anasazi hundreds of years ago.

Instructor: Dr. Linda Cordell, archeologist and author of *Anasazi World*

Time: June 4-8, 1988

Place: The trip will meet and end in Blanding, Utah. All food and transportation will be provided from Blanding.

Cost: Contact the museum at 581-4887.

SPEAKERS NEEDED

The Business-Industry-Community Education Partnership is seeking persons willing to speak on various topics concerning Anthropology to grade school classes in Salt Lake City. For more information, please contact Georgia Herron at 268-8587.