ACRA’s Role in a National Park Service Initiative on Improving Archaeological Practice

by Kay Simpson/Dan Roberts/Terry Klein

ACRA was recently asked by the National Park Service to participate in an initiative designed to improve archaeological practice on a national scale. This initiative had its genesis in 1995 when discussions were held within the National Register program on the “archaeological problem.” These discussions were followed in turn by numerous other meetings, discussions, and reports, including the SAA report of the second conference on “Renewing Our National Archaeology Program” and several National Register workshops held in conjunction with professional conferences.

The Park Service’s current initiative is to draft a set of archaeological guidelines to be used on a national scale that can serve as the basis for archaeological practice conducted under federal mandate. The intent of the Park Service at this time is to gather together a group of archaeologists from around the country whose purpose will be to provide input on the three basic levels of archaeological inquiry—identification, evaluation, and treatment. The goal will be to craft a guidance document that will result in more consistent implementation and review of archaeological projects conducted under federal mandate.

ACRA has already met with representatives of the Park Service, Advisory Council, Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, Natural Resources Conservation Service, and the National Council of State Historic Preservation Officers to discuss in a preliminary fashion the purpose and intent of this initiative. It will be ACRA’s intent to fairly and aggressively represent the interests of its membership at the full working group meeting(s) later this year by making recommendations that focus on what constitutes a “reasonable and good faith effort” to identify, evaluate, and treat eligible archaeological properties and on the advocacy of “sound and reasoned public policy.”
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### HOUSE AND SENATE CALENDARS FOR 1999

**HOUSE CALENDAR - 106TH CONGRESS**
- January 6: House Convenes
- January 8-18: Winter District Work Period
- February 13-21: President's Day District Work Period
- March 27 - April 5: Spring District Work Period
- May 28 - June 1: Memorial Day District Work Period
- July 3 - July 11: Independence Day District Work Period
- August 7 - September 7: Summer District Work Period
- October 29: Target Adjournment

**SENATE CALENDAR**
- February 13-21: President's Day Recess
- March 27-31: Easter Recess
- May 1-9: State Work Period Recess
- May 28- June 1: Memorial Day Recess
- July 3 - 11: Fourth of July Recess
- August 7 - September 7: August Recess
- October 9-11: Columbus Day Recess
- October 29: Target Adjournment Recess

---

**Flote-Tech Flotation System**

- Excellent recovery
- Cost-effective
- Labor saving

*Being used by more than 60 universities and cultural resource management firms in the U.S. and overseas*

R.J. Dausman Technical Services, Inc
2860 Division Rd., Jackson WI 53037
414-677-4825 Fax 414-677-0339
http://www.execpc.com/~rdausman
E-mail: rdausman@execpc.com

---

**ACRA Edition offers advertising space to our members. Does your company have a special product, service, or publication that would be of interest to some aspect of the CRM community?**

**Why not consider placing an ad in ACRA Edition?**

**Advertising Rates:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Per 6 Months</th>
<th>Per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Card size (3.5&quot;x 2&quot;)*</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 page (3.5&quot;x 4.75&quot;)</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 page (7.0&quot;x 4.75&quot;)</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$525.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Business cards can be scanned.
The results of the 1999 members poll have finally been tabulated. Among the 112 corporate members in 1998, 65 completed and returned their questionnaires. As you know, the results of this poll are intended to be used by ACRA when characterizing the ACRA corporate membership to other associations, politicians, potential members, the general public, etc. We also would like to use the information from the poll to gauge the numbers of people employed by ACRA members and project that to CRM generally, because one of the first questions people want to know about CRM when they contact the executive director is “how many people work in CRM?” With only a 58 percent return rate, we cannot even say how many people are employed by ACRA firms, so please take some time to complete and return the poll next year so we can get some solid information.

Since this is the second consecutive year that the same basic set of questions has been asked in the polls, the 1999 results are compared with the 1998 results. Rather than filling this article with table after table of numbers, only some of the salient percentages are shown here. If you would like to see the raw scores, please let Tom Wheaton know (tomwheaton@newsouthassoc.com or 770-498-5159) and he can E-mail or fax them to you. He will also try to put some of them on the website like last year.

The results of the poll generally appear to reflect the overall membership as far as size categories go, so the following statistics may be fairly valid for the entire membership. It is probably not valid to extrapolate any trends to CRM as a whole, since not only are the firms who answered the poll self-selected, but ACRA membership itself is very self-selecting.

Table 1 shows the respondents broken out by company size. Small firms tended not to complete questionnaire as often as the other two categories. Disadvantaged (DBE) and woman-owned firms returned polls at an above average rate; of 19 such firms, 17 returned their questionnaires.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership Category</th>
<th>Questionnaire Responses</th>
<th>1998 Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small = &lt;300,000; Medium = 300,000-999,999; Large = 1,000,000+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantaged Business Enterprise</th>
<th>Questionnaire Responses</th>
<th>1998 Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBE (Single-M)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBE (Group-M)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of Size Category</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 1999 poll, the major disciplines (as determined by numbers of employees) are again dominated by archaeology (Table 2). In 1999, employees engaged in archaeological work ranged from 58 to 80 percent of the total employees, and in 1998, the range was from 61 to 81 percent. In 1999, small firms show an increase in employees with responsibilities in history and architectural history, perhaps indicating that small firms tend to specialize. Medium-sized firms showed an increase in employees in both archaeology and history; while large firms showed a decrease in employees in history and an increase in employees in architectural history. This may indicate the begin-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>DBIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Architecture</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural History</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwater Archaeology</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ning of a trend toward diversification in the medium and larger firms although the overall numbers are very similar from 1998 to 1999.

The geographic distribution (Table 3) indicates that the different size categories are fairly evenly distributed across the country. There are some minor differences due to the dominance of a state which encourages many smaller firms due to state laws (such as California or Florida), or other economic or historical factors. Smaller firms seem to concentrate in the southeast, medium-sized firms in the intermountain west and southwest, and large firms in the east. DBEs occur most often in the southeast. But again the overall differences are minimal.

For the past two years we have asked for members to prognosticate about the future. In 1998, only the east, midwest, and southwest reported that 1997 had been better than 1996, and the plains broke even. The far west, southeast, and intermountain west reported a very poor 1997. While all parts of the country thought 1998 would be a better year, the east, midwest, plains, far west, and the intermountain west were the most enthusiastic about 1998, and the southeast and southwest were somewhat less so. How well did this predictions hold up?

In 1998, over 80 percent in all regions, except the southeast, reported a better 1998 than 1997. The results were even better than expected. The southeast lagged behind the rest of the country, supporting the lower earlier projection. What about 1999?

Table 3. Regional (Market) Distribution By Company Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>DBE</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermountain</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Company Improvements for 1998 and Company Outlooks for 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermountain</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermountain</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If respondents are as good at projecting 1999 as they were 1998, 1999 should show a moderate improvement generally. The southeast and east may be looking forward to a better 1999 than other regions, and the southwest is the most pessimistic. Time will tell.

The size of firms may correlate with improvement in the bottom line. In 1998, 85 percent of the medium-sized firms reported a better 1997 than 1996, while 56 percent of the large firms reported a worse year in 1997, and the small firms broke even. Prognosticating 1998, around two-thirds of all three groups felt that 1998 would be better than 1997. Did this hold true? In 1999, two-thirds to three-quarters of the small and large firms reported a significantly better 1998, and the medium-sized firms dropped to 75 percent, still a higher number than the projected 62 percent. For 1999, all sizes of ACRA members generally agree that the year will be better than 1998.

If the number of companies saying they will hire new permanent employees is an indication of faith in the future, the optimism shown above may not be as strong as it seems. The percentage of firms saying they will make new hires in 1999, is not significantly different from 1998, and in fact, the medium-sized firms saying they will make new hires in 1999 has dropped from 77 percent to 63 percent. Unfortunately, most respondents who said that they anticipated making new hires did not answer the question of how many new hires they would make so trying to obtain an estimate of the actual job market was impossible. An interesting aside is the fact that more firms were willing to admit they had had a bad year than were willing to either answer the question on new hires or put down a number of projected hires.
Table 5. Changing Trends Over the Past Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>DBE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAS worked with Native Americans this year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS Errors and Omissions Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS General Liability Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS Workers’ Comp Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The poll also asked about the annual conference. The attendance among small and medium firms did not change from 1998 to 1999, about one-third for small businesses and a little over half of the mid-sized businesses attended. However, for large businesses, the percentage of attendance jumped from 46 percent to 60 percent. A clue to the cause for this jump in attendance may be found in what respondents said about the conference. Of the 20 respondents who answered this question, the overwhelming choice for the best part of the conference was networking. In second place were workshops and sessions, and a few people said the whole conference was useful. Clearly, the larger businesses are using the conference to network, set up teaming arrangements, find subcontractors, and generally find out what is going on in the industry. Given this situation, it seems that the smaller firms would help themselves tremendously by attending the annual conference and to begin making contacts with the larger firms.

Finally, there were four questions on the membership poll that show shifts in the industry over the past year (Table 5). All size categories are doing more work with Native Americans, and thus with TCPs. ACRA has had workshops at the annual conference on this topic, and it appears that more such workshops will be needed in the future. The last three questions dealt with insurance. This is a gauge of how business-like our members have become or are becoming (we hope). In every category of insurance, members reported significantly higher percentages of insurance. The medium and large firms and DBEs all reported having workers’ comp and general liability. Even though the smaller firms are not at 100 percent yet, they are well into the 90s. It is encouraging to see that these firms are recognizing their legal responsibilities. As for errors and omissions (also called professional liability) insurance, the increase is no less encouraging even though we have not achieved 100 percent in any size category.

This leads to a question some members have been asking with more frequency in the past 6 to 12 months and that is about the status of the ACRA E&O insurance policy. As you may recall, over a period of 2½ years, ACRA developed an inexpensive E&O policy with premiums in the hundreds of dollars rather than the thousands. While the policy was not perfect - it had a maximum limit of $250,000 - it was a beginning that we hoped to build upon as the underwriters became familiar with the risks involved in CRM. However, so few firms followed through that we had to abandon the program. Before we look into such a program again, we will need to be assured that enough members are truly interested.

To those of you who completed and returned the 1999 poll, we thank you. Next year, there will be improvements in the format of the poll, to make things clearer, as well as some new questions. If there is something about the CRM industry that you would like to know or see in the poll, submit your question or topic, and we may be able to include it for next year.
Summary of the Board of Directors Mid-Year Meeting
February 27 and 28, 1999, West Chester, Pennsylvania

Hosted by John Milner and Associates

The following is a summary of those board discussions considered to be of most interest to the membership or that require comment or action. Those agenda items detailed elsewhere in ACRA EDITION are not repeated here. The full and approved minutes will be available for review following the 1999 annual meeting.

Please note that the Board of Directors meetings are open to all ACRA members. The Board welcomes your attendance and participation. Contact Executive Director Tom Wheaton one month prior to the mid-year or annual board meetings if you would like an item added to the agenda.

Board Members in Attendance (representing a quorum): Cory Breternitz, Susan Chandler, Ann Hubber, David Ketz, Loretta Lautzenheiser, Patrick O’Bannon, Kevin Pape, Duane Peter, Mike Polk, Kay Simpson, Dan Roberts, Donald Weir, Tom Wheaton, Lynn Larson, Karen Hartgen; Colin Busby

Board Members Absent: Kathryn Toepel; Tom Lennon

Also in Attendance: Jeanne Harris, editor ACRA Edition; Stephen Hall, URS Greiner-Woodward Clyde

Treasurer’s Report, submitted by Don Weir

ACRA has been awarded tax-exempt status and Weir is attempting to secure non-profit status retroactive to 1995.

1999 Annual Conference, report submitted by conference host Ian Burrow of Hunter Research

The 1999 ACRA Annual Conference is scheduled for Mount Laurel, New Jersey, located 20 minutes east of Philadelphia International Airport. Workshops under discussion include Public Outreach and Initiative; OSHA; Application of Digital Technology; and Benefits and Retirement Plans (specific to the CRM industry). Each workshop will be designed to allow and encourage audience participation and interactive discussion of regional/local approaches to national issues. The OSHA workshop is targeted at business owners, not employees, and will detail health and safety plans that need to be established.

The Saturday agenda will focus on the dual conference theme of “New Opportunities” and “A Changing CRM Workforce.” Topics for consideration include the changing market and marketing strategies; education reform; succession plans; and identification of benefit and training programs that meet employee needs and expectations. The discussion will be multi-disciplinary with historians, archaeologists, and architectural historians from the private sector and from academia.

Board members also expressed concern that there be adequate time for ACRA members to discuss current issues — from regional perspectives — and that the new 36CFR800 regulations be addressed. Burrows was asked to shorten the marketing/new opportunities break-out session and to schedule a Saturday afternoon plenary session for open discussion.

Burrows was also encouraged to recruit member firms to sponsor coffee breaks, transportation to evening functions, etc., as a means of reducing registration costs.

Newsletter Report, submitted by Pape and Harris

Jeanne Harris suggested that the board look more closely at the newsletter’s advertising potential, both as a means of recouping newsletter costs and as a means of providing ACRA members with information.

Kay Simpson suggested that it would also be valuable to create a data base of subconsultants and devote one issue per year of ACRA Edition to a service directory. ACRA would provide a one-line listing free of charge. Business card advertisements could also be purchased. The service directory would not only bring in advertisement dollars but would provide a direct and tangible benefit to members.

Kevin Pape reiterated a recurring theme - associate editors remain in short supply – and asked for a reassessment of the kind of information presented in the newsletter. What do people want to see, and how might that lead to topical columns that could then be assigned to associate editors? Suggestions included a human resources column and member-firm profiles.

ACRA Board of Directors

Duane Peter
Geo-Marine, Inc.
Plano, Texas

Michael Polk
Sagebrush Archaeological Consultants L.C.
Ogden, Utah

Daniel Roberts
John Milner Associates, Inc.
West Chester, Pennsylvania

Kathryn Toepel
Heritage Research Associates, Inc.
Eugene, Oregon
Status of National Park Service Contracting-Practices Discussion, submitted by Chandler and Hubber

Chandler reported that she has received no response to her request (published in ACRA Edition) that members identify those contracting issues that they would most like to see on an agenda for discussion with park service officials.

In the absence of comment, the board directed the newly established Federal Contracting Practices Committee to submit a five-issue agenda to regional Cultural Resource Program managers.

Permitting Practices, New Mexico BLM, status report by Breternitz and Peter

Duane Peter represented ACRA at an October meeting, in support of NMAC's protest against the 12 permit areas proposed by the BLM New Mexico state office and the means of evaluating relevant experience. Peter reported that the meeting was professional, civil, and resulted in a preliminary plan to reduce the permit areas to 3 and to accept applicants' claims of comparable experience, outside the immediate geographic area. In a subsequent meeting, BLM retreated to 10 permit areas. Peter will continue to monitor the issue, as ACRA's official representative.

Government Relations Committee, report submitted by Chandler (See Committee Reports)

The board also revised ACRA's three-tier assessment of legislative/regulatory priority issues, used to direct Nellie Longsworth's efforts on Capital Hill. This list will be published in the next edition of ACRA Edition.

Status of International CRM, report submitted by Wheaton

Tom Wheaton reported on the World Archaeological Conference that convened in Cape Town in January 1999, and on the workshop on CRM programs.

While in Cape Town, Wheaton met with representatives of the European Archeology Association (EAA), a nascent "mix of Society for American Archaeology (SAA) and Register of Professional Archaeologists (ROPA)" committed to developing a private CRM sector to address the volume of work likely to result from recent environmental legislation as [these laws] take effect the university programs will be overwhelmed, just as American universities were overwhelmed in the 1970s." Wheaton noted that ACRA, working with the EAA and through participation in their up-coming conference, has an opportunity to help mitigate the fear that private enterprise is a threat to cultural resources and to help define the European CRM program at an early stage, thereby opening markets for those ACRA firms able to provide management expertise or specialized services.

Society for American Archaeology Awards, report submitted by Breternitz

Cory Breternitz argued that ACRA should be taking a much more active role in nominating projects for SAA's CRM awards. The nominations and awards remain dominated by university-sponsored projects and inadequately reflect the contribution of private-sector firms to quality Cultural Resources Management. ACRA should also maintain a higher profile at SAA, SHA, NCPH, and AIA annual meetings, and take full advantage of the opportunities that those meetings present for ACRA members to talk about issues. The board directed Wheaton to develop a proposal and budget for a booth or display that showcases ACRA and its members' work and that can be used as a bookroom display at appropriate professional meetings. In addition, the board agreed that ACRA should encourage its members to submit their work, or that of their colleagues or their clients, for award in the appropriate professional organizations and that the nomination deadlines be published in ACRA Edition.

National Park Service meeting on Improving Archeology Practices, Report submitted by Roberts and Simpson (See associated front page.)

Increasing ACRA Membership, report submitted by Kay Simpson

The membership committee has contacted lapsed members and has talked to prospective members at a variety of forums in an effort to better define those immediate and tangible benefits that ACRA is or should be providing. The board agreed to provide a yearly service directory in ACRA Edition and to provide a Members Only List Server to promote communication within the organization, disseminate information of value to members, and provide greater visibility of the benefits of membership.
Nominations for ACRA Board of Directors

ACRA's Nominating Committee is soliciting suggestions from the membership for potential candidates for the 1999 Board of Directors elections. Candidates must be owners/employees of member firms. Please E-mail your suggestions by May 1 to pobannon@ksk1.com or contact Patrick O'Bannon, Nominating Committee chair, at 215-790-1050.

In accordance with the by-laws, the member firms of a particular class (small, medium, or large) vote for the Board candidates seeking election within that class. For example, member firms that pay dues as medium-sized businesses vote for the candidates for the medium-sized firm slots on the Board. The by-laws state that the election of officers is the responsibility of the Board of Directors. The Board develops the slate of candidates, which need not be confined to members of the Board, and votes for these positions. Membership input into the officer elections is assumed to stem from the membership's election of the Board members.

ACRA's CRM Contracting Workshop

Kevin Pape and Patrick O'Bannon will conduct ACRA's workshop on CRM contracting at the 21st Annual Conference of the National Council on Public History in Lowell, Massachusetts on Thursday, 29 April 1999. The workshop offers a practical introduction to the business of CRM consulting. Topics include how to read and respond to a Scope of Work, how to develop an appropriate cost proposal, and how to calculate overhead rates and other financial data. The cost of the workshop is $50. For more information contact Patrick O'Bannon at pobannon@ksk1.com or 215-790-1050, or Elaine Duquette at Lowell National Historical Park at elaine_duquette@nps.gov or 978-275-1717.

ACRA's New Members Only Listserver

ACRA now has an online discussion group just for members. "Membersonly" is a Listserver that operates much the same way as ACRA-L, with the exception that it is only available to members. Its purpose is to offer the board, members, and the executive director a venue to share the latest news from ACRA; promote dialogue between members on current issues; and enable members to post announcements or inquiries to other members.

To subscribe to the list a member must contact ACRA's Executive Director Tom Wheaton. Once you have supplied Tom with your E-mail address, he will subscribe you to this list. Contact Tom at 770-498-5159 or E-Mail: tomwheaton@newsouthassoc.com.
Committee Reports

Government Relations Committee

ACRA Lobbying Day in Washington, D.C.

On February 26, 1999, four ACRA members and Nellie Longsworth of CEHP met with congressional staff members in Washington, D.C. in ACRA’s first 1999 foray into lobbying on Capitol Hill. Tom Wheaton, Executive Director; Cory Breternitz, President; Patrick O’Bannon, Past-President; and Susan Chandler, Vice President for Governmental Affairs, represented ACRA. The group had a series of appointments on both the House and Senate sides of the Hill, including meetings with Debby Weatherly, Staff Assistant (Majority) for the House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Interior; Rick Healy, Minority Legislative Staff for the House Resources Committee, Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands; Bruce Evans, Clerk (Majority) and Kurt Dodd, Clerk (Minority) for the Senate Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Interior; and Jim O’Toole, Professional Staff Member (Majority) and David Brooks, Minority Senior Counsel for the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation.

Our goal was to build good relationships with key committee staff members when there is no crisis at hand. We presented ACRA as a resource for them to tap when dealing with cultural resource issues, pointing out that cultural resource professionals such as ourselves deal with national historic preservation legislation on a daily basis and understand the impacts that such legislation has on the industry and our clients. For the most part, we asked them to tell us what issues were on the table and what the funding outlook for historic preservation. Topics included in their replies were the Millennium Initiative, the National Park Service Vanishing Treasures program, the recreation fee demonstration programs, land/water conservation bills, Historic Preservation Fund reauthorization, and Section 106.

ACRA members also met with staff of their own members of Congress. We presented an issue paper, prepared by Nellie Longsworth, on the Historic Homeownership Assistance Act of 1999 to our own members of Congress, requesting that they cosponsor the bill.

ACRA was well received, and we came away from the meetings with the sense that Congressional staff was pleased to know of our existence and our willingness to provide assistance to them. Nellie Longsworth recommends that ACRA keep up our government relations efforts in Washington on a regular basis, and suggests that the next lobbying trip include meetings with federal agency officials, such as the National Park Service.

Thanks are due to Nellie Longsworth, for her excellent work in setting up our appointments and training us on how to approach the folks on the Hill. Thanks, too, to New South Associates, Kise Straw & Kolodner, Soils Systems, Inc., and Alpine Archaeological Consultants, Inc., for paying the time and travel expenses for their ACRA representatives.

Susan M. Chandler, VP for Governmental Affairs

Awards Committee

ACRA Awards: A Reminder

The deadline for submission of nominations for the 1999 ACRA awards is July 2, 1999. Awards will be presented at the 1999 ACRA Annual Meeting. The 1999 categories are: Government Award, Industry Award, Public Service Award, and Quality Product Award.

Please note that this year, all entries will be anonymous. Please read the instructions and ensure that your submission meets the anonymity requirement or it will be disqualified.

Questions can be directed to Charissa Wang, ACRA Awards Chair, 614-784-8733.

Full descriptions of each category and the nomination form was included in the February issue of the ACRA Edition. They also can be downloaded from the ACRA Web Site: http://www.acra-crm.org/nominations.html.

Conference Committee

1999 Annual Conference

The 1999 annual conference will be held at the Travelodge in Mount Laurel, New Jersey, October 8-10, 1999. The annual board meeting will be held on Thursday, October 7. The conference organizer is Hunter Research of Trenton, New Jersey. This location is within 40 minutes from Trenton.
MESA TECHNICAL

HABS/HAER Large Format Photography
Archaeological Soil Science

David G. DeVries
principal

HABS/HAER Photographic Documentation
- Dozens of large and small HABS/HAER projects completed.
- Industrial, Residential, Commercial, Cold War and Military.
- Widely experienced in Historic Districts and Landscapes.
- In-house 8x10" Sinar copy camera for historic drawings.
- In-house lab/darkroom for archival processing and printing.

Archaeological Soil Studies & Geomorphology
- Stratigraphy: description and correlation across landscape.
- Depositional History: paleo-landforms, stratigraphic integrity.
- Sampling: physical, chemical; lab data interpretations.

2630 Hilgard, Berkeley, CA 94709-1002
Telephone/Fax 510.845.7830

Michael Polk
Sagebrush Consultants L.L.C.
3670 Quincy Avenue
Suite 203
Ogden, UT 84403

1999 ACRA EDITION SCHEDULE

DEADLINE
February 1
March 29
May 31
August 2
October 4
December 6

PRODUCTION
February 15
April 12
June 14
August 16
October 18
December 20

ACRA Edition
is a bi-monthly publication of The American Cultural Resources Association. Our mission is to promote the professional, ethical and business practices of the cultural resources industry, including all of its affiliated disciplines, for the benefit of the resources, the public, and the members of the association.

This publication's purpose is to provide members with the latest information on the association's activities and to provide up-to-date information on federal and state legislative activities. All comments are welcome.

Please address comments to:
Jeanne Harris, Editor
ACRA News
c/o Gray & Pape, Inc.
1318 Main Street
Cincinnati, OH 45210
513•287•7700

or
Thomas Wheaton, Executive Director
c/o New South Associates, Inc.
6150 East Ponce de Leon Ave.
Stone Mountain, Georgia 30083
770•498•5159
tomwheaton@newsouthassoc.com