STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

Pursue Legislative Remedies:

Tribal involvement grouping:

- Tribes recognized in S&G and DEQA process by requiring consultation with tribes concerning treatment of resources.
- Involve local and tribal governments in monitoring local development projects to ensure compliance.
- Use tribe’s political abilities and clout to advance these issues. Use NA political stature to lobby.
- Clarify and codify Native American involvement in CEQA driven projects.

Reviews:

- SHPO review of all CEQA projects. Require project proponents to pay for these reviews.
- Get project proponents to pay for review.
- Create an oversight agency for CEQA projects like SHPO for Section 106.

Regulatory/Legislative changes:

- Pursue ways to make the lead agency follow CEQA guidelines. Many rural areas simply pay no attention to CEQA when issuing (or ignoring the need for) permits.
- SHCR/ARC draft amendments to CEQA guidelines.
- Partner with CPF to push for regs.
- Coordinate regulations at the legislative level.
- Work with OPR to create legislation which requires City/County to include a historic preservation plan in new or update general plans.
- Pursue means to require ministerial projects that may impact historical resources to be defined as a project and thus subject to CEQA.
- Local CRM-ers and Tribes promote stronger local county historical preservation ordinances. (e.g., San Diego model).

Develop Permit and/or Licensing System

- I need a permit to go fishing; why not do to archaeology?
- Adopt RPA – legally mandated.
- Use RPA roster as basic qualifier. Already exists; don’t reinvent.
- Develop archaeologists permit process. New Mexico’s system has permit issued by SHPO, applicants reviewed by Historic Resources Commission. Simultaneous legislative mandate.
- Follow Texas system for issuing excavation permits.
- State review board. Follow other state’s templates.
- Legislature to require licensure through RPA list.
- Put everything mappable in to GIS.
- Involve tribes in regular performance review of CRM-ers listed by local/County/state governments as being ethically professional.
- Require ongoing educational development activities in order to maintain one’s license.
- License renewal tied to ongoing continuing education.
- Mandate MA or equivalent degree for primary investigators. And evidence of continuing education.
- Every 5 years, like a teaching credential, 100 hours or 8 units.
- Adoption of a statewide certification annual program for archaeologists. (e.g., Riverside, San Diego)
- Continuing education required annually (e.g., 16 hours per year, in pertinent topics.
- Need some kind of penalty for malpractice
• English models for Standards & Practice. Institute for Archaeologists (www.archaeologist.net) or British Archaeological Jobs Resource (BAJR.ORG).
• Who will provide oversight? What body issues permits and reviews them for currency?
• Who reviews potential licensing or permitting? Process? Results?
• Negative – this can backfire and result in a litigation of an established firm or Indian sue.

**Develop Standards and Guidelines for Practice**

• Provide incentives for CRM firms who make a real (documented) effort to use less invasive and destructive tools and methods for sensitive sites.
• Requirement that any project involving earth disturbing activities would at a minimum include eval by archaeologist, records search, Phase I walk over survey and report, Phase II if nec. Prior to project approval.
• Requirement that archaeo surveys are conducted in a manner culturally sensitive to tribal customs and practices.
• Draft and adopt NA Tribal consultation guidelines for CEQA practice
• Standards and Guidelines to be developed and taught at college level; both for Indian and non-Indian practitioners. Various levels of practice.
• Native American CRM-ers, monitors, etc. should have the same standards as archaeologists. Standards should be across the board.
• Second level- standards for practitioners. Needs to be simple (basics) for the “engineers” that often do the hiring.
• Draft and adopt by SHRC/ARC or OPR process for considering and resolving significant impacts on historical resources, modeled after Section 106.
• Requirement to take into account the regional landscape when determining significance.
• Create statewide database of publicly accessible reports for interpretation and education.
• Educate lead agencies in the need for preservation.
• The paper distribution of information to CRM practitioners (field techs) regarding their expected roles, monitoring, and conducting other work, especially on large public works projects, but on local projects as well.
• Look at cities/counties that have already established guidelines and model rather than starting from scratch.
• Adopt SOI standards and guidelines.
• Look at SD Co. model/ Riverside Co.
• Adopt RPA standards.
• Endorse Annex rules of 2001 UNESCO Convention on underwater cultural heritage. (Best Practices)
• Tribal cultural significance is a factor that must be taken into account when determination of significance is made.
• Local agency charges review fee with project application for SHPO review of CRM reports, under CEQA. Fee based on project size, # of sites, etc.
• Find funding for SHPO review of CEQA reports.
• Approach issue from position of agency responsibility. The review can enforce standards of work by rejecting poor projects. Use ICS as reviewers or other CRM firms.

**Develop Professional Qualification Standards**

• At a minimum, incorporate SOI standards but also develop a code of ethics that incorporates both terrestrial and underwater cultural heritage.
• Pursue partnerships with CSU MA programs to develop continuing education programs. Work with universities to develop programs.
• CRM archaeologist should demonstrate familiarity with regional literature, research questions, and on-going work before being accepted as contractor by local agency. 
• There should be a review and accreditation process for CRM programs.
• Have educational benchmarks for CRM programs, updated with input from tribal reps. Guidelines should be reviewed and updated regularly.
• Tribal cultural sensitivity course requirement for contract archaeologists.
• Devel. PGRs, or alternative experience instead of education like feds. (mix of ed. and experience, not just ed.)
• Grandfather in people who may not qualify.
• Licensing requirements for CRM work need to require post-grad field work, measured perhaps in hours, so there needs to also be positions for unlicensed grads.
• Adopt Caltrans PQS standards or SOI’s
• Adopt SOI standards.
• Adopt RPA quals.
• Principal Investigator should have at a minimum an MA in appropriate field.
• Develop and balance quals/ education for people without MA, PRAs but have years of experience.
• How well does PRA work? When/How will a CA System be better?
• Professional Quals based on SOI. Why should they be different?
• Require RPA
• License archaeologists through OHP or other body to ensure they meet minimum qualifications based on SOI standards. OHP promulgate regs.

General discussion notes:
• Develop state preservation program that mandates local (county, city) preservation programs.
• Involve tribal representation.
• Consider establishing a private or grant-based fund that would help develop preservation guidelines and help enforce on local level.
• Discussion Points:
• Work with CPF and historic preservation communities to get archaeology considered as part of the general plan.
• SB 18 as frame of reference.
• Local efforts to build grass roots; use connections to locals to build interest
• New Mexico HRC reviews quals.
• Use tribal political organization
• Guidelines that people could follow on what to expect from an archaeologist
• Keep working on guidelines for what is in a historic preservation plan.

Upshot of the discussion:
1. Work on creating guidelines or sample language of what an archaeological preservation ordinance would include and how it would be incorporated in the general plan amendment process.
2. Work on guidelines or recommendations on what is a “qualified” archaeologist under CEQA.
3. Work on guidelines or recommendations on what constitutes good work in CA CRM.
CONSERVATION

• Nominate properties to the NR as part of mitigation.
• Expand CASSP programming
• Provide pro-bono help to developers, etc. to designate landscapes
• Eligibility based on dynamic characteristics
• Require landscape perspective in evaluation and permitting process.
• Look at land forms and transportation corridors in evaluation of individual sites.
• There’s a lot to learn from the wilderness Act and subsequent attempts to preserve and not touch a landscape, as if landscapes can be static.
• Modify “ethnographic landscapes” concept to allow change over time, both to include archaeological sites and present land use.
• Take this approach / idea to planning process (regional, county) to think about “landscapes” as still alive.
• Don’t forget water – submerged cultural resources.
• Training on district / landscape concept for archaeological sites.
• Partner with groups like Nature Conservancy, Trust for Public Lands to make them aware of the need to protect archaeological and historic elements of the land they seek to acquire.
• OPR advocates a cultural landscape analysis (natural & cultural features integration
• Insert cultural landscape (e.g., ethnographic) analysis requirement into NAGPRA or CA equivalent.
• Cultural landscapes to encompass more than the static, fixed, physical properties, but also be inclusive of social, familial, spiritual / religious aspects across time.
• Early consultation feeds into project redesign which encourages conservation.
• Connect with National Trust for Hist. Pres. To use existing mechanisms for publicizing issues.
• Look to the George Wright Society for ideas and possibly partnerships.
• Shift to conservation means an approach that uses concepts of maintenance, sustainability, and maintain ability to use.
• Be careful when creating archaeological districts and what constitutes the contributing elements, NA habitats were vastly different in prehistory then they are today.
• Property tax “holiday” deferment or credit for maintaining important sites intact, give incentive to property owner to conserve sites.

PROTECTION

• Amendments to CEQA that cultural importance is a factor in determining significance.
• Training for land-use in planning, managers to ensure equal application for CEQA
• Mandate a review of every permit for cultural resources when there is an impact to land.
• The recourse to courts as one of the only ways in which to make sure CEQA is followed is not a viable mechanism, especially for poorly funded stakeholders.
• Update local gov. master plan to include consideration of archaeology
• Require preliminary reviews of projects in order for local gov. to inform applicant about avoidance potential, next steps possible mitigation requirements. Ties back to early consultation leading to possible project redesign.
• Expand SB 1034 (?) to cover land owned by local governments.
• Educate developers and agencies about what can be done / discouraged within a landscape or district. Tax benefits / pr benefits/ good will / industry.
• Local gov’t env. Staff should be trained in cultural resources management.
• Broaden both what we want to protect and what we count and protection.
• Combine “protection” with “conservation”
• Use and extension of Passport in Time to include people who are trained in a “protection” for site specific areas – different from CASSP who are “documenting”
• Mitigation banking
• Mitigation fees can be spread out over various contractors – develop0ers on a cumulative basis, but everyone pays, but a little less when the costs are shared.
• Make it mandatory to protect (avoid) sacred/burial sites.
• Climate change preparation. We’ve got a limited time to record coastal sites prop to loss due to sea level rise, erosion; should be placing these sites on high priority lists.
• Archaeologists should partner with law enforcement and tribes to enhance enforcement and protection, e.g., see Martin McAllister’s work and classes on law and protection.
• It is essential that we focus on the cultural landscape (analysis) approach in both the NEPA/Section 106 and CEQA review process to achieve conservation/protection goals. Amend CEQA to require cultural landscape analysis. Must be coordinated and integrated with other CEQA checklist requirements so the requirement is not perceived as another burden or place to stop a project. Will need to define “cultural landscape”. Compare to 106’s APE. See CPF’s definition of preservation. Preservation is not for its own sake – it’s about managing change while ensuring that heritage is recognized as important.
• Support property tax credit if property owner / developer completes a CRM survey – a cultural landscape plan. This is similar to Williamson act.
• OPR should require cultural landscape analysis methods.

CURATION
• Fund Cal-NAGPRA
• Create a fee for certification to pay for orphaned collections.
• Make developers pay for curation
• What is the true cost of curation – long term costs.
• Problem is at the source – development must fund the problem they create.
• Work with all museums in developing standards lexicon and guidelines.
• Mandatory curation fee for any undertaking or project. Fee scaled to square meters. all permits require fees whether or not in sensitive areas. Averaging will help the landowners where collections are made. This will generate a curation fund and will eliminate CRM responsibilities for budgeting for curation.
• Train students in curation before they excavate.
• Update SCA ethics statement
• Develop oral history project to assist in understanding why site was excavated.
• Amend CEQA to correspond to feds. Support curation class instruction or create an internship in CRM degree.
• Develop finding aids for collections that can be accessed through the web.
• Curation includes personal professional papers and photos.
• Scanning and protection of associated documents.
• Repository can submit 1 page site record update for sites with collections.
• Data recovery paradigm must change to avoidance at collection as first priority.
• Encourage study of existing collections as thesis or dissertation subject.
• Lobby university programs to promote study of curated collections for student AND faculty research.
• Acknowledge collections generated from previous studies in order to adequately answer research design questions.
• Require collection management plans for all projects. After significant deliberation, as part of data recovery programs. Include as component of agency CEQA guidelines.
• Guidelines for discard of certain categories of artifacts.
• We need to reexamine professional ethics re: curation. Once analysis is compete, do we really need to curate every unidentifiable bone frag., glass, etc., which seem to form the bulk of our collections.
• The lead agency must make curation a consideration of a project and make sure the applicant is required to cover the cost. The CRM firm needs backing from the lead agency.
• Encourage consultation with tribes as an alternative to curation.
• Engage native American and or descendant community in curation process. Those groups may want materials for their own repositories or historical museums, deed of gifts, loans. Etc.
• Repatriation where possible. Make casts of key artifacts prior to repatriation.
• Include tribal museums in the development of repositories.
• Involvement of tribal museums who might not meet federal standards?

INTERPRETATION
• Spend some effort debunking pseudo archaeology.
• More participatory research should be advocated and carried out. Direct involvement of stakeholders (e.g., Tribes) to define the direction of research is an essential goal.
• Involve the state assn. of historical societies and county /city/ local museums and organizations.
• Link to each other’s web pages to share ideas.
• Utilize existing education institutions to both educate them and thru them educate general public.
• Assist in creation of high school curriculum to each CA history.
• Work with land managing agency interpretive program to better cover archaeology.
• Survey other state public interpretation programs for strategies and best practices (especially for web based materials).
• SHPO should expand web links, outreach to other state departments to further CRM interpretation on construction projects statewide. BTH other departments in Natural Resources Agency.
• I don’t see how the name of the white paper interpretation has anything to do with that subject. It should have been called “outreach.” Raise records search fees with a percentage going to OHP to help fund these ideas.
• You’re taking a moral high road in my opinion. When we teach kids about the importance of taking care of the environment in the fun and exciting way so that they own generational responsibility.
• Split the CHRIS inventory records search budget from the CHRIS outreach budget. Keeps funds separate. This could give a better idea of funding needed.
• Consider including interpretation component in lieu of data recovery or in combination with it.
• Make movies
• Expand k-12 interp. To include content (special studies curric. As well as methods – science curric)
• Public is interested in hands-on volunteer opportunities. Perhaps SCA website could have a bulletin board for archaeologists to post current volunteer opportunities.
• IC statewide standards.