



NEW ZEALAND
ARCHAEOLOGICAL
ASSOCIATION

NEW ZEALAND ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION NEWSLETTER



This document is made available by The New Zealand Archaeological Association under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

To view a copy of this license, visit
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>.

CONTRACT ARCHAEOLOGY IN HAWAII

Paul H. Rosendahl,
Bernice P. Bishop Museum

INTRODUCTION

Contract archaeology projects in Hawaii are defined as those concerned with archaeological resources, undertaken through public or private funding, in areas to be altered or developed by or for man's use. Contract archaeology projects involve the investigation of archaeological resources - the identification, evaluation, and preservation or salvage of those resources - for the purposes of describing and explaining the life-ways of past inhabitants, and the course of cultural development in the Hawaiian Islands.

In recent years, contract archaeology has become increasingly important and extensive in the United States. This trend has been strong in Hawaii, but mainland United States knowledge of contract archaeology in Hawaii appears to be virtually nonexistent. This paper, a slightly revised version of one presented at the 40th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology (May 1975), summarizes the development and current condition of contract archaeology in Hawaii, and the contract archaeology programme of the Department of Anthropology, Bernice P. Bishop Museum. Development from beginnings in the 1950s to organized programmes of the present is outlined. Discussed are specific legislation guiding the practice of contract archaeology in Hawaii, the variety of projects conducted for both governmental and commercial clients, the problems encountered by contract work in Hawaii, and the outlook for contract archaeology in Hawaii.

LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Contrary to the apparent belief of many on the mainland, Hawaii is indeed part of the United States; and, therefore, contract archaeology in Hawaii is subject to the same Federal regulations as the rest of the country. The most significant Federal items are: (1) Antiquities Act of 1906; (2) Historic Sites Act of 1935; (3) National Historic Preservation Act of 1966; (4) National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; (5) Executive Order 11593, "Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment" (1971); (6) Archaeological and Historic

Preservation Act of 1974; and (7) National Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, "Procedures for the Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties" (1974). There is no need to summarize content here; adequate summaries may be found in McGimsey's *Public Archaeology* (1972) and in the *Proceedings of the 1974 Cultural Resource Management Conference* (1974).

The legislative background for the State of Hawaii has also been summarized by McGimsey (1972: 140-143, 207-215), and, in his opinion, Hawaii has probably the most comprehensive and strict set of antiquities legislation in the country. The principal legislation is Chapter 6, Revised Laws of Hawaii (1968). A single, existing State agency, the Division of State Parks within the Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR), was assigned primary responsibility for conducting programmes of archaeological research and preservation. Procedures were established under which DLNR administers a system of permits to recognized scientific and educational institutions. These permits include requirements concerning the content of archaeological work on State lands and reports to be submitted. The location of all recorded sites on to State tax maps is directed. Prior to any public construction project, the agency involved must consult the tax maps and advise DLNR as to the presence of any known sites. Prior to any construction or alteration on private lands, a landowner must inform DLNR of his intent. In either situation, DLNR must then take the appropriate necessary action.

Directed also was the legislative establishment of a non-profit corporate foundation, the Hawaii Foundation for History and the Humanities, which reviews DLNR work, approves nominations to the National Register of Historic Places, as well as several other functions related to the development and preservation of cultural resources in Hawaii.

Probably one of the most significant sections of Hawaiian antiquities legislation is that which requires, not authorizes, but requires funding by State agencies, in connection with any public construction project, for recovery of archaeological and historical remains. This funding is to be up to 1% of the total project appropriation.

Unfortunately, the high potential of the Hawaii State archaeological programme has never been achieved, due to the consistent lack of adequate funding, staffing, and enforcement.

County level involvement in aspects of antiquities development and preservation varies a good deal among the four counties of Hawaii. At present, only one county has anything in ordinance form, but the policies of the others function similarly to varying degrees. This seems to relate directly to the volume of local commercial resort and multiple-unit residential development within each county.

NATURE AND SCOPE OF CONTRACT ARCHAEOLOGY IN HAWAII

Contract archaeology in Hawaii proceeded at a low level of activity until about 1968, when such work began to increase, due principally to new State antiquities legislation and the growth in commercial development beyond existing urban areas. From about 1968 to 1970, the State Parks Division conducted several projects, principally surveys connected with highway and airport construction programmes. Following this short period, the State for the most part withdrew from actual conduct of such work, and adopted a policy of outside contracting.

From 1971 on, several private corporations and consulting firms appeared, undertaking a small number of contract projects. For the most part, the University of Hawaii has not engaged in contract work. The period 1971-present has seen great increase in the volume of contract work in both public and private sectors. This can be regarded as a continuing response to the two factors mentioned earlier, State legislation and commercial development, and increasingly to Federal legislation.

Specific clients can be grouped into two major categories: government, or public clients, and commercial, or private clients. Government clients comprise the Federal, State, and County levels, through a range of specific agencies and offices, while commercial clients comprise both companies and individuals, generally involved in resort and residential development, including planners, land developers, construction companies, sugar and pineapple plantations, local historical societies, and non-profit local foundations.

The several different contractors conducting archaeological work can be grouped into two basic categories: private institutions, and private companies (the latter often comprised of single individuals). State agencies essentially conduct no archaeological work themselves. Several private companies or corporations are engaged in contract archaeology, but they lack any significant institutional association or base in terms of staffing, support facilities, storage and curating capacity, publication, or management. Such services are usually obtained from outside on a specific by-project basis.

BISHOP MUSEUM CONTRACT ARCHAEOLOGY PROGRAMME

The Bishop Museum is the only private institution in Hawaii engaged in contract archaeology, and at present conducts the majority of contract work done in Hawaii. The contract programme of the Museum functions as a semi-independent programme within the Department of Anthropology, and is administered by one of the three research archaeologists on permanent full-time staff. Specific major projects are generally directed by one of these archaeologists, all of whom devote a portion of their time during the year to working within the contract programme. The results of contract archaeology projects are distributed either as unpublished manuscripts, or in one of two publication formats - the Departmental Report Series (DRS), or the Pacific Anthropological Records (PAR).

Under the contract archaeology programme, the Anthropology Department conducts several different types of projects for both public and private clients.

The Document Search (Records Check, Inventory of Present Knowledge) consists of the review and evaluation of all documentary materials available for known recorded sites. It does not include any actual on-site work.

The Reconnaissance Survey (Walk-Through Survey, Preliminary Survey, Extensive Survey, Extensive Reconnaissance) consists of documentary research and extensive on-site inspection to determine the presence or absence of archaeological resources. It permits realistic estimation of potential results of, and costs for, more intensive survey work.

The Phase I Survey (Intensive Survey, Intensive Reconnaissance) consists of on-site work including the detailed recording and plotting of all sites, and selected test excavations, to permit evaluation of significance of sites, and to facilitate recommendations regarding the necessity and nature of any further investigations or preservation.

The Phase II Excavations (Salvage and/or Research Excavations) consist of extensive excavations at any sites which are scheduled to be altered or destroyed by any construction or development work, or to be preserved and/or interpreted. Such excavations aim at the maximal recovery of cultural and ecological information.

The Phase III Restoration (Interpretive Presentation, Reconstruction) consists of stabilization and restoration of significant sites for inclusion into development projects as permanent, on-site interpretive elements.

Ethnohistoric Research is very often included as an important integral aspect of any survey, excavation, or restoration programme. Also included whenever appropriate are Ethnobotanical and Ethnographic research.

Archaeological Consultation is the final type of project conducted, and this refers to any archaeological work in which the Department of Anthropology functions in a consultant capacity with regard to any of the types of work previously mentioned.

Formal contract work for government agencies and private clients began less than 20 years ago. These early contracts were not numerous. During the period 1957 to 1967, the Museum had little in the way of any organized programme. Some 13 major projects were undertaken, 11 for government agencies and only two for commercial clients. Contract work during this early period was principally that of the Phase I Survey type - intensive surveys and ethnohistoric and natural history research, with National Park areas in Hawaii being the most common project areas.

The period 1968 to 1975 has seen a gradually increasing expansion of contract archaeology, featuring changes in client composition, project types, and locations, as well as increase in total volume of work. Two principal changes that can be identified are (1) a shift from the identification of cultural and natural resources for the purposes of resource management, to the assessment and salvage of resources in conjunction with land alteration projects; and (2) an extraordinary increase in the number of projects done for commercial clients.

Specific trends for the period 1968 to 1975 have been (1) the large proportional increase in Reconnaissance Survey and Phase II Excavations, as well as the appearance of several Phase III Restoration projects; and (2) the overall absolute increase in Reconnaissance Survey and Phase II Excavations, as well as Phase I Survey projects, as a direct result of Federal and State legislation and county ordinances and policies.

The scope of recent contract archaeology at the Museum can be indicated by some relevant financial figures for the period of 1968

to 1975 (April). For this period adequate financial data for 115 projects are available:

- 115 projects = \$1,298,117.00
Minimum = \$50.00; maximum = \$263,674.00
Averages: \$11,288.00/project; \$177,824.00/year
- (a) 47 government projects = \$666,949.00
Minimum = \$130.00; maximum = \$263,674.00
Averages: \$14,190.00/project; \$91,362.00/year
- (b) 68 commercial projects = \$631,168.00
Minimum = \$50.00; maximum = \$131,891.00
Averages: \$9,282.00/project; \$86,461.00/year

Utilizing average totals for projects over this period, it is possible to include an additional 19 projects for which complete financial data are not available to arrive at a final estimation:

134 projects = est. \$1,470,500.00
Average: approx. \$201,400.00/year

In addition to archaeological contracts, the Anthropology Department undertakes other kinds of contracts within the contract programme. These consist mainly of State contracts related to educational programmes, but also include miscellaneous non-archaeological consultant contracts with the State, and occasionally the Federal government and international agencies, involving ethnographic and ethnologic research. The combined totals for the non-archaeological projects undertaken since 1970 are:

12 projects = \$154,930.00
Averages: \$12,911.00/project; \$30,986.00/year

Therefore, the overall total for the Museum contract programme yields an estimated current level on the order of \$232,500.00 per year.

PROBLEMS OF CONTRACT ARCHAEOLOGY IN HAWAII

Contract archaeology in Hawaii has two basic types of problems: (1) those related to specific archaeological conditions in Hawaii, and (2) those related to the general conduct or administration of contract archaeology. Those of the latter type are possibly unique to Hawaii; more likely, they are common to most contract work both on the mainland United States and in Hawaii.

Specific archaeological problems derive from two factors: (1) the nature of the archaeological resources - the portable and non-portable remains - and the physical setting in which these resources are found; and (2) the current infant state of substantive development in Hawaiian archaeology. Relative to the former might be mentioned such considerations as the general absence of diagnostic artifacts, the extreme difficulty of assigning functional identifications to sites and features, and the limited nature of the ethno-historic and ethnographic data that are available. Relative to the latter factor, it can be pointed out that the period of subsurface archaeology in Hawaii is approximately 25 years long, and that prior to even the last eight to ten years, the annual volume of excavation was quite small.

The two specific archaeological factors mentioned are closely related, and they have a particularly strong effect in that the determination of site significance - especially such judgments as functional identification, and approximate age(s) and time span(s) of occupation(s) - on the basis of surface survey, even including test excavations, is generally quite difficult.

Problems related to the general conduct and administration of contract archaeology in Hawaii can, for the most part, be ascribed to inadequate communication, co-operation, and understanding among the archaeological contractors, the government and commercial clients, and the State Historic Preservation staff. Specific problems include:

- (1) inadequate knowledge and understanding, by all parties involved, of (a) various legislative requirements, and (b) compliance procedures;
- (2) lack of involvement of professional archaeologists in planning stages of land alteration and development projects;
- (3) lack of clearly-defined standards for contract archaeology project specifications, fieldwork, and reporting of results;
- (4) lack of professional standards for archaeological contractor qualifications;
- (5) no adequate review process for the evaluation of archaeological contractor work;
- (6) difficulties in scheduling archaeological projects, and therefore staffing and ancillary support;

Lipe, William D. and
Alexander J. Lindsay Jr
(eds)

1974 *Proceedings of the 1974 Cultural
Resource Management Conference,
Federal Center, Denver, Colorado.*
Museum of Northern Arizona
Technical Series No. 14.

McGimsey, Charles R.
III

1972 *Public Archaeology.* New York:
Seminar Press.