



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/>.

SITE RANKING: THE NEW ZEALAND HISTORIC
PLACES TRUST CRITERIA FOR FIELD SURVEYS

Kevin Jones
N.Z. Historic Places Trust
Wellington

Legislation protecting archaeological sites is now in force in most countries. In New Zealand, the law is framed so as to control the destruction of sites by imposing blanket protection on all archaeological sites. On application, this protection may be lifted from any particular site by authority from New Zealand Historic Places Trust. Decisions on whether a site may be destroyed are therefore made by the principal statutory body charged "to identify, investigate, classify, protect and preserve ... any historic place ..." (Historic Places Act, 1980). The use of the term "classify" here clearly places a statutory obligation on the Trust to concern itself with the ranking and significance of historic places, which includes archaeological sites.

The statute places archaeological sites in a different position to other broadly 'environmental' or conservation matters such as native trees. Until April 1976, archaeologists had to rely on persuasion and public opinion to divert developments which threatened to destroy sites. Now, archaeologists and the Trust in particular, face a challenge quite different from the former need for persuasion; deciding which sites are of less value and which therefore need not be preserved from development. It is this question of value that has entered the professional literature under the term 'significance' (United States Forest Service, 1973; Lipe, 1974; Moratto and Kelly, 1976; McGimsey and Davis, 1977; Schiffer and House, 1977).

It should be clear that decisions on site value cannot be avoided in the long term. To defer such decisions either means losing control of the situation (as we have in the case of small-scale farm development), or in effect prevents development on quite a large scale, at least cumulatively. Whatever one's personal attitude towards the landscape modifications and development that occur around us, it is realistic to recognise that the Historic Places Act 1980 would not be allowed to become a major barrier to development. If it did, it would no doubt be removed, as it has in a limited sense under the National Development Act 1980.

Mining legislation is currently under revision, and amongst the procedures up for discussion are procedures similar to those of the National Development Act, with 'reporting agencies' making submissions to either a planning tribunal or a special mining tribunal, and eventually to the Minister where the final decision lies (Link Consultants, 1981).

New Zealand site-ranking precedents

In the early 1960s there was a movement within the New Zealand Archaeological Association to devise practical means of protecting sites. The method proposed by a committee of the Association council was the scheduling of sites which were to receive reserve status. Two interim reports to the council were later summarised as follows:

A. Sites of National Historic Importance: Scheduled and Protected Sites.

Category I - Permanent Preservation - Historic or Scenic Reserve.

Category II - Interim Protection - in which necessary salvage operations are contemplated should further destruction or modification of the existing site threaten the prehistoric information which it still contains.

B. Archaeological Remains - Sites which are recorded but for which no additional protection is sought.

Category III - Remains worth excavating and recording. - Sites which warrant detailed recording and investigation if time, labour and finance available.

Category IV Remains worth recording - sites in which excavations are regarded as not worthwhile because site is despoiled, insignificant, or a better site of similar type exists elsewhere.

Category V - Destroyed - Sites of which no visible features remain, but are recorded in printed literature or reliable manuscript....

The kinds of sites and criteria selected must be expected to vary from region to region. This is due to the fact that different types of sites are being or have been destroyed in each region, and more importantly, because the types of sites and settlement patterns found throughout New Zealand vary in kind, number and distribution from region to region (Green, 1963).

The criteria for permanent preservation of the sites of national historic importance were:

Unique sites in the region which - because of their wealth of visible features, or their association with events in Maori tradition, or the fact that their partial excavation and the information derived from it has made them key sites in the interpretation of New Zealand prehistory - warrant consideration as sites of National Historic Importance. For the most part these sites should have been little disturbed by European settlement so that possible excavations in them may be expected to throw additional light on existing problems and still yield materials for new interpretations in the future (Green, 1963).

One of the reports from the council committee contained lists compiled by some filekeepers of sites for scheduling. This movement foundered for lack of agreement on a number of issues within the Association.

In 1970, the Department of Lands and Survey, in discussion with the Association, had been prepared to assist with a national archaeological survey. A key point in the Department's consideration of the programme was that "some type of significance rating on nation-wide basis" was to be devised. Draft guidelines were prepared by the Central Filekeeper but not circulated. Among the criteria was "the desirability of preserving a full range of typical site types in an area".

In 1976 the Historic Places Amendment Act 1975 came into force, and the actual shape of the "archaeological survey" was determined by the staffing needs entailed in that legislation.

Ranking of sites also gained some hold in site surveying practice in the 1970s. There is no need to review all of these here since most follow precedents set in earlier reports. Some introduce new criteria to be used in evaluating sites, notably reports by Davidson (1971), Coster and Johnstone (1975) and Challis (1976). These reports predate implementation of the Historic Places Amendment Act 1975 and they were written in anticipation of land use changes in the survey area. The object, albeit unstated, of the gradings adopted would have been to establish significance and hence priorities for preservation of sites threatened by land development. The ranking categories proposed in the three studies are listed and discussed below.

Davidson's (1971) ranking categories may be listed as follows:

1. Sites of outstanding historical, traditional or visual importance.
2. Sites of greater than average importance.
3. Average sites. Some sites in this group range up towards group 2, others tend down towards group 4.
4. Sites which on present evidence tend to be of less than average significance. Includes doubtful sites and sites in poorer condition.
5. Sites of little or no significance, often in very poor condition or entirely destroyed.

Sites in groups 1 and 2 should be regarded as important, and most sites in 3 are probably also important. Sites in group 4 do not on present evidence appear to have much significance, but could be found to be important in the light of subsequent knowledge. Only sites in group 5 can be safely regarded as having little significance.

In discussing these categories, Davidson emphasises that they are relative one to the other. The explicit matters on which significance is based are evidently: historical importance, traditional importance and visual importance. These criteria do not specifically include values derived from the sites' potential for future archaeological research. However, at the time of writing, Davidson (1971: 22) anticipated undertaking a "thorough analysis of Maori settlement patterns" which may be reflected in the stated gradings for sites.

The ranking categories used by Coster and Johnstone (1975) are slightly different.

1. Outstanding site.
2. Representative site of relatively high archaeological, historical or scenic significance, or unusually well preserved.
3. 'Average' site. Not unusual but of possible archaeological or scenic interest and in a reasonably good state of preservation.
4. Insignificant or badly damaged site.

The authors explicitly recognise that the scale is based on visible surface features rather than "true archaeological importance". Specified matters taken into account in the formulation of these gradings include: archaeological interest, historical interest, scenic interest and state of preservation. In addition, the authors include the need for "a representative selection of all kinds of sites" within the study area, following Davidson's (1975) report to the Auckland Regional Authority.

The ranking categories adopted by Challis (1976) are again slightly different.

1. Outstanding. A site of major importance to New Zealand archaeology And/or the Maori people in several of the following aspects: visual earth-works, association of features, apparent archaeological potential, condition, Maori reverence and traditional importance.

These sites warrant full protection measures.

2. Important. A site of significance in the study area, outstanding in one or important in several of the characteristics listed under Rank 1. Includes partly damaged major sites and sites with unusual features.

Sites deserve full consideration in land use planning.

3. Average. A site with apparent archaeological potential but either in poor condition or of a relatively common type.

Sites merit careful archaeological reinvestigation and reappraisal.

4. Less than average. A site in the form of findspot evidence only or apparently in very poor condition.

Sites should be re-examined.

5. Insignificant. A site not accurately located because of apparent destruction, foreshore situation, surface masking or imprecise verbal report.

No further consideration need be given.

Challis recognises the "inaccuracies inherent in judging below ground features on the basis of surface indications". Nevertheless it is suggested that "a divergence of more than one point in the ranking (e.g., from 1 to 3, or 3 to 5) can be accorded a high degree of significance". The matters to be taken into account are clearly listed under the definition of rank 1 sites.

These three approaches to the ranking of sites have marked similarities; among the more specific criteria for assessing significance are:

| <u>Criteria</u> | <u>No. of times cited</u> |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Archaeological potential | 3 |
| condition | 3 |
| tradition | 3 |
| visually impressive earthworks | 2 |
| historic association | 2 |
| representative of types of site | 2 |
| scenic | 1 |
| association of types of features | 1 |
| unusual features | 1 |
| find spot only | 1 |

TABLE 1. Ranking criteria used by Davidson (1971), Coster and Johnstone (1975) and Challis (1976).

Although these three authors have phrased their accounts of significance in different ways, there is a consensus here that the criteria that should be taken into account are: apparent archaeological potential, condition, tradition/historic association, visually impressive earthworks and representative samples. There is also a clear recognition that standard extensive surveys of archaeological field evidence cannot adequately assess sub-surface values of sites.

U.S. site ranking precedents

The above criteria are similar to those proposed about the same time in the United States. Lipe's excellent synthesis of the conservation archaeologist's role is a key paper in the discussion of significance, and in particular of the concept of a representative sample:

" Many of our archaeologically-based national parks and monuments were established on the presumption that the largest, most spectacular, and most unique (sic) types of archaeological sites were the most significant. At the time these preserves were set up, this was probably an accurate reading of both the public's and the research archaeologists' assessment of significance. Yet today, we have increased numbers of projects

designed to investigate functional variability among numbers of sites, small as well as large, and much greater interest in the statistically typical as well as the rare and unique. From this perspective, it is easy to take the next step and say that the guiding principle in setting up additional archaeologically relevant land preserves should be representativeness rather than current significance. The notion of preserving a representative sample of this country's archaeological resources should be paramount.... Such a sample replicates the main features of the original population, or universe, whether these features are known in advance or not. It thus permits new discoveries about the sample which can be reliably thought also to apply to the original universe."

(Lipe, 1974)

Moratto and Kelly (1976) have proposed that legal, scientific, ethnic, public, monetary and managerial values should be taken into account when deciding on significance. McGimsey and Davis (1977) narrow this down to: investigation potential, integrity, public appreciation and monetary value. The latter authors gloss these terms as follows:

1. Investigative potential: may be realised by (a) representative sample, preferably based on stratified sampling, (b) current research values.
2. Integrity: a concept derived from U.S. National register, covering in part condition and historic association.
3. Public appreciation of the results of previous research and commemoration of past individuals or cultures.
4. Monetary value.

The U.S. National Register of Historic Places includes archaeological sites and buildings, so that its criteria are of necessity broadly framed. However, they are worth quoting.

- "The quality and significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association, and:
- A. that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
 - B. that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
 - C. that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction.... or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

- D. that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history."

(Greenberg, 1976:XV)

Of interest in these criteria is (C), the idea that although individual "components may lack distinction", their association to form an entity may be valuable. This concept is close to that of the precinct or historic area which may be of value in archaeological preservation, and is now recognised in New Zealand law (Historic Places Act, 1980, s.49)

Site evaluation categories for site surveyors

The Historic Places Trust has recently adopted criteria of site significance. The need to do this has arisen mainly from increasing archaeological surveys of afforestation blocks. Afforestation is a drastic land-use change involving soil preparation, roading, etc., which destroys a high proportion of sites. After burn-off, site recognition is particularly easy, and in some areas the number of sites discovered has been considerable. As a result, it has been necessary to narrow down the options for decisions on site preservation. The Trust has decided to do this by approving, with certain safeguards, the practice of site surveyors recommending on site grading. Such recommendations are assessed by Trust staff and discussed with development interests as to whether they are practicable. The final decision is reviewed and made by the Trust or its Archaeology Committee.

Three categories are proposed in contrast to the New Zealand precedents previously discussed. This is because the categories are essentially designed to lead to decisions to preserve or not to preserve. The intermediate category is for sites whose value cannot be readily assessed. Drastic as this seems, the alternative procedures available for granting authorities would be less satisfactory. This would be to grant authorities for areas of land, in the same way that other statutory permissions are granted. Although attractively convenient, this is regarded by the Trust as legally doubtful under its Act and, more importantly, it does not sufficiently safeguard sites in areas that are poorly known or surveyed.

Following site survey, site surveyors are asked to allocate sites to one of the following categories:

- "A" site to be preserved,
- "B" a holding category for sites that the Trust decides are to be investigated before modification, or are to be reassessed by Trust staff as either "A" or "C"; and,
- "C" sites that may be modified or destroyed on the condition that an adequate site record has been made.

These divisions are based on evaluations of individual sites. In some cases a 'precinct' or archaeological area with a range of sites may be a better approach to the preservation of a sample of archaeological sites. In such a precinct, authorities to modify or destroy "C" sites would not be granted.

The following criteria are used in assessing sites for placement in the categories listed above:

1. Scientific values. (a) preserve a representative sample of sites; and (b) preserve sites relevant to research programmes.
2. Management values. (a) preserve sites unlikely to be threatened by development operations, (b) preserve 'archaeological landscapes' rather than scattered individual sites.
3. Public values. (a) preserve sites with visible surface features, (b) preserve intact sites rather than damaged ones, (c) consider traditional importance; educational or historical value; accessibility; ownership.

Any of these criteria on its own may be sufficiently important to justify the "A" evaluation for a site. In considering the area from which a sample is to be taken, site recorders should look for a stream catchment, transect of a valley or coastal strip, or some other 'natural' division of the land, as the unit from which sites are selected.

Discussion

Some difficulty arises in a consideration of the area which is sampled using these criteria. In most surveys, the project area will eventually be well known, yet similar, occasionally adjoining land has never been surveyed. The notion of 'representative sample' of any unit other than the artificially bounded project area fails in this common circumstance.

The principal difficulty with these criteria is that they are based on information gained from surveys of surface evidence. In principle the problem of sub-surface evidence has not been tackled, and it must be stressed that this surface evaluation is the first step in the process. In practice, no evaluation criteria could be based on the minimal sub-surface evidence available from pre-development site surveys over large areas. It is anticipated that testing of sub-surface sites will remain with Trust staff or other trained archaeologists.

Sub-surface evidence. Sub-surface evidence should of course be of the utmost importance in final evaluation of a range of sites. However, except where land is disturbed, this kind of evidence is least known and least tangible. Useful archaeological evidence is undoubtedly

more extensive than we are aware, but its discovery will usually depend on disturbance in the course of the development operation itself, e.g. middens appearing in road sections.

On-the-spot monitoring of site destruction could be of value here. For a fraction of the cost of excavation, considerable information may be gained by working "in the trail of the bulldozer". There could be a fair measure of control of the earth-moving by virtue of the conditions under which an authority is granted under the Historic Places Act 1980. The paradox on which such an approach is based, viz., the site must be destroyed before its value is known, but by then we have defeated our purpose which is to preserve the valuable sites. In favour of the approach is the likelihood that the rapid gains of understanding from a few sites destroyed in this manner, will allow for better prediction of the value of further sites. The post-mortem is a useful parallel. The examination hasn't saved the poor fellow, but its results may allow others to live.

Research potential. Consideration of the sub-surface evidence after field survey brings into focus the problem of research potential. It would be foolish to say that research potential is arbitrarily or 'subjectively' defined. Nevertheless, archaeologists will differ on the value of specific research programmes. In the case of the public archaeologist trying to decide the research potential of a site in vacuo only a consensus of current research values seems practicable.

The essential difficulty lies in the nature of archaeological research. If one person or a group of people can in principle be accorded the privilege of deciding research value/potential, then we have advanced little past the era of Galileo. It is the essence of a discipline like archaeology, that advances are made by thinking out new ways of defining and tackling problems, and indeed setting up the problems themselves.

If I may quote Sir Mortimer Wheeler discussing the results of the "criminally unscientific" excavation of Mohenjo-daro:

"I am well aware that, in applauding Silchester and Mohenjo-daro, I am trespassing dangerously beyond the borders of scientific morality. I am commending crime because it happened to be successful. Let me make it clear that in neither case, either at Silchester or at Mohenjo-daro, am I suggesting that any special merit accrues to the excavators for the methods and policy which they adopted. In fact they knew no better ... I remember one of them visiting me at Maiden Castle, when, in that closely interleaved site, I was digging a small area with a teaspoon. 'What you want', said my visitor robustly, 'is 300 men to whip the whole of the surface off'. Years afterwards,

standing on the eviscerated mounds of his Mohenjo-daro, I recalled his words with a new understanding of his mind.

Nevertheless, hidden away in all this immorality is a moral which is worthy of our attention. I have mentioned Maiden Castle, and am reminded that, in publishing our work there, I expressed regret that circumstances had prevented us from recovering any considerable portion of the ancient town-plan of the place We do in fact need more complete pictures of our ancient habitations, villages and towns: more long-term work."

(Wheeler, 1950:125)

Before rashly advancing any abstract considerations of research potential, I should stress that a good deal could be done in the way of improving channels of communication. Besides the absolute necessity for all public archaeologists to be involved in substantial research, so that they are 'in the swim' so to speak, a number of practical steps could be taken to refine consensus on the research possibilities of particular regions, especially those where development is rapid.

For the last year, I have been looking at forestry blocks in the Eastern Bay of Plenty and on the East Coast. It would be of some value to me in recommending on the fate of such sites as occur in that area, if there could be held a seminar or some formal discussion, on current and anticipated research in the Bay of Plenty. Research opportunities to fill several life-times occur here. To name a few:

1. Inland economic adaptations and settlement pattern in the Whirinaki valley.
2. Morphology, location and age of ridge and hilltop pa in the Eastern Bay of Plenty.
3. Inland riverine settlement pattern, e.g. in the Motu or Waiotahi valleys.
4. Horticulture and settlement patterns in the Cape Runaway vicinity.
5. Inland Maori settlement following the Bay of Plenty land wars.

To some extent, venues such as a New Zealand Archaeological Association conference would be appropriate to this work, but it would be worthwhile from time to time to hold seminars on the subject, either in the region itself such as the Northland seminar, or in the universities. Another practical step would be to call in consultants, usually from the universities, to 'audit' particular site survey reports and recommendations with a view to the research potential they contain. This is, of course, in effect one of the functions of the present Archaeology Committee of the trust.

What steps other than these procedural measures could be taken? There have been a few attempts recently to sort out the "ingredients" of scientific site significance. Schiffer and House (1977) draw a distinction between three types of significance: substantive, anthropological or social scientific and technical/methodological/theoretical. The terms are taken from their paper and maybe glossed as follows:

1. Substantive: the value of a site for answering specific questions about pre-history, usually of a region, for example, what sort of agriculture was undertaken here?
2. Anthropological: sites that could contribute to 'nomothetic' generalisations about topics which supposedly provide the 'laws' of the 'science' of anthropology, for example, the relationship between economy and settlement pattern, culture change, etc.
3. Technical, methodological, theoretical: sites that would perhaps not contribute to substantive questions as defined in 1 above, but that would be useful for refining techniques of analysis, etc.

Groube (n.d.) discussing the ranking of sites in Dorset, has also defined a roughly comparable tripartite division of research values. His paper covers also the degree and kind of threat faced by sites, and the question of rarity and values arising therefrom; these need not be further discussed here. Groube's account of research values follows:

1. Problem levels.
 - a. The collection of facts, usually by excavation; a low value is placed on improving the sample by this means, since in Groube's opinion archaeology is in part the art of conducting research on inadequate, fragmentary remains.
 - b. Integrative problems, for example, drawing correlations between sites, detecting patterns, articulation of cultures; excavation is not integrative in character unless all otherwise available data has been assimilated.
 - c. Theoretical problems which may not readily yield to empirical demonstrations such as the nature of culture change, etc.
2. Flow/feed back potential. The value of a site measured by its potential contribution to further research, and to raising the 'level' of the problem.
3. Local relevance. What is a relevant research problem in one place may not be relevant elsewhere.

With some minor modifications, and allowing for the inevitable problems of terminology, there is remarkable agreement between the three kinds of significance defined by the two U.S. authors and those of Groube. That is, "substantive" would equate with "fact collection" (although Groube places a low value on this in isolation) and "anthropological" would equate with "theoretical". Less clearly the U.S.

authors open "technical/methodological/theoretical" category could equate with Groube's "integrative".

The categories evolved above are, of course, analytical and may do some violence to any particular field problem if one category is applied to the exclusion of others. Nevertheless, they provide a reasonable scale of points on which to consider a site irrespective of any particular interest that an archaeologist may have.

To free the matter from unnecessary jargon and relate it to the New Zealand scene, I offer the following as values that should be considered in assessing the research value of the site.

1. Regional studies. Will the site extend our knowledge of the archaeology of the region? In many cases in New Zealand, the answer to this question would be yes, but there would be cases where excavation will not warranted but preservation is. For example, would we want to excavate another silcrete quarry in the Central Otago area, given the work already done at Oturehua? But certainly such a site is worth preserving. Is it worth excavating an isolated kumara storage pit in Northland or the Bay of Plenty? These two examples would probably fit Groube's fact-collecting level of archaeological problems.

2. (a) Fact collecting. The excavation of a pit will tell us something of its structure and function, but can this be regarded as a priority unless we have a wider interest, say in the distribution of pit types or the function of a particular pit type within a settlement pattern. Can we anticipate such a study occurring in future?

(b) Recovery of portable artefacts. The days of Teviotdale are no longer here, but there is a respectable emphasis on the need to recover artefacts: (i) if a site is to be destroyed, or (ii) if the material is readily and economically excavated. I would instance the swamp excavations of the last decade which of course have considerable integrative value in terms of, say, stylistic affinity between areas, environmental reconstruction, etc.

3. Thematic studies. Dominant themes in archaeological research do change, but central concerns such as horticulture, midden analysis, subsistence generally, settlement patterns, trade, etc. can generally be tied to specific sites. Sites can therefore be assessed according to the contribution they could make to the study. This contribution would be of most use at Groube's integrative problem level.

4. Method and technique. It is clear that many sites lend themselves to exercises in method and technique, although whether we would want to defend the value of the site purely on these grounds is unlikely.

5. Theoretical. These values would be confined to issues that could not be solved by any straightforward empirical demonstration; e.g. we place considerable value on sites such as Pounaweia, or the Opito middens, because of their role in the development of New Zealand archaeological thought.

Licensing. Any elaboration on existing procedures will slow down the rate at which decisions on authorities can be made. In any period when land development occurs at a high rate, the Historic Places Trust will find its resources stretched. This raises the question of whether a more decentralised method of site evaluation and decision-making is feasible.

One way to do this would be to license archaeologists to make decisions on site preservation. Licensing of archaeologists who are willing and competent to undertake site evaluation would have the great advantage of speeding up the approvals required under the Historic Places Act 1980.

The objections to such a scheme are fairly evident. The first is that the Trust is in effect already licensing archaeologists by the practice of asking them to investigate and recommend on site preservation decisions. Such recommendations from individual archaeologists are of course subject to review by the Trust's Archaeology Committee, and eventually the Trust Board. The practice could nevertheless be regarded as a sort of licensing.

Secondly, placing this power in the hands of individuals without review means that they are subject to considerable personal pressure in discussions with the developer. Even with the existing procedures, there is a tendency for field archaeologists to avoid discussing the implications of their work with the developer; understandably, some do not wish to be at all involved with the question of site evaluation.

Thirdly, who would license archaeologists? This matter would either have to go to an arm of the state with available archaeological expertise (i.e., the Historic Places Trust), or to a professional organisation. At the moment, there is no organisation in New Zealand which represents professional archaeologists per se. One could argue that this is no bad thing, and that the New Zealand Archaeological Association, which does an excellent job in promoting interest in the 'welfare' of the archaeological record, is simply not meant to be that sort of organisation.

Finally, the blanket protection of archaeological sites which exists in New Zealand is a very strong measure constraining uses to

which land may be put. The present structure, whereby decisions of the Trust are subject to appeal by the Minister, places review of the use of this power with Cabinet. It is probably best retained there.

Conclusions

Site evaluation categories for site surveys on land subject to radical changes in use have been discussed. Three categories have been adopted by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust: "preserve", "hold for further consideration or investigation", and "may be destroyed or modified".

The grounds on which sites are placed in these categories are: research value, ease of management, public values such as visible earthworks, traditional importance and education.

Although difficulties exist in predicting sub-surface site values, these evaluation categories are thought to provide an essential basis for digesting survey information for the purpose of decisions by the Trust on allowable destruction of sites.

It is suggested that research potential of New Zealand sites may be more readily determined by having set procedures for consultation, formal or informal. An analysis of research potential under the heads of regional studies, fact-collecting, recovery of portable artefacts, theme studies, methodology and theoretical, is sketched.

Acknowledgements

The criteria adopted by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust for site evaluation are the indirect result of a long and sometimes halting train of development of some 20 years. Given the issue's link with the efforts of the Association and the Trust, it is a little unfair to single out individuals, but I would like to note Roger Green's initial impetus within the Association on the site scheduling question. The form taken by the Trust's criteria for forestry surveys is in large part the work of Bruce McFadgen.

References

- Coster, J and
G. Johnstone
- 1975 Report on the Kaitoke-Harataonga archaeological site survey, Great Barrier Island. New Zealand Historic Places Trust, Wellington.

- Challis, A.J. 1976 Motueka district : archaeological site recording 1974 - 1975. Report to New Zealand Historic Places Trust.
- Davidson, J. 1971 Te Pahi Archaeological Survey. Mimeograph report, Auckland Institute and Museum.
- 1975 Archeological Sites in the Auckland Region. Auckland Regional Planning Authority.
- Green, R.C. 1963 Site preservation. N.Z.A.A. Newsletter, 6:83-87.
- Greenberg, R.M. 1976 The National Register of Historic Places 1976. Washington, Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation.
- Groube, L.M. n.d. Dorset decays; problems and priorities in Dorset archaeology. Dorset Archaeological Committee, unpublished report.
- Link Consultants 1981 An assessment of issues of public concern over the operations of the Mining Act 1971.
- Lipe, W.D. 1974 A conservation model for American archaeology. The Kiva, 39:213-245.
- McGimsey, C.R. and H.A. Davis 1977 "Significance", pp.31-34 in The Management of Archaeological Resources: The Airlie House Report. Society for American Archaeology.
- Moratto, M.J. and R.E. Kelly 1976 Significance in archaeology. The Kiva, 42:193-202.
- Schiffer, M.B. and J.H. House 1977 An approach to assessing scientific significance. Pp.249-257, in Schiffer and Gumerman (eds), Conservation Archaeology. New York, Academic Press.
- U.S. Forest Service 1973 Forest Service Manual, 2361.05, R-5 Supplement No.59.
- Wheeler, R.E.M. 1950 What matters in archaeology. Antiquity, 24:122-130.