A RECIPE FOR IMPROVING POLICY-DRIVEN ARCHAEOLOGY: ADD PUBLIC OUTREACH AND STIR

BENJAMIN HARRIS
DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY, SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

Public outreach is an increasingly critical part of the archaeological world: it not only enhances our interpretations, but also makes archaeology relevant, accessible, and socially meaningful to the public we serve. However, for many policy-driven archaeologists, constraints on trying to mount such projects are daunting. This paper investigates implementation practices of public archaeology and how these can be improved in the context of regulatory compliance. Ethnographic interviews were conducted to illustrate the broad spectrum of perspectives that comprise the profession of policy-driven archaeology. Thus, the fact that they converge upon a shared set of recommendations is all the more significant.

ETHNOGRAPHIC REFLECTION: HEREIN LIES THE PROBLEM

In March 2009, I was conducting thesis research at the Society for California Archaeology (SCA) annual meeting in Modesto. On Saturday, a gentleman introduced himself as an SCA member who had recently moved to Green Valley in Solano County. He asked me if I knew how he could learn more about the area's history and whether any local historical or archaeological societies existed. I confessed that I did not and could offer no further advice about what he could learn, bar going to the local library or continuing his search on the internet.

On reflection, it occurred to me that this is precisely the problem with the current state of archaeology. A member of the public (i.e., not a policy-driven archaeologist) is interested in learning about the archaeology of his newly adopted region, but cannot find any information. This is ironic given that Green Valley has a rich prehistoric and historic archaeological record (see Wiberg 1992, 1993, 1996). This conversation at the SCAs perfectly encapsulates why we need to convey the results of our work to the public. By conducting ethnographic interviews with policy-driven archaeologists, I have investigated implementation practices of public outreach and how these can be improved in the context of policy-driven archaeology. (I use the term "policy-driven archaeologist" to denote any professional or academic archaeologist whose work is undertaken as part of state or federal regulatory compliance.) My research shows that, despite varying opinions among policy-driven archaeologists and a tribal representative about the impediments they face in trying to implement public archaeology within a regulatory context, they recognize its benefits and suggest viable options for improving it. This, in turn, highlights the applicability and importance of a multivocal approach, which gives everybody a place at the table to voice opinions on how to reconcile public and policy-driven archaeologies.

THE RELEVANCE AND PURPOSE—TO THE PUBLIC AND PROFESSION—OF AN ETHNOGRAPHIC PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY STUDY

> We suspect that unless archaeologists find ways of making their research increasingly relevant to the modern world, the modern world will find itself increasingly capable of getting along without archaeologists [Fritz and Plog 1970:412].

> If we want to be relevant to society and be part of an important dialogue throughout this country, we need to think about how we can make our discipline relevant [Shackel 2005:27].

Despite these quotes being written 35 years apart, the message they convey remains the same: archaeology needs to be relevant, accessible, and contribute to modern society. In a world where finances and accountability are prime considerations within archaeology (especially publicly sponsored initiatives), these authors' insightful decrees serve as a warning that archaeology cannot afford to become an irrelevant social science dinosaur, lumbering along in a self-contained bubble, serving nobody's interest but its own.

Archaeologists in private consulting companies, academic institutions, and federal, state, and local agencies are increasingly required to justify and demonstrate "that public money is being spent wisely, appropriately, and that they are attempting to extend the benefits of that funding to a wider audience" (Merriman 2002:546). This becomes all the more acute during such periods of economic downturn as the United States and the world have been experiencing since 2008.

The global financial crisis has brought into sharp focus for archaeologists the realization that they must justify expenditure on cultural resources by making archaeology relevant to the public, disseminating archaeological research (where appropriate) to the public, and contributing to society as a whole. Given that policy-driven archaeology conducts over 90 percent of archaeological investigations in North America each year and is sponsored primarily from public funds (Sebastian 2010:7), we have a responsibility toward adequately serving the public. Yet, despite this overwhelming number of publicly funded, regulatory-based projects, the public's exposure and access to archaeological investigations and their conclusions are minimal (King 2010:142; Noble 2007:70). As shown by the years elapsed between Fritz and Plog's and Shackel's words, discussions on how to improve public archaeology are nothing new, but as King (2010:159) states, "it would be unreasonable or even dangerous to wish them away."

The need to examine public outreach initiatives has been identified as a key issue by the Archaeological Resource Committee of the State Historical Resources Commission (SHRC) in California. The committee's White Papers (Mikesell et al. 2007) have begun to facilitate discussion on improving professional archaeological practice in California and creating greater involvement of the public through various media. The Archaeological Resources Interpretation section discusses the relative underfunding of public archaeology, as well as the lack of access for a public wanting to understand about and participate in California's history (Newland 2007:24). The SHRC formally adopted the White Papers on June 30, 2010; discussion on implementation of the White Papers started in the fall of 2010 and is expected to continue into 2011 (Michael Newland, personal communication 2010). Improving access to and dissemination of archaeological data to the public has up to now been a concern, albeit an under-examined one, of many practitioners in California.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The aim of this research is to investigate implementation practices of public archaeology and how these can be improved in the context of policy-driven archaeology. It has resulted in recommendations that will facilitate greater access to and dissemination of archaeological results to the public and archaeologists. To create these recommendations, I conducted ethnographic interviews with many of the practitioners who are driving the current public archaeology discourse in the San Francisco Bay area. This is a particularly advantageous region in which to address my research aims because several major public archaeology initiatives have been conducted over the last 15 years as part of major transportation projects (e.g., the I-880 Cypress Freeway Replacement project in West Oakland [Praetzellis and Praetzellis 2004; Praetzellis et al. 2007] and the Guadalupe Parkway Upgrade Project in San José [Allen et al. 2002]). Several more continue today, such as the educational programs at the Presidio of San Francisco (Presidio Trust 2010), Kashaya Pomo Interpretive Trail at Fort Ross (Lightfoot et al. 2004), and Kashaya Pomo Cultural Landscape Project (Dowdall and Parrish 2005). These projects have involved a broad spectrum of archaeologists from academic, consultant, state, and federal entities, and have forged collaborative partnerships with indigenous, descendent, and local communities.

The application of ethnographic methodologies is an asset increasingly being utilized by archaeologists to facilitate deeper, more meaningful collaboration with local communities (Antoniadou 2009; Dowdall and Parish 2003; Greer et al. 2002; Hollowell and Nicholas 2009). These ethnographic studies are exploring the everyday experiences that allow people greater control over their cultural knowledge—particularly when broaching the often conflicting worldviews of traditionally held beliefs, anthropological and archaeological theory, and legal requirements.

The participatory and multivocal nature of these ethnographic studies provides an excellent framework for exploring the implementation realities of public archaeology undertaken as part of state or federal regulatory compliance work. Despite the many studies (listed above) that explore stakeholder perceptions of archaeology, ethnographic inquiry that seeks opinions and perspectives on public outreach from those who implement and regulate policy-driven archaeology is lacking. It is crucial that perspectives of policy-driven archaeologists be represented, from a variety of positions and affiliations. Such multifaceted ethnographic data are more likely to produce recommendations for improvement that are grounded in the business and regulatory realities in which policy-driven archaeology operates.

The interviewees invited to participate in the interview process of this research were selected because they derive from diverse backgrounds (consultant, federal, state, and Native American tribal liaison) within policy-driven archaeology. Multiple perspectives provided by policy-driven archaeologists and tribal liaisons, who function at different levels or stages within the regulatory framework, may reveal interesting approaches, perspectives, or methods for tackling implementation practices of public archaeology in the context of compliance. (It should be stated clearly that I do not intend to conflate Native Americans with "the public." They are but one group who has a particularly strong vested interest in archaeology and are closely tied to the regulatory process.) Many of the projects undertaken by the participants in my study exemplify successful cooperative approaches between a government agency, a private company, an academic institution, and the community.

THE PROBLEM OF BEING A "NATIVE"

In their ethnographic study of Nanumea, one of eight islands that comprises the Polynesian nation of Tuvalu, Chambers and Chambers (2001:2) openly disclose the methods they employed and the difficulties they encountered (e.g., the language barrier) when trying to immerse themselves into Nanumean culture. This critical self-reflection is an integral part of their ethnographic approach, as it allows both them and the reader to "step beyond one's own cultural values and assumptions and to develop an empathetic understanding of another way of life" (Chambers and Chambers 2001:xii).

I highlight this example because of the difficulty that Chambers and Chambers encountered when beginning to study a new culture and language. My challenge consisted not of immersing myself into a new culture or language as such, but rather extricating myself from the policy-driven archaeological "society" to which I belong. I had already been a member of the "Cultural Resource Management tribe" that I was now trying to understand ethnographically for quite some time, which is an inherently conflicted position. I needed to describe and analyze my interview data as an ethnographer, not as a policy-driven archaeologist. Otherwise, I risked glossing over the potentially diverse concepts and multiple perspectives revealed by policy-driven archaeologists and stakeholders who function in different capacities.

This is not to say that I did not bring my own experiences and biases into this study through my interpretation of the ethnographic data. In particular, my employment in policy-driven archaeology since 1999, both for consultants and for a state agency, has undoubtedly shaped the course that my research has taken. Nevertheless, I attempted to control for these biases in a number of ways. For example, during the interviews I intentionally did not disclose my employment status (except for one interview), so that the interviewees would treat me as a graduate student rather than professional equal. I also asked "Native Language questions" to reinforce the student/cultural teacher roles, as it made interviewees clarify statements or language and “encourage [them] to speak in the same way they would talk to others in their cultural scene” (Spradley 1979:89).

RESEARCH OUTCOMES

Potentially one of the most significant improvements drawn from these interviews is the need to strengthen federal and California state laws to include explicit language that facilitates greater integration of public archaeology within a regulatory context. It falls on the ethical motivation of policy-driven archaeologists at all levels to implement public outreach.

The ethical motivation of archaeologists becomes all the more important when conducting policy-driven archaeological investigations under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA is wholly inadequate when it comes to public outreach and the standards with which policy-driven archaeology is practiced in California. The competitive nature of CEQA-driven archaeology often negates investment in public outreach, because of the added expense of something that is not ultimately required. The lack of accepted and enforced standards, as well as oversight, compounds this problem further.

The ethical motivation of archaeologists was a major discussion point for the interview group, and one that highlights the importance of a multivocal approach to examining ways of improving public archaeology. Throughout the interviewees’ discussions, the divergences and convergences of their perspectives on this subject were evident: because they function in different capacities within the regulatory process, they bring different experiences and insights to the table. They primarily diverge about who bears responsibility for pubic archaeology and why it’s not conducted as much as it should be. One interviewee suggested that academic institutions, especially those that teach California prehistoric and historical archaeology, are in the best position to elevate the level of public outreach. Other interviewees suggested that state and federal agencies are responsible because they are in a position to ensure the integration of public outreach into an archaeology project. The Native American tribal liaison charged all archaeologists with the ethical responsibility of consulting with tribes to determine the appropriate dissemination of their heritage. Finally, it was also suggested that public archaeology falls within the consultant domain. Even within these groups, there can be a range of opinion. For example, one federal archaeologist, while acknowledging their own influential position in requiring public outreach, still felt that the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) should provide greater direction.

Despite these alternating opinions about who is primarily responsible for increased public archaeology, they all share one thing in common: all wanted to conduct more of it, but currently feel impeded. For example, one archaeologist cited an example where public archaeology had been frowned upon by a professor’s tenure committee, while another relayed their personal experience of a graduate advisor trying to dissuade them from any public involvement. Government archaeologists felt impeded by the lack of funding, staff, and support from within their respective agencies. One state archaeologist recounted difficulties with project management within the state agency, which parallels the academic problem of tenure committees and graduate advisors (in the role of project managers) frowning on such activities. (Project Management as used in this paper refers to individuals or a collective of people [who are not archaeologists] who plan, organize, and manage resources to bring about the successful completion of a specific project, of which archaeology is but one component—for example, a transportation project, housing development project, and so forth.) The consultant interviewees lamented the budgetary constraints and the regulatory contexts in which they work, again mirroring those complaints issued by agency archaeologists.

Where we end up is the tension between what policy-driven archaeologists think we should be doing and what the law fundamentally enables us to do; until the law changes, these pressures will remain. The fact that the interviews ultimately converge, with a shared set of ideas as to potential solutions, makes them all the more important. The question then becomes, what are people doing in response to the tension and the impediments? The following five recommendations are drawn from my ethnographic research. In particular, they show that many of the most successful public archaeology programs in the bay area have been forged on multi-institutional partnerships (between federal, state, and local agencies, universities, consultants, Native Americans, and other interested parties), and that this is the direction in which policy-driven archaeology should be heading.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

1. Improving access and dissemination of archaeological research
2. Improving utilization of archaeological reports
3. Collecting statistical data on public archaeology
4. Marketing archaeology: involvement and education of non-technical specialists
5. Community collaboration

Recommendation 1. Improving Access and Dissemination of Archaeological Research

> We must not be guilty of hoarding the resources or information for ourselves or our small circle of colleagues. We must make good faith efforts to publish research results within a reasonable time and make those results available in a variety of formats that are accessible to the public [Messenger 2000:75].

All of the practitioners who participated in this ethnographic study acknowledged the profession's failure to adequately communicate the results of archaeological investigations to the public. Greater utilization of the internet was a solution that was universally expounded as a way to increase accessibility and broaden dissemination of archaeological data to the public. Using the internet to improve accessibility and dissemination is not a ground-breaking revelation. However, this debate is still evolving in California.

In trying to create greater access and dissemination of archaeological data for the profession and the public, practitioners including Little (2007:75), Newland (2007:24), King (2010:162), and Sebastian (2010:6) have considered archaeological digital repositories with searchable databases, downloadable files, and the ability for long-term storage and preservation of archaeological collections as potential solutions.

In the White Papers, Newland (2007:24) suggested broadening the current availability of archaeological information via an accredited organization or institution, such as the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) webpage. Newland argued further during our interview that such a resource could be a beneficial investment on the part of the OHP or another agency that sponsors archaeological investigations in California.

Public dissemination of archaeological data online has been successfully implemented at the University of York (2011), Maryland Historical Trust (2011), and Thomas Jefferson's Monticello Estate (2011), among others, where digital versions of full archaeological reports and collections (e.g., field and laboratory records, artifact photographs) have been made available to the public. The Florida Public Archaeology Network (University of West Florida 2011) provides a website that acts as a portal for dissemination of archaeological data and regional centers that promote public archaeology events and volunteer opportunities. These websites allow unparalleled access to an extensive array of archaeological and historical data. They have been designed so that many different audiences can access and download varying degrees of information, from the very general to more detailed technical excavation reports and artifact catalogs.

An internet-based initiative designed to foster collaborative research and data-sharing among archaeologists, while simultaneously fulfilling calls for greater access and dissemination of archaeological data, is one way to improve policy-driven archaeological practice in California, as well as public archaeology within a regulatory context. An archaeological clearinghouse or portal has immense potential to fulfill the needs of professional archaeologists while providing interested members of the public, such as the gentleman interested in Green Valley mentioned at the beginning of this paper, with information about the archaeological history of California. The advantages of such an enterprise would be:

- Greater access and dissemination of archaeological data to the profession, educators, indigenous and descendent communities, and the general public.
- Improved promotion and stewardship of California's cultural resources.
- Tangible return on public investment.
- Greater comparative use that could facilitate synthesis of archaeological data and challenge or alter currently held perceptions of the past.

Recommendation 2. Utilization of Technical Reports

During the course of my ethnographic research, many of the interviewees argued that greater utilization of various archaeological report formats is an important step toward improving public outreach. One example was to insert research themes or language into planning reports, such as a research design or a Memorandum of Agreement, prior to large excavations. Another practitioner suggested that public archaeology should be a research theme in and of itself.

Regardless of the specific roles that the interviewees play within the regulatory process, they all agreed that incorporating a public archaeology covenant in planning documents is a good way to ensure its inclusion. Whether or not the archaeological project is ultimately amenable to public outreach, the interviewees agree that it is better to have it in than not. These documents ensure that if public outreach becomes a viable part of the data recovery process, archaeologists can point to this document as support for its implementation. Trying to convince project management to commit to more time and money once these planning documents have been finalized is extremely difficult.

Over the last 40 or so years, since the inception of historic preservation laws such as the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended 2006) at the federal level or state laws such as CEQA, the commercial sector of archaeology has produced an avalanche of "grey literature"—underutilized data wrapped up in technical reports that reside in repositories across the country (Noble 2007:70). The profession is beginning to realize that this mass of paper is inaccessible not only to the public who primarily sponsors regulatory-based work but largely to the profession as well, which King (2010:142) argues is "affecting our ability to develop new interpretations about life at this time."

The reports generated in California are primarily housed at nine regionally based centers of the California Historical Resources Information System. The bay area is served by the Northwest Information Center (NWIC), an institution located in Rohnert Park, Sonoma County. The NWIC is currently transitioning to digital formats, which have been integrated into a GIS database that allows for searchable criteria when conducting a record search. The potential for the advancement of California archaeology is enormous here: such a system could provide the infrastructure to integrate disparate data sets, which would be vital for researchers interested in taking archeological interpretation to a new level through synthetic analysis (Kintigh 2006:570).

As the technical report is the principal vehicle for preserving the site once it is physically destroyed, it is an extremely important document. Several of the interviewees are not fully satisfied with how archaeological information (particularly from data recovery projects) is presented and disseminated to the profession and the public. There is no question that the nuts and bolts of an excavation need to be included in a report, as these lay the foundation for the interpretations that follow. But, as several practitioners lament, if these reports are not engaging to the profession, then how are they meant to engage and educate the public? If part of the solution to improve dissemination and accessibility of archaeological information lies in report preparation, how do we rectify this?

Greater utilization of existing archaeological reports to synthesize existing data was one solution raised by several interviewees. Synthetic analyses meld information from technical reports to produce new overviews and interpretations that could not only increase the level of prior knowledge about an area, but could also be absorbed into the local school curriculum, enabling children to have a more direct relationship with archaeological literature. Kintigh (2006:571) believes that “synthetic and comparative data will bring research to a new level and enable researchers from across the scientific disciplines to address long term questions.” The advantages of collating archaeological and geological data into a regional synthesis are highlighted by Rosenthal and Meyer’s (2004) geoarchaeological study of the Hollister, San Juan, and southern Santa Clara valleys. This undertaking was prepared in response to current and proposed transportation projects in the region. It provides an essential planning tool for archaeologists to evaluate the potential for buried archaeological sites. This particular synthesis is geared more toward professionals than the public, but that does not diminish the clear advantages of such an endeavor.

Recommendation 3. Collecting Statistical Data on Public Archaeology

As a profession, archaeologists should be far more sophisticated in promoting the relevance and benefits of public-oriented efforts directed toward non-archaeologists that can be influential within the environmental regulatory process of a project—for example, legislators who can champion cultural resource issues at the government level or those who hold the purse strings, such as project managers, because funding public archaeology is often a major stumbling block. Public archaeology needs to be marketed to professionals outside of the discipline whose line of work intersects with our own, such as environmental planners, engineers, and project managers, to show what a viable and invaluable asset it is.

This can be achieved by collecting quantitative and qualitative data that chronicles positive experiences with public archaeology and highlights the level of interest that it generates. Gathering such information would enable archaeologists to present evidence that supports their case to these aforementioned groups for the inclusion of a public archaeology component into a project.

At an early stage of my research, I participated in an archaeology open day in San José as part of the Heinlenville / Japantown excavation run by the Anthropological Studies Center (ASC) at Sonoma State University. The fact that over 500 people turned up and were waiting outside the gates up to half an hour before opening time testifies to the level of interest that this project generated within the community. This does not even take into account the visitors who had traveled from further afield, requiring a bigger commitment on their part. During the course of the open day I heard nothing but positive comments from the public about this experience, their education about the community’s history, and their desire to know if another open day was to be held.

Other examples are provided by Allen et al. (2002) and Praetzellis and Praetzellis (2004), who chronicled public archaeology efforts within their reports. In the case of Allen et al., they dedicated a chapter to their public archaeology program, reflecting upon why it became an integral part of the project before, during, and after completion. This is a wonderful addition to Allen et al.’s overall site report and serves as an important record of the activities, open days, lectures, and publications that they geared toward the public. Coupled with the statistical data they provide, Allen et al. convincingly demonstrate the level of interest and fascination in archaeology from all ages across a wide social spectrum, as well as the benefits that all participants in this project reaped.

Recommendation 4. Marketing Archaeology: Involvement and Education of Non-Technical Specialists

Trying to convince non-technical specialists such as environmental planners, engineers and project managers involved in the decision-making process about the benefits of public archaeology is a topic rarely discussed. Much of the discussion in the general literature centers on how archaeologists need to improve our own communication practices both toward the public and within the discipline. However, projects at the federal, state, or local levels require the involvement of non-technical specialists to ensure that a project is completed successfully. Several of the interviewees recalled that once project managers, engineers, and planners were made aware of the benefits, they understood its worth and were more accommodating toward public outreach within their respective projects. By building bridges with these groups and conveying the advantages of public archaeology to the project, the community, and the profession, partnerships can be forged that pave the way for future endeavors.

An area within the planning phase of a transportation project that may facilitate greater public involvement is the Community Impact Assessment report. These documents are normally produced for large, complex, and controversial projects in order to evaluate the social, economic, land-use and growth, and public service impacts of transportation planning and project implementation on a community. Normally, planners or impact assessment specialists conduct this work. It is part of their job to identify the types of communities that could potentially be affected by a transportation project and, accordingly, they have the resources and experience that can define the demographics of an area. This also allows them to tap into subareas of neighborhoods, such as gathering places that are not easily defined by statistics but are part of the community makeup. By utilizing the information procured from Community Impact Assessment specialists and suggesting that they investigate heritage concerns, archaeologists could potentially begin to build the all-important rapport and trust with a community that can yield an exciting and beneficial collaborative effort. This information could also inform archaeologists about the areas of research or social issues that may be of interest and relevance to the community.

Recommendation 5. Community Collaboration

Collaboration between archaeologists and those we serve is increasingly becoming an important feature of our discipline: it challenges different perspectives and perceptions of the past, and illuminates paths toward greater public dissemination, access, and relevance in today's society. Archaeologists also need to be aware that, given the uniqueness of Native American tribes and other communities, there is no "cookie-cutter" method for conducting community archaeology as part of a project. It would be shortsighted and naïve to assume that one system fits all, so I will not offer a step-by-step guide on facilitating community collaboration. Rather, I will discuss several ways in which policy-driven archaeologists have achieved varying levels of collaboration within a regulatory context, which serve as models for future practice.

It is important to collect and analyze data in an objective manner using the appropriate standards, but science and traditional beliefs can complement one another. Allowing for meaningful collaboration that integrates indigenous, descendent, or community groups' worldviews into technical studies goes back to the call from several interviewees for an improvement in the way the profession writes technical studies. In one recent example, Smirnoff (2009) demonstrates how regulatory and tribal views can easily be integrated into a technical study. By incorporating the Kashaya Pomo recommendations and considerations for their heritage, the Management Plan for the Little Black Mountain property delivered a far more developed and deeper understanding of the cultural landscape under the stewardship of the Sonoma Land Trust. It is not necessary to reconcile all conflicts or create a singular narrative, but giving community members the opportunity to voice how they interpret and protect the spiritual or ritual aspects attached to their heritage is surely what public archaeology should be striving for.

As the profession moves steadily toward increased community collaboration, graduate programs such as those at Sonoma State University, UC Berkeley, and Stanford University, among others, are providing an important service by teaching students about the complex social negotiations of community collaboration and consultation. It is important to teach anthropology graduate students different strategies for working with communities, and these institutions should continue encouraging student participation and critically examining approaches that lead to successful and meaningful community collaboration. Ethnography, in particular, is increasingly becoming an important method for bridging the scientific and regulatory perspective of archaeology with a community's spiritual or ritual associations. As a result, communities can articulate their own conceptions of identification, interpretation, and stewardship, which provide a far more accommodating and informative understanding of their cultural history and current needs. If students have been exposed to community ethnography or collaborative efforts, they will be in good stead for future employment and move the profession in the right direction.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Public archaeology in the twenty-first century is a complex melting pot of theory and social issues. It is forging new approaches on the presentation and dissemination of archaeological data to the public, and tackling issues of community cohesion and cultural identity. Public involvement in archaeology is viewed by many archaeologists as a crucial and complementary component to archaeological investigations. The tangible and accessible information provided by education and outreach programs helps to justify and maintain public expenditure.

My research has lead to a set of recommendations to improve and implement public outreach, through ethnographic interviews with leading practitioners in policy-driven archaeology. The results and conclusions of this research can serve as a powerful supplementary guidance tool when integrating public outreach into a policy-driven archaeological project, not only for archaeologists, but also for non-technical specialists. By investigating how to provide tangible and accessible information to justify and maintain public expenditure, this research can inform innovative approaches toward public archaeology. This research has been designed to investigate the level of public archaeology at a regional level and potentially serve as the first step toward a more comprehensive statewide assessment of the effectiveness of outreach programs. Such an assessment would go a long way toward addressing the current problems of archaeology in California as stipulated in the White Papers, making archaeology relevant to communities, and justifying the expenditure of public funds. After all, because human cultures are the subjects of our study, they should also be its beneficiaries.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was conducted as part of a Master's thesis for the Cultural Resource Management program at Sonoma State University. I am very grateful to the members of my thesis committee, Margaret Purser, Ph.D., John Wingard, Ph.D., and Michael Newland, M.A., for their advice and support throughout the process. Alexis Boutin, Ph.D., also provided editorial assistance for this article. Finally, ultimate thanks to my interviewees, who so graciously gave their time to help my research. They are an integral part of this ethnographic research and I feel privileged and honored to have met them, and grateful that they were willing to be part of my study into public archaeology.

The following participants kindly gave their time to be interviewed as part of my ethnographic research into public archaeology. They are grouped by their affiliation and not the order in which they were interviewed:

- Anonymous (Consultant)
- Rebecca Allen, Ph.D., President, Past Forward, Inc. (Consultant)
- Mary Maniery, M.A., President, PAR Environmental Services, Inc. (Consultant)
- Michael Newland, M.A., Staff Archaeologist, Anthropological Studies Center, Sonoma State University (Consultant, Academic Institution)
- Janet Pape, M.A., California Department of Transportation (State Agency)
- Kathleen Lindahl, Senior State Archaeologist, California State Parks (State Agency)
- Stephen Mikesell, M.A., Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Office of Historic Preservation, Department of Parks & Recreation (State Agency)
- Eric Blind, M.A., Principal Archaeologist, Presidio Archaeology Laboratory, The Presidio of San Francisco, National Park Service (Federal Agency)
- Elizabeth Clevenger, M.A., Curator of Archaeology, Presidio Archaeology Laboratory, The Presidio of San Francisco, National Park Service (Federal Agency)
- Kathryn Ahern, Coordinator of Education Programs, Presidio Archaeology Laboratory, The Presidio of San Francisco, National Park Service (Federal Agency)

- Nick Tipon, Committee Chair, Sacred Sites Protection Committee (Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria)

REFERENCES CITED

Allen, Rebecca, Scott R. Baxter, Annemarie Medin, Julia G. Costello, and Connie Yu Young

2002 *Excavation of the Woolen Mills Chinatown (CA-SCL-807H) San José*. Vol. 1. Past Forward, California Department of Transportation, and Foothill Resources. On File at the California Department of Transportation, District 4, Oakland, California and Northwest Information Center, Rohnert Park, California.

Antoniadou, Ioanna

2009 Reflections on an Ethnographic Archaeology of "Looting" in Kozani, Greece. *Public Archaeology* 8(2-3):246-261.

Chambers, Keith, and Anne Chambers

2001 *Unity of Heart: Culture and Change in a Polynesian Atoll Society*. Waveland Press, Prospect Heights, Illinois.

Dowdall, Katherine M., and Otis O. Parrish

2003 A Meaningful Disturbance of the Earth. In *Archaeologists and Local Communities: Partners in Exploring the Past*, edited by Linda Derry and Maureen Malloy pp. 19-29. Society for American Archaeology, Washington D.C.

2005 Archaeology and Places with Sacred Narratives. Paper presented at the 70th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Salt Lake City.

Fritz, John M., and Fred T. Plog

1970 The Nature of Archaeological Explanation. *American Antiquity* 35:405-412.

Greer, Shelley, Rodney Harrison, and Susan McIntyre-Tamwoy

2002 Community-based Archaeology in Australia *World Archaeology* 34(2):265-287.

Hollowell, Julia, and George Nicolas

2009 Using Ethnographic Methods to Articulate Community-Based Conceptions of Cultural Heritage Management. *Public Archaeology* 8(2-3):141-160.

King, Julia A.

2010 The Challenges of Dissemination: Accessing Archaeological Data and Interpretations. In *Archaeology and Cultural Resource Management: Visions for the Future*, edited by Lynne Sebastian and William D. Lipe, pp. 141-167. SAR Press, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Kintigh, Keith

2006 The Promise and Challenge of Archaeological Data Integration. *American Antiquity* 71:567-578.

Lightfoot, Kent G., Otis O. Parrish, and Edward M. Luby

2004 The Kashaya Pomo Interpretive Trail Project. *Proceedings of the Society for California Archaeology* 17:179-182.

Little, Barbara J.

2007 What Are We Learning? Who Are We Serving? Publicly Funded Historical Archaeology and Public Scholarship. *Historical Archaeology* 41(2):72-79.

Maryland Historical Trust

2011 Maryland Historical Trust Archeological Synthesis Project. Electronic document, http://mht.maryland.gov/archeology_synthesis.html, accessed July 15, 2011.

Merriman, Nick

2002 Archaeology, Heritage and Interpretation. In *Archaeology: The Widening Debate*, edited by Barry Cunliffe, Wendy Davies, and Colin Renfrew, pp. 541-566. Oxford University Press.

Messenger, Phyllis Mauch
2000 Public Education and Outreach In *Ethics in American Archaeology*, edited by Mark J. Lynott and Alison Wylie, pp. 75-77. 2nd ed. Society for American Archaeology, Washington D.C.

Mikesell, Stephen, Michael McGuirt, and Trish Fernandez
2007 State Historical Resources Commission Archaeology Committee White Papers: Essays on Cultural Resource Problems and Prospects by the State Historical Resources Commission's Archaeology Committee *Society for California Archaeology Newsletter* 41(1):18-25.

Newland, Michael
2007 Archaeological Resources Interpretation: State Historical Resources Commission Archaeology Committee White Papers, Essay on Cultural Resource Problems by the State Historical Resources Commission’s Archaeology Committee. *Society for California Archaeology Newsletter* 41(1):24-25.

Noble, Vergil E.
2007 Making Connections: Beyond the Confines of Compliance. *Historical Archaeology* 41(2):67-71.

Praetzellis, Mary, and Adrian Praetzellis (editors)
2004 Putting the "There" There: Historical Archaeologies. In *Cypress Freeway Replacement Project Interpretive Report No. 2, I-880 Cypress Freeway Replacement Project, SHPO Ref # FHWA900927X (ALA-880 PM 31.9/34.8, ALA 2.3/4.0; EA 04-190270 in the Cities of Oakland and Emeryville, Alameda County, California)*. On file at California Department of Transportation, District 4, Office of Cultural Resource Studies, Oakland, California and Anthropological Studies Center, Rohnert Park, California.

Praetzellis, Mary, Adrian Praetzellis, and Thad Van Bueren
2007 Remaking Connections: Archaeology and Community after the Loma Prieta Earthquake. In *Archaeology as a Tool of Civic Engagement*, edited by Barbara J. Little and Paul A.Shackel, pp. 109-130. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.

Presidio Trust
2010 Education and Outreach. Electronic document, http://www.presidio.gov/history/archaeology/education/, accessed August 2, 2010.

Rosenthal, Jeffrey, and Jack Meyer
2004 *Landscape Evolution and the Archaeological Record: A Geoarchaeological Study of the Southern Santa Clara Valley and Surrounding Region*. Center for Archaeological Research at Davis Publication No. 14. University of California, Davis, California.

Sebastian, Lynne (editor)
2010 The Future of CRM Archaeology. In *Archaeology and Cultural Resource Management: Visions for the Future*, edited by Lynne Sebastian and William D. Lipe, pp. 3-18. SAR Press, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Shackel, Paul A. (editor)
2005 Memory, Civic Engagement, and the Public Meaning of Archaeological Heritage. *SAA Archaeological Record* 5(2):24-27.

Smirnoff, Leslie E.
2009 Cultural Resources Inventory and Management Plan for Sonoma Land Trust's Little Black Mountain Property. Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, California.

Spradley, James P.
1979 *The Ethnographic Interview*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

Thomas Jefferson Monticello

2011 Research and Collections. Electronic document, http://www.monticello.org/research/index.html , accessed July 11, 2011.

University of West Florida

2011 Florida Public Archaeology Network. Electronic document, http://www.flpublicarchaeology.org, accessed July 15, 2011.

University of York

2011 Archaeological Data Service, Electronic document, http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/, accessed July 15, 2011.

Wiberg, Randy S.

1992 *Archaeological Data Recovery at Sites CA-SOL-69 and CA-SOL-315, Green Valley, Solano County, California*. Holman and Associates Archaeological Consultants, San Francisco, California. On File at Northwest Information Center, Rohnert Park, California.

1993 *Final Report: Archaeological Data Recovery at Prehistoric Site CA-SOL-355/H, Green Valley, Solano County, California*. Holman and Associates Archaeological Consultants, San Francisco, California. On File at the Northwest Information Center, Rohnert Park, California.

1996 *Archaeological Excavations at Site CA-SOL-356 Fairfield, Solano County, California: Final Report*. Holman and Associates Archaeological Consultants, San Francisco, California. On File at the Northwest Information Center, Rohnert Park, California.