
ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSIONAL ARCHAEOLOGISTS

Box 101, McMaster University P.O., Hamilton, Ontario L8S 1C0

NEWSLETTER, VOLUME 5, NUMBER 2, 1994

1994 ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

This year the APA will be holding its Annual General Meeting on Saturday, November 19, 1994 at Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario. By the time you have received your Newsletter you will already have received a notification of the day's busy itinerary. All members are encouraged to attend.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

The APA has a number of positive developments to report in this second Newsletter of 1994. First, we are very pleased to have seen a 20% growth in membership since January of this year and, with the introduction of new guidelines, expect a further 10% growth in our next three months. Our newly appointed membership director, Gary Warrick, has instituted a one-month turn-around time in the processing of new member applications, replacing our previous system.

We would also like to extend a warm welcome to new members Malcolm Horne and Allison Bain who both have considerable experience in Ontario archaeology. Malcolm is the archaeologist/planner for the city of London, and Allison is a palaeo-entomologist currently analysing samples from the Arctic and Quebec City. We are looking forward to their participation in the Association.

Also, recently rejoining the Association is Peter Engelbert, marine

archaeologist with MCTR. Welcome back Peter!

In conjunction with Wilfrid Laurier University, the APA will be bringing in a speaker in association with its Annual General Meeting in November. We hope that members and their friends will turn out for an engaging evening.

Advocacy efforts continue to be the focus of our Directors, ranging from Planning Reform review to monitoring of the long-awaited, new and improved (we hope) Ontario Heritage Act. Vice-President Phil Woodley, together with myself and Secretary Bill Fitzgerald, is currently heading a review of the MCTR Technical Guidelines. Our goal is to assess what is and what is not working under this system, and to assist MCTR with this feedback. If there are other issues you would like the APA to address, call or write me. Until next time.

Lawrence Jackson

ADVOCACY ISSUES

As of July 1994, the Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Recreation has released two draft guidelines related to the use of land in the province of Ontario. These guidelines will have an effect on heritage conservation in Ontario.

Sections of the draft guidelines are being presented in this newsletter for the members' information and commentary --

let us know what you think are the positive and negative aspects of the new draft guidelines, and any suggestions for change.

1. An Implementation Guideline for the Conservation of Significant Landscapes Within the Land Use Planning Process. MCTR Draft: July 29, 1994.

i). Section 1.2 discusses **Policy B-13**, which states: "Policies and decisions regarding development and infrastructure should conserve significant landscapes, vistas and ridge-lines." (page 1).

ii). The following definition of **Cultural Heritage Landscapes** is given in the draft, Appendix A:

"Cultural heritage landscapes are any discrete aggregation of features made by people. The arrangement of features illustrate noteworthy relationships between people and their environment. They can provide the contextual and spatial information necessary to preserve, interpret or reinforce the understanding of important historical settings and changes to past patterns of land use. Cultural landscapes include any scenic or heritage area perceived as an ensemble of culturally derived landscape features such as a neighbourhood, townscape, farmscape, or shorescape that illustrates noteworthy relationships between people and their surrounding environment.

Three broad categories of Cultural Heritage Landscape include (1) Historically Designed landscapes such as gardens, parks and transportation corridors (eg. Queens Park, Mount Peasant (sic) Cemetery, etc.); (2) Evolving landscapes such as rural areas, urban streetscapes and industrial complexes (eg. rural Eramosa Twp., Oak Ridges Moraine, Cobalt Mining areas, etc.); and (3) Sacred landscapes, such as burial grounds, battlefields, and areas of worship and traditional use (eg. Manitou Mounds, War of 1812 Battle of Chippewa, Agawa Pictographs, etc.)." (page 9)

iii). The recommended **Selection Criteria** for "defining significant landscape" listed in the draft are as follows:

"1) The importance of the landscape, vista or ridge-line, and the view of the resource, held by the local community, the public generally, and other interested groups or organizations (including First Nations).

2) Accessibility of important vantage points from which to view the resource.

3) Rarity or Representativeness of the resource.

4) The components of the resource that make the view significant.

5) Associations of the resource and its view to persons, cultural expressions, or cultural traditions of importance to the community.

6) Integrity of the resource.

7) The importance of the resource and accessible views of the resource to factors such as tourism and recreation." (page 5)

2. An Implementation Guideline for the Conservation of Cultural Heritage Resources Within the Reformed Land Use Planning Process. MCTR Draft: July 1994.

i). "The specific policies for cultural heritage resource conservation are known as B-14 and B-15:

Policy B-14: Policies and decisions regarding development and infrastructure should conserve significant cultural heritage landscapes and built heritage resources.

Policy B-15: Development and infrastructure may be permitted on sites containing significant archaeological resources and on sites with medium and high potential if the site is studied and the archaeological resources are removed, catalogued and analyzed prior to

development or construction. Where archaeological resources must be preserved on site to ensure their heritage integrity, only development and infrastructure which maintains the heritage integrity of the site will be permitted." (page 2)

ii). "The following are the key criteria to be considered during the cultural heritage resource review of development proposals. Potential is determined by the presence of any one of Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5, or the presence of two or more of Criteria 6, 7, or 8.

1) Distance (within 400 metres) from primary sources of water, such as rivers, lakes, and large creeks; or from relict or ancient primary sources of water, such as glacial shorelines (as indicated by raised beach ridges), relict river channels or lakeshores, or relict larger creek beds. Association with drainage, as a source of water and as transportation corridors, was a primary criteria determining prehistoric aboriginal settlement in Ontario.

2) Distance (within 200 metres) from secondary sources of water, such as smaller creeks, streams, seasonally wet creek and stream beds, springs, marshes, and swamps; or from relict or ancient secondary sources of water, such as relict creek and stream beds (usually visible as a channelized dip in the topography), or drained and/or filled former marshes and swamps.

3) Presence of known heritage resources within or in the vicinity of the development proposal, such as built features of known heritage significance, cultural landscapes or known archaeological sites.

4) Presence of rolling or elevated topography, sandy soils, or unusual land formations.

5) Evidence from documentary sources or local knowledge or Aboriginal oral history associating the property in question with

historic events, activities or occupations.

6) Capacity of the land to accommodate large or small scale settlement. This includes a consideration of current and past availability of plant, animal and raw materials.

7) Presence of historic settlement, land use, industrial or economic activity areas in the vicinity of the development proposal. This can include the older core or initial settlement area of hamlets, villages, towns and cities; early military or pioneer settlement in the region; heritage conservation districts, presence of a pioneer church and/or early cemetery; etc.

8) Association of the development proposal to historic transportation routes, such as historic waterways, roads or portage routes; Aboriginal or early pioneer trail systems.

9) Extent and type of previous land disturbance to have occurred on the subject property." (pages 10-11)

iii). Section 4.2 of the MCTR draft contains information regarding **Cultural Heritage Resource Significance Evaluations**.

"Generally, the significance of cultural heritage resources, regardless of type, can be evaluated based on one or more of the following criteria:

1) Historical significance (associated with a renowned event, person or community).

2) Rarity or Representativeness (locally, regionally, provincially).

3) Community interest (the value of a resource's significance as expressed locally).

4) Age (how old).

5) Integrity (condition of the resource).

6) Association (the relationship of a specific

resource to broader geographic, temporal and cultural associations).

7) In addition, archaeological sites may be evaluated based on the size, relative productivity of data from the site, and potential presence of human remains.

8) Built resources may also be evaluated based on the uniqueness of the architecture (structure, style, use of space, use of materials, etc); the renown of the architect, and the potential for documenting an architectural or engineering innovation." (page 16)

[Both draft guidelines are directed to the attention of planners, municipalities and developers, not to archaeologists, hence many of the explanations next to the selection and significance criteria. We hope this has been an informative "glimpse" at pertinent sections of the draft guidelines. The Editor]

Archaeological Horror Story

The APA Executive thought it would be interesting for the membership to read some tales of the dark side of archaeology in Ontario. Even though Hallowe'en has passed, we hope there still remains some space in your hearts into which true fear can be struck!

Submissions to the Newsletter for other "horror stories" are welcomed. Please maintain the anonymity of story characters in your submissions: our goal is to make other archaeologists and MCTR personnel aware of unusual things happening in the field and the discipline, but not at the perpetrator's expense.

Our first exposé is submitted by Bud Parker....

Although the central northern Ontario area has been without a provincial government archaeology office since 1989, one so-called student of archaeology has been very active in the region since the late 1980s. I will not name him, as his activities are "under review" by the provincial heritage offices, but I will describe some of his "work".

For convenience, I will use the name, Ace, as I describe this person's archaeological activities. Ace is a graduate of the local community college, and majored in history. He is an avid bottle collector, and has a large collection of bottles and other artifacts from the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Ace probably began his collecting in his high school days, and may have even purchased old bottles at garage sales and flea markets. However, it was soon made apparent to Ace that the best places for finding old bottles are in historic dumps, cellars, and other archaeological contexts.

Thus began Ace's "work" in what he calls "Salvage archaeology". Ace has been given a lot of newspaper coverage in the local daily, and this plus his many contacts in the construction industry has led to his "discovery" of many interesting "finds". Ace usually gets permission from the construction company to monitor the excavation of large building projects or other similar undertakings. Equipped with trowel, shovel, screens, hard hat and steel-toed boots, he "rescues" hundreds of artifacts (especially whole bottles) from certain destruction by heavy machinery at the construction sites.

Ace was granted an archaeological licence in 1991, which restricted him geographically, and entitled him to conduct only surface survey. Although it is uncertain whether or not he has submitted a report for his activities, it is known through conversations with this reporter that he "lost" the site registration forms. Through the same discussion with me, he stated that

he approaches construction sites within and outside his licence boundaries, and he introduces himself to prospective contacts as "an archaeologist, licensed by the Ministry". He also confessed to have tried to find the midden of an early 19th century historically designated house, but was verbally "harassed" by its neighbours, and he left without being able to dig a single hole.

Ace has also shown an interest in establishing a chapter of the OAS in his area, but when that proved to be too "complicated" he formed his own club, and he and the handful of current members now collect bottles on outings at the various "digs" throughout the region.

It seems that Ace does his salvage work as a hobby, for he does not ask for any money from the various development proponents he works with. He does get to retain the artifacts, and many of these end up in the local museum or in a display at the local community college. The information from his enterprises focuses on the socio-economic picture that the recovered bottles present. He does not seem to correlate the data from other finds, such as ceramics, faunal, and architectural remains, with his bottle-generated theories.

Ace's activities were first noted by this reporter in 1991, and copies of several newspaper articles about his endeavours were sent to the OHF, OAS, and APA. It seems that MCTR and OHF have been watching Ace for a while, and the newspaper articles which appear about twice a year indicate he is still very active. It is these articles which add to the publicity of his poor-quality heritage resource management, since they emphasize the "thrill" of discovery of whole bottles and they lack in failing to mention the obvious negative aspects of Ace's work. Proper archaeological resource management needs to be encouraged in Ace's region, but unfortunately real CRM work would probably appear to be boring to the general

public. Until the Ministry acts, either to persuade Ace to become more ethical (ie., through subtle tactics), or prosecutes him under the Ontario Heritage Act, he will certainly continue to act as a "consultant", and the archaeological resources in his region will continue to be destroyed.

Why do Private Sector Archaeologists Undervalue Their Worth?

In 1984 James Fitting wrote a sobering article on the plight of American consulting archaeologists and their employees ["Economics and Archaeology", in *Ethics and Values in Archaeology*, edited by Ernestene Green, The Free Press, New York]. The issues raised by Fitting a decade ago are especially applicable to 1994 Ontario and, unless they are immediately realized and addressed, it is not difficult to foresee the collapse of what could be a rewarding profession. Visions of seasonal migrant fieldworkers being shuttled from site to site like wormpickers are not preposterous -- in some instances the future is here. Fortunately though, it does not have to be a future that university graduates who want to pursue archaeological careers need to face if all participants in private sector archaeology can work collectively to improve the state of the profession.

It is increasingly clear that without uniform standards for archaeological consultants to follow, all components of the archaeological process, including wages and benefits, tend to be underestimated or reduced for fear of being "low-balled" in the bidding process. By believing that the only way to secure contracts is by implementing artificially low standards, it is the archaeologist, without the help of developers and government officials, that is contributing to a weakening of the viability of the profession.

In an informal poll of private sector firms that deal exclusively with heritage

matters, the daily charge-out rate of archaeological personnel averages between \$200 and \$250 per person. Included in this per diem is the salary of the fieldworker - generally between \$8 and \$12 per hour. In multidisciplinary projects that include botanists, geologists, engineers, as well as archaeologists, it is evident from the examples below that archaeological consultants are grossly undercharging in relation to other professions. Were it not for archaeologists, the botanists and biologists would be bringing up the rear...not that these groups really have to fear about slipping into last place since their charge-out rates are 50% above those of the archaeologists! Further demonstrating how out of synch archaeologists are with the rest of the business world, the our per diems are more than 50% below the study groups' averages.

An unfortunate development of this practice is that national firms that incorporate archaeology within broader environmental studies now believe they do not have to pay archaeologists wages or benefits (such as travel considerations, accommodation, meal allowances) that are any greater than those offered by the ever-increasing number of archaeological consulting firms. The lowest common denominator has now become the industry norm.

An archaeologist's dedication to the discipline should not have to compensate for the deficient remuneration offered by most private sector heritage, environmental, and engineering firms. Nor should a person's qualification for archaeological employment be contingent on their proximity to the job site, or their willingness, out of financial desperation, to work for substandard wages.

If a career as a private sector archaeologist can ever be considered as a means by which to make a basic or even decent living, all participants -- the consultant and their employees -- will have to begin considering themselves as

professionals whose education and experience merits professional treatment. Until this problem of professional self-esteem is overcome, the majority of private sector archaeologists will continue to languish at the bottom of the payscale. Unless wage standards and per diems comparable to related professions are employed by heritage and environmental/engineering firms, the hope that archaeology can ever be considered as a legitimate career is unlikely to be realized.

There is no reason that consultants cannot all charge out and pay comparable professional rates any more than they can all pay wages that are unnecessarily low. If consultants could agree to a reasonable fee schedule, no consultant would have to be at a competitive disadvantage. Adequate per diems would benefit everyone, and it would be the most qualified, not just the most handy, fieldworkers that would be hired.

Private sector archaeologists should now realize that for the profession to endure and flourish it is necessary for all participants to work together. This is not simply a business issue, it is one of professional survival. In an attempt to improve this situation, the Executive is planning on organizing a workshop for consultants with the goal of creating a very detailed price list (based on time and costs), like other professions have, for the range of archaeological procedures. This could lead to greater consistency in bid formulation, lessening the fear of overpricing. For instance, how much would one acre of a ploughed field cost to survey, or an acre of clay bush vs. sandy bush cost to test pit.

So take a look at the figures below and plan to keep a weekend open this winter. We'll provide you with details shortly.

Bud Parker/Bill Fitzgerald

Per Diems from Two Watershed Studies

Project Manager	\$825	_____
Land Use Planner	\$788	_____
Environmental Geologist	\$773	_____
Hydrogeologist	\$725	_____
Senior Terrestrial Ecologist	\$700	_____
Municipal Engineer	\$687	_____
Senior Systems Engineer	\$655	_____
Senior Water Resources Engineer	\$626	_____
Senior Project Engineer	\$500	_____
Senior Terrestrial Biologist	\$500	_____
Aquatic Biologist	\$500	_____
Intermediate Project Engineer	\$414	_____
Intermediate Environmental Planner	\$400	_____
Junior Biologist	\$350	_____
Junior Project Engineer	\$333	_____
Senior Archaeologist	\$250	_____
Junior Archaeologist	\$200	_____

Range: \$200-\$825

Average: \$542

Project Director	\$825	_____
Technical Director	\$825	_____
Ecosystem Planner	\$800	_____
Environmental Geologist	\$773	_____
Senior Servicing Engineer	\$750	_____
Senior Land Use Planner	\$750	_____
Water Quality Treatment Specialist	\$726	_____
Senior Biologist	\$675	_____
Associate Project Director	\$673	_____
Hydrogeologist	\$650	_____
Senior Systems Engineer	\$635	_____
Water Resources Engineer	\$577	_____
Pedologist	\$500	_____
Senior Landscape Architect	\$500	_____
Project Engineer	\$500	_____
Water Resources Engineer	\$433	_____
Land Use Planner	\$425	_____
Water Resources Engineer	\$394	_____
Botanist	\$380	_____
Wildlife Biologist	\$380	_____
Senior Archaeologist	\$250	_____
Junior Archaeologist	\$200	_____

Range: \$200-\$825

Average: \$574

A Planning Company's Per Diems

Principals	\$800-\$960
Planners	\$360-\$720
Technicians	\$320
Draftspersons	\$280

Ministry of Transportation Weekly Wages (NOT Per Diems)

Research Officer 2B (Crew chief)	\$847.24-\$1004.72
Research Officer 2A (Technician)	\$737.41-\$850.82
Research Officer 1 (Seasonal staff)	\$616.01-\$699.85



OFFICERS OF THE APA

President:

Lawrence J. Jackson, P.O. Box 493, Port Hope, Ontario L1A 3Z4 (905) 342-3250

Vice-President:

Philip Woodley, 395 Herkimer Street, Hamilton, Ontario L8P 2J4 (905) 527-2670

Secretary/Treasurer:

Bill Fitzgerald, 24 Mapleside Avenue, Hamilton, Ontario L8P 3Y5 (905) 577-4748

Directors:

Bud Parker, 279 Sandowne Drive, Unit 28, Waterloo, Ontario N2K 2C1 (519) 888-0169

Dean Knight (Grievance Co-ordinator), Archaeology Lab, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3C5 (519) 884-1970 extension 6845

Gary Warrick (Membership Committee Chair), Ministry of Transportation, 5th Floor, Atrium Tower, 1201 Wilson Avenue, Downsview, Ontario M3M 1J8 (416) 235-5551 extension 7630

Newsletter Editor:

Alison Ariss, P.O. Box 493, Port Hope, Ontario L1A 3Z4 (905) 342-3250