City of Santa Fe

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
DATE 10/26/11 TIME 1:30p
BY
RECEIVED BY

Agenda

ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

THURSDAY, November 3, 2011 – 4:30 pm.

CITY COUNCILORS' CONFERENCE ROOM

CITY HALL, 200 LINCOLN AVENUE

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
October 06, 2011
October 20, 2011

E. ACTIONS ITEMS

1. Case#AR-17-11. Approval of Monitoring Report prepared for the Facilities Division, Public Works Department of the City of Santa Fe, for the construction of Dumpster enclosure along Federal Place, located within the Historic Downtown Archaeological Review District. Requested by Stephen Post, Office of Archaeological Studies, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs, for the City of Santa Fe.

2. Case#AR-18-11. Approval of Data Recovery Report prepared for the Community Projects Division, Santa Fe County, for the construction of the First Judicial District Courthouse, located on a 2.4-acre parcel within the Historic Downtown Archaeological Review District. Requested by Stephen Post, Office of Archaeological Studies, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs, for the State of New Mexico.

F. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

G. COMMUNICATIONS

H. MATTERS FROM THE COMMITTEE

I. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

J. ADJOURNMENT

For more information regarding cases on this agenda, please call the Planning Division at 955-6605. Interpreters for the hearing impaired are available through the City Clerk's office at 966-6520, upon five (5) days notice.

SUMMARY INDEX
ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
November 3, 2011

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
City Councilors Conference Room
November 3, 2011

A. CALL TO ORDER

A meeting of the Archaeological Review Committee was called to order by Jeremy Kulisheck, Chair, at approximately 4:30 p.m., on November 3, 2011, in the City Councilors Conference Room, City Hall, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present
Jeremy Kulisheck, Chair
Tess Monahan, Vice-Chair
James Edward Ivey
David Eck

Members Excused
Gary Funkhouser

Others Present
John Murphey, Land Use Department
Melessia Helberg, Stenographer

There was a quorum of the membership in attendance.

NOTE: All items in the Committee packet for all agenda items are incorporated herewith to these minutes by reference; and the original Committee packet is on file in, and may be obtained from, the Historic Planning Division.

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: Tess Monahan moved, seconded by David Eck, to approve the Agenda as published.

VOTE: The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: OCTOBER 6, 2011 AND OCTOBER 20, 2011

The following corrections were made to the minutes of October 6, 2011:

Page 4, paragraph 2, line 2, correct as follows: "...they did archival [research] as..."
Page 5, paragraph 1, line 3, correct as follows: "...American ~~Antiquities~~ Antiquity has..."
Page 6, paragraph 2, line 2, correct as follows: "...and ~~done~~ [dug] the.."
Page 11, Paragraph 4, line 1, correct as follows: "... said ~~DeDe~~ Dedie Snow has..."
Page 11, Paragraph 4, last line, correct as follows:.. No ~~mixture of~~ layer of mixed material..."
Page 11, paragraph 2, line 2, correct as follows: "...~~Otern~~ Otero Street..."

The following corrections were made to the minutes of October 20, 2011:

Page 1, Roll Call, Others Present, correct as follows: Strike the first ~~Melessia Helberg~~, ~~Stenographer~~ and the second ~~Others Present~~.
Page 4, paragraph 2, correct as follows: "... Funkhouser asked how..."
Page 6, paragraph 3 under Chair Kulisheck, correct as follows: ".. ~~reference site~~ references cited.."
Page 8, paragraph 3, line 2, correct as follows: "...we ~~would~~ wouldn't have..."
Page 8, paragraph 4, line 3, correct as follows: "... ~~dames~~ dams, especially ~~gabian~~ gabion..."
Page 9, delete paragraph 5.
Page 9, paragraph 6, line 1, correct as follows: "...these [retention dams] being
Page 12, Paragraph 1, line 3, it is "Park" not "Parks"

MOTION: Tess Monahan moved, seconded by David Eck, to approve the minutes of the meetings of October 6, 2011, as amended, and October 20 2011, as amended.

VOTE: The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

E. ACTION ITEMS

1. CASE #AR-17-11. APPROVAL OF MONITORING REPORT PREPARED FOR THE FACILITIES DIVISION, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE, FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF DUMPSTER ENCLOSURE ALONG FEDERAL PLACE, LOCATED WITHIN THE HISTORIC DOWNTOWN ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW DISTRICT. REQUESTED BY STEPHEN POST, OFFICE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL STUDIES, NEW MEXICO DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS, FOR THE CITY OF SANTA FE.

Chair Kulisheck reminded the Committee that this will be a recommendation for approval, with a finding that the Report conforms with City ordinance.

John Murphey, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Division, presented information from the Staff Report, with attachments, dated October 28, 2011.

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY

At the request of the Facilities Division, Public Works Department of the City of Santa Fe, the Office of Archaeological Studies (OAS) conducted archaeological monitoring during the excavation of footings for a Dumpster enclosure along Federal Place on the City Hall campus. The monitoring is a provision of General Archaeological Excavation Permit NM-11-027-M, and was required because of the potential discovery for human remains associated with LA 1051. Per the committee's request, the applicant included the monitoring plan submitted to the New Mexico Historic Preservation Division (HPD).

On June 22 and June 23, 2011, a crew of City workers hand-excavated four trenches 4.80 m. long and 48-50 cm. wide, with an average depth of 50 cm. along each trench except the north trench. OAS archaeologist Richard Montoya monitored the work. The trenching resulted in recovery of a single disarticulated human long-bone fragment; no artifacts were found in association with the fragment. The City of Santa Fe, the Pueblo of Tesuque and HPD were notified of the recovery. After approvals were granted, the fragment was removed to City Hall for storage. It will be reburied according to procedures agreed upon by the City of Santa Fe, the Pueblo of Tesuque and HPD.

ISSUES: Several typographical errors. Defer to Committee.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends, given correction of typographical errors, approving the monitoring report.

Chair Kulisheck asked Mr. Murphey if he provided a list of the typographical errors to the applicant, and Mr. Murphey said no.

Chair Kulisheck said he would ask Mr. Murphey to provide those at the close of the meeting to the proponent, if that is the most logical time to do so..

Steve Post said this was a small monitoring project in the northeast corner of LA 1051. He said the project was monitoring of footings for a dumpster enclosure. He said basically, the City was doing its due diligence on this project by recognizing the likelihood there would be an occurrence of not just intact deposits, but scattered disarticulated human remains from deposits just about anywhere on the site. He said they only encountered a single element during the project.

Mr. Post said John Murphy contacted him regarding the typographical error on page iii in the last paragraph, which states that the skeletal [inaudible] was reburied in 2005. He said it was to be reburied in December 2011, however he said he would report that they are looking at reburial this month.

Mr. Eck and Ms. Monahan said they have no comment.

Mr. Ivey said he has no comment, noting the Report was hugely entertaining.

Chair Kulisheck thanked Mr. Post for including the proposal since we don't routinely receive those. He said on page 11, paragraph 2 in the Summary of Recommendations Section where it discusses the disarticulated human femur fragment it says, "Broken at both ends, this element was likely redeposited multiple times during the construction of the Santa Fe Community Convention Center." He asked if it shouldn't say "prior to" the construction.

Mr. Post said no, because as fill was excavated it was respread across the site in various areas, so there is a probability that it could have been dug up during the actual construction excavation and redeposited as part of that activity. He said in monitoring, he would like to think that they observed all human remains that were unearthed, but does not think that was likely.

MOTION: Jake Ivey moved, seconded by David Eck, with regard to Case #AR-17-11, that the Archaeological Review Committee recommend to the State Archaeologist, at the State Historic Preservation Division, the acceptance of the Monitoring Report prepared for the Facilities Division, Public Works Department, City of Santa Fe, for the construction of a Dumpster enclosure along Federal Place, in the Historic Downtown Archaeological Review District, requested by Stephen Post, Office of Archaeological Studies, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs, State of New Mexico, with the typographical changes discussed earlier, finding that it conforms with the provisions of City Ordinance.

VOTE: The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

Mr. Post said Jason Klute, Project/Manager for the Public Works Department, asked that the Historic Preservation send him an email, letter or memo stating that the Report had been accepted.

Mr. Murphey said he will get that done.

2. **CASE #AR-18-11. APPROVAL OF DATA RECOVERY REPORT PREPARED FOR THE COMMUNITY PROJECTS DIVISION, SANTA FE COUNTY, FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURTHOUSE, LOCATED ON A 2.4 ACRE PARCEL WITHIN THE HISTORIC DOWNTOWN ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW DISTRICT. REQUESTED BY STEPHEN POST, OFFICE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL STUDIES, NEW MEXICO DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS, FOR THE CITY OF SANTA FE.**

John Murphey, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Division, presented information from the Staff Report, with attachments, dated October 28, 2011.

Chair Kulisheck reminded the Committee that we are recommending approval, and finding that this Report conforms to City ordinance.

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY

At the request of the Community Projects Division, Santa Fe Count, the Office of Archaeological Studies (OAS) performed data recovery for LA 156027, a site associated with the construction of the First Judicial District Courthouse, and comprising of a 2.4 acre parcel within the Historic Downtown Archaeological Review District. Data recovery investigations took place between mid-March and May 9, 2008, with follow-up field visits made on January 22, and 23, 2009. Identification of human remains on February 11, 2009, resulted in a monitoring program which continued through March 2009.

The data recovery investigated precontact features and deposits identified by Charles A. Hannaford during testing in 2007, and included a new examination of previously unstudied areas in the southwest and east-central portions of the site. An intact, precontact Native American component (AD 1275-1400) was discovered in one of these areas. Given the site's varied characteristics, both mechanical and hand excavation methods were employed. In addition, OAS conducted archival research to understand the land-use activities and socio-economic status of postcontact occupants,

focusing on the Depression era. Euroamerican artifacts were analyzed, not only as to material, but also as to function. The accompanying report analyzes these artifacts under nine function-based categories; faunal and archaeobotanical analyses of Euroamerican features are presented separately. ARC review is a requirement of the New Mexico Cultural Properties Review Committee for issuance of a permit.

ISSUES: Defer to Committee.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends approval of the Data Recovery Report.

Steve Lakatos said this project began in 2007 when testing was conducted there by Charles Hannaford and identified some postcontact features, as well as what would appear to be some precontact Native American objects. He said from that information, they developed a research and data recovery plan to address what they anticipated would be on the site. He said in 2008, the data recovery plan was approved by the CPRC and removed for data recovery. He said they identified a depression area privy, a trash pit as well as a precontact Native American component consisting of a single thermal feature, and what they interpreted as a disarticulated burned jackal structure. He said a preliminary report was generated at that time, presented to the CPRC and submitted to the Archeological Review Committee, and anticipated the data recovery to be done.

Mr. Lakatos said during construction some disarticulated remains were encountered, and the monitoring plan that was consistent with the unanticipated discoveries in the data recovery plan was submitted to SHPO and approved. He said during monitoring, they identified a small habitation structure, as well as two articulated human remains. He said during analysis, they found what appeared to be a late coalition classic period component as well as, perhaps, late Spanish Colonial Mexican period Territorial agricultural feature, a small acequia as well as well as what they interpreted as furrow marks. An analysis revealed similar aspects of plows on archaeology. He said there was a Depression era component, and archival research identified it to most likely be the Santa Fe Maternal Health Center which was located in the Quintana Apartment complex that used to be at that location.

Mr. Lakatos said overall, it appears that the Native American component is likely a seasonal farmstead, and didn't appear to be a year-round habitation. He said, although they couldn't date the agricultural feature, the furrow marks, it is likely, based on archival research, that this area was cultivated for some time, and through the Territorial period, and that the Depression era household was the first birth control clinic in New Mexico.

Ms. Monahan said this is a rich area, and it was nice to see the layers being discovered. She said it was a good report..

Mr. Ivey said he loved the great presentation of data on Sanborn, and asked how that was done.

Mr. Lakatos said that was done using Photo Shop and trial and error.

[Mr. Lakatos' remarks here are inaudible because someone was flipping pages.]

Mr. Eck said on page 191, under Human Remains, in the discussion of Burial 2, paragraph 3, 4th sentence, there needs to be a designation of "left or right," or the reference to the "maxilla and zygomat" should be plural, since there are two of each.

Mr. Eck said on page 192, under the discussion of Burial 4, it should be "fourth" lumbar instead of "forth" lumbar." Later in the meeting, Mr. Eck said he did a quick scan, and suggested Mr. Lakatos should do a global search and replace on "forth." He said another word he noticed during the scan was "porosites," which should be "porosities."

Mr. Eck said he has no further comments.

Chair Kulisheck said overall this was a really high quality report which he enjoyed reading.

Chair Kulisheck said he has one correction, on Page 43, line 1, paragraph 1, it says, "The name LA 156207 was assigned in 2007..." He said LA 156207 is a number, and not a name.

Chair Kulisheck said one of the things he found fascinating about this, was that feature 10, the acequia segment on page 68, doesn't have any late 19th - 20th century trash in it and is sterile. He said this would suggest that there was a hiatus in use of this lot for farming, or at least farming with that particular acequia, sometime between the late 19th century urban development on the lot, and its development as an agricultural field probably in the late 17th century, based on the ceramics that were seen there. He said it appears that there is a second hiatus indicated by the fill, and it seems to have been abandoned sometime in the later 18th or early 19th century, because it is filled with material and there is no post-railroad trash. He said it could be that particular acequia segment was abandoned and they were bringing water from somewhere else. He said the 18th and early 19th century is a period of time where you get a lot of curated technologies. People aren't generating nearly the volumes of trash they started generating in the late 1800's. However, there still seems to be a dearth of late 18th century, early 19th century material on the lot itself. He said the only material he saw that would date to that time period were the powhoge polychrome ceramics. This is something he found which he found interesting, and doesn't know if that jives.

Mr. Lakatos said it is small enough that it could be built and abandoned in a relatively short

period of time. He said he did struggle with the reason we weren't finding anything, besides Native American, so that would explain that.

Chair Kulisheck said he wondered, since the lot was so close in, why they would farm it and then abandon it.

Chair Kulisheck said he was very taken with Figure 519 where there is a diagram superimposed on the photo of the excavation unit which is very good, commenting he likes that innovative use of Photo Shop.

Chair Kulisheck said he appreciates the tackling of field houses, and trying to get into the literature and make sense of what's going on with field houses, because most people really don't.

Chair Kulisheck said he isn't crazy about Moore and Purcell's dichotomy between farmsteads and field houses, and finds it sort of over-normative, and think it masks the ability to look at the range of variability in field house use and seasonal farming use. He said it neglects to take into account the complexity of Pueblo farming, particularly the microeconomics of Pueblo farming. He said if we go even as far back as Maxwell's summary of Pueblo farming in 1992, that paper which is so dynamite that talks about all the Pueblo farming, it's more an attempt to create a couple of categories and try to cram the variability that we see into those categories. However, this isn't something which needs to be changed for this report. He said he thought Mr Lakatos had concluded that this was not a farmstead, and was a permanent habitation, and this is the way he read it.

Mr. Lakatos said his conclusion is that it is verging on a residential use. He said he really struggled trying to identify what some of the functions might be. He said he thought it was a farmstead initially, and starting to move more toward more year-round than seasonal.

Mr. Lakatos said he would like to stress that this was a collective effort and thanked the volunteers from Friends of Archaeologist, archivists, historians alike, and in particular Santa Fe County for its support of the research. He said it was important to include all of those people and the reason it came together as it did.

MOTION: David Eck moved, seconded by Jake, with regard to Case #AR-18-11, that the Archaeological Review Committee recommend to the State Archaeologist, at the State Historic Preservation Division, the acceptance of the Data Recovery Report prepared for the Community Projects Division, Santa Fe County, for the construction of the First Judicial District Courthouse, located on a 2.4 acre parcel within the Historic Downtown Archaeological Review District, requested by Stephen Post, Office of Archaeological Studies, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs, State of New Mexico, finding that it conforms with the provisions of City Ordinance.

VOTE: The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

F. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Mr. Murphey said he has included External Policies 1-15 in the packet and asked that they take those out and use them. He said Mr. Rasch said there is an External Policy #16, but that has not surfaced, but he will search diligently over the next two weeks.

Mr. Murphey said he received a Final Data Recovery Report for the Executive Office Building from Matthew Barbour.

Mr. Murphey said Ron Winters called to say that he is monitoring the ARC/National Park Service joint project for interpretation of Ft. Marcy, which he thinks is happening this week.

The Committee discussed the best meeting dates and times. It was the consensus among the Committee that the current meeting schedule, 1st and 3rd Thursdays at 4:30 is the best for all of the Committee members.

G. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no Communications.

H. MATTERS FROM THE COMMITTEE

Ms. Monahan thanked Mr. Murphey for the copies of External Policies. She said there was some discussion when Janet McVickar was Chair about people organizing their experience in a way which would indicate whether or not they meet the criteria to be listed as an approved archaeologist. She asked the Chair if he has an opinion in this regard.

Chair Kulisheck said he recalls the discussion, and that we concluded, much to Chair McVickar's chagrin, that the breakdown was not necessary. He said City Ordinance and External Policy provides for a much lesser breakdown. He said, while the breakdown was helpful, all they really need to do is to demonstrate their qualifications and that they met the time period requirement, expressed in months or years, to be designated as an approved archaeologist and/or a historian. He said the Committee agreed this was the metric they had to use.

Chair Kulisheck said at the time, it was the general consensus among the Committee that we couldn't require applicants to do more than that, because there was no language in either the Ordinance or External Policy which required them to do so.

Mr. Eck recalled the conversation, although he was not a member of the Committee at the time. He said this arose from the recognition that people do submit a table which breaks out the experience for a State permit. He said it is fine if the applicant already has the table and submits it.

Chair Kulisheck said Chair McVickar's concern was that someone had submitted a document which did demonstrate their time in certain positions, but was not organized and formatted in accordance with what the State expects. She said Chair McVickar wanted to see the information in the State format. He said this Committee reached the conclusion that we had no authority to enforce it, and simply needed them to demonstrate that they had the experience and the time served in the position to meet the requirements.

Ms. Monahan asked Mr. Murphey what is Policy 16, and Mr. Murphy said he doesn't know.

Mr. Eck said he would like a current list of approved archaeologists, noting the one in the packet is dated 2006.

Mr. Murphey said he can provide that list.

Mr. Eck said many people are listed as historians, and in the Downtown Historic District a historian needs to be involved in a reconnaissance project, and asked if it is necessary to have a historian involved in a monitoring project.

Chair Kulisheck said yes, commenting he didn't look at Mr. Montoya's qualifications for the recent monitoring report. He said we have requested that this be done of other applicants.

Mr. Eck said the State has the same problem, and continually get reports submitted by people who "aren't qualified to do what they do."

Mr. Ivey asked what does "A" mean on the list of the approved people, and asked if it means "All" or something else, noting it isn't on the list.

Mr. Murphey said he will find out and provide that information at the next meeting.

Chair Kulisheck said it is refreshing to have a new and higher level of service that we've had over the past year, commenting that Mr. Rasch did the best he could under the circumstances. He likes having the staff reports and appreciates the name plates.

I. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

There was no Business from the Floor.

J. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Jake Ivey moved, seconded by Tess Monahan, to adjourn the meeting.

VOTE: The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote, and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:25 pm

Jeremy Kulisheck, Chair

Melessia Helberg, Stenographer