

# A BRIEF HISTORY OF CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN ALASKA

Howard L. Smith

717 Keeling Rd., North Pole, AK 99705; hsmith@mosquitonet.com

## ABSTRACT

One of the most significant influences on the practice of archaeology within the past four decades has been the birth of cultural resource management in response to federal historic preservation laws. An examination of the growth and development of cultural resource management (CRM) in Alaska reveals that CRM has become the overwhelming source of data and information concerning archaeological sites and resources, as well as the primary employment sector for archaeologists working in the state. This paper consists of a brief history of the growth of CRM archaeology in Alaska, including descriptions of major CRM projects and trends, and the sequence of initial hiring of archaeologists by federal agencies. Finally, three major contributions of CRM to archaeology are discussed, including significant additions to the statewide database of sites, an increased emphasis on historical archaeology, and examples of original research.

**KEYWORDS:** public archaeology, federal agencies, Alaska Office of History and Archaeology

## INTRODUCTION

The passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) had a profound influence on the discipline of archaeology. This single piece of federal legislation, with its procedural requirements for the consideration of impacts to historic and prehistoric sites, has created a legion of jobs for archaeologists, provided significant new sources of funding for archaeological research, and drastically changed how and what we do.

A primary result of the NHPA was to greatly increase the amount of archaeology being done, primarily for purposes associated with management of the resource base. This type of archaeology is generally referred to as cultural resource management (CRM). Some, such as King (2004:12–13), would define the term very broadly, to include such nonmaterial phenomena as beliefs, perceptions, and practices that would normally fall outside of the sub-

ject matter of archaeology. Given that the primary focus of this paper is to assess the development of CRM as it affects the practice of archaeology, such a broad definition is not appropriate. Here, the term is used in a more traditional manner to refer to the management of the physical remains of past human activity on public and private lands, including material that has been collected and stored in public repositories.

There have been several reviews of cultural resource management over the years since passage of the NHPA. The Airlie House Report (McGimsey and Hester 1977) was an early attempt to do so on a national basis, and it remains a classic. An extensive review of CRM archaeology in Alaska was completed in 1985, under the sponsorship of the Society of American Archaeology (Workman 1985). It resulted from one of a series of 10 regional conferences

intended to update the Airlie House Report and involved the active participation of a wide range of archaeologists working in Alaska. This paper examines how cultural resource management has grown and developed in Alaska since passage of the NHPA, with emphasis on significant CRM projects, noteworthy trends, and a history of employment in both the public and private sectors. The paper concludes with a brief discussion of the contributions of CRM to Alaska archaeology over the past four decades.

### **A SELECTIVE REVIEW OF CRM PROJECTS IN ALASKA**

Although passage of the NHPA in 1966 represents a watershed in the growth of CRM archaeology as we know it today, there were projects in Alaska before this date that are properly considered to be done in a CRM context. The first of these was the survey conducted by Frederick Hadleigh West in 1959 and 1960 in the Cape Thompson area in northwest Alaska (Wilimovsky and Wolfe 1966). This work was conducted as part of a massive project to analyze potential impacts of Project Chariot, a plan to excavate a deep-water port using nuclear explosives. West completed another CRM survey in 1963 and 1964 in the impact area of a proposed dam in the Rampart area of the Yukon River (West 1965).

In 1969 or 1970, Frederick Hadleigh West of Alaska Methodist University and Bob Lund, a recreation specialist at the Anchorage office of the Bureau of Land Management, began a cooperative effort to compile information on known prehistoric and historic sites throughout the state. Originally named the Alaska Archaeological Index and consisting primarily of information gleaned from existing literature, these data were turned over to the state in 1970 and became the precursor to today's Alaska Heritage Resources Survey (Alaska Division of Parks 1974:3; William S. Hanable 2006, written communication).

An important development in 1973 was the founding of the Cooperative Park Studies Unit (CPSU) at the University of Alaska in Fairbanks. The Anthropology and Historic Preservation section, under Zorro Bradley, was funded by the National Park Service but filled positions through the university. The CPSU accomplished several significant cultural resource management projects. The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 allowed Native regional corporations to acquire cemetery and historic sites based on criteria that are very similar to those for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places.

CPSU staff completed extensive research in Alaska Native communities to identify cemetery and historic sites and also conducted archaeological field examination and verification of eligible selected sites, thereby playing a significant role in determining ownership of a large number of historic sites throughout the state (Bruce Ream, written communication).

Over the 10-year life of the CPSU, it established a record for publication that could serve as an example for all of us. A quick scan of the holdings at the Rasmusen Library results in a list of approximately 35 publications on the subjects of history, archaeology, subsistence, and traditional land use. An exhaustive listing of these publications is beyond this article, but in terms of utility for cultural resource management the various regional compilations of traditional land use sites based on interviews with informants deserve mention. Andrews (1977) and Koutsky (1981–1982) are good examples of such reports, covering the Doyon and Bering Straits regions, respectively.

Several large archaeological projects followed passage of the National Historic Preservation Act. The largest of these was done in support of construction of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System (TAPS). Archaeological work on the northern portion of the line, where almost all of the archaeological sites were located, was directed by John Cook of the University of Alaska Fairbanks, while the southern portion of the work was directed by William Workman, then at Alaska Methodist University. The TAPS project began in 1969 and lasted until 1976, and in terms of the number of sites involved, the number of people employed, and the geographical extent of the project, a similar project is unlikely to occur again. Unfortunately, portions of the project remain unreported to this day, and the reports that were completed were distributed on a limited basis (Cook 1971, 1977; Workman 1976). Also, the technology available at the time for determining and recording location was limited, so some confusion still exists about exact site locations. Despite these shortcomings, the TAPS reports include information about some of the initial excavations done in the area covered, as well as descriptions of sites identified along the pipeline corridor. Anyone who reads these reports will encounter many archaeologists who are still active in the state today.

About the same time, between 1968 and 1971, as a result of the planned testing of nuclear devices on Amchitka Island in the western Aleutian Islands, an extensive program of survey and excavation resulted in the identification of 77 sites, followed by extensive excavations and

collecting from about a third of these (Cook, Dixon, and Holmes 1972; Desautels et al. 1971). It remains the largest such project from the Aleutians Islands (Deborah Corbett 2006, written communication).

The University of Alaska Museum undertook a large-scale cultural resources project between 1979 and 1985 as part of feasibility studies for proposed hydroelectric development on the Susitna River. Under the direction of E. James Dixon and George Smith, archaeological crews surveyed 182 locales in the project area and recorded 248 sites along the remote Middle Susitna River. Besides greatly increasing cultural resources documentation in a little-known region of the state, the project also succeeded in constructing a regional stratigraphic chronology based on tephra. The chronology included the American Paleoarctic tradition, Northern Archaic, Late Denali complex, and Athapaskan tradition, as well as historic Euro-American sites (Dixon et al. 1985; Becky Saleeby 2007, written communication).

The *Exxon Valdez* oil spill in 1989 was another major event affecting cultural resource management in Alaska. Over 2,090 km of coastline from Prince William Sound to the central Alaska Peninsula were contaminated with crude oil. Emergency response and cleanup activities resulted in the identification of over 350 new sites, providing new information on the prehistory of the area. In addition this activity resulted in the implementation of new techniques for outreach and training that could be useful as mitigation measures to protect archaeological sites should similar incidents occur in the future. One important result of the oil spill was that a grant from the oil spill trustees was instrumental in establishing the Alutiiq Museum in Kodiak (Alutiiq Museum 2006; see Steffian and Saltonstall, this volume).

### **ALASKA'S STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICERS**

The first thing most states did after passage of the NHPA in 1966 was to appoint a state historic preservation officer (SHPO), to satisfy one of the provisions of the act. Alaska was no different, although in the early years the designated SHPO was not a preservation specialist and was not called the state historic preservation officer. The first person to serve in this capacity was Theodore G. Smith, who was appointed to the position of state liaison officer for historic preservation (SLOHP) by Governor Hickel in 1967. At that time Smith was chief of the Parks and Recreation

Section in the Division of Lands. The first historic preservation staff was added to the section in 1970 when William S. Hanable was hired as historian. That year saw the first nominations to the National Register from Alaska, including the Eagle Historic District, Chief Shakes House, Fort Abercrombie State Park, and Totem Bight State Park (William S. Hanable 2006, written communication).

Sometime between 1971 and 1973, the title of state liaison officer for historic preservation changed to the current state historic preservation officer (SHPO) with Theodore Smith continuing to hold the position (William S. Hanable 2006, written communication). Late in 1973 a new Office of Statewide Cultural Programs was established within the Division of Parks, and Hanable was appointed chief of the office and deputy SHPO.

In 1974, Smith resigned and was replaced as SHPO by William Sacheck, the state forester, who briefly headed a combined Division of Parks and Forests (Bacon 1975:2; William S. Hanable 2006, written communication). This new division lasted for only about a year, and when Parks and Forestry were again separated, Russell W. Cahill was appointed head of the Division of Parks and SHPO. In 1976 when Cahill resigned, William Hanable, then head of the Alaska Office of History and Archaeology (OHA), was appointed as SHPO. This marks the first time an individual with training in one of the historic preservation disciplines served as SHPO, and it set the pattern for all subsequent appointees being head of the Office of History and Archaeology (William S. Hanable 2006, written communication).

In 1980, Hanable left the Office of History and Archaeology and was succeeded as SHPO by Robert Shaw, who served in that capacity for about one and one-half years. Shaw was followed by Ty Dilliplane, who was appointed to the position in early 1982 by Governor Jay Hammond. Dilliplane filled the position until April 1984 and was replaced by Judith Bittner, the current SHPO (Ty Dilliplane 2005, personal communication).

### **GROWTH OF CRM POSITIONS**

The most significant effect the NHPA has had on archaeology in Alaska is in the number of new full-time jobs created for archaeologists. Quantifying the increase in jobs is not as straightforward as it might appear. Some interpretation is required in determining what is full-time, what is a CRM position, and even what might qualify as positions for archaeologists. Agency archaeologists often have re-

sponsibilities outside of traditional CRM, and some are employed in positions with titles such as “cultural resource manager” or “natural resource specialist.” These problems increase when trying to estimate full-time positions in the private sector.

Table 1 shows the number of CRM positions for archaeologists in Alaska at three different times during the period between 1973 and 2003. The year 1973 represents a logical starting point because that is the year in which the first archaeologist was hired by any state or federal agency. The numbers for 1984 are derived from Workman (1985:48–56). Those for 2003 are simply the result of this author polling individuals in the various agencies in an informal fashion. There seems little doubt about the general import of the table: during a period when the number of positions in traditional academic settings has remained in single digits, the number of CRM positions has grown to include at least several dozen.

A cautionary note seems justified at this point. Although growth is clearly evident in the number of full-time positions in the state, this is only part of the picture. Without an intensive survey of all agencies in Alaska, it is not possible to determine exactly how programs have grown, but changes in the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) since the mid-1980s may be instructive. In 1984 the agency had the same number of full-time positions as

it did in 1973, but these positions were described in part as follows:

In the Fairbanks District Office 13 working months a year are funded for all cultural activities. This time must be divided among four archaeologists, with the rest of their time taken up with unrelated activities such as realty cases, input to general planning documents, navigability studies and the like. (Workman 1985:49)

In 2003 there were still four archaeologists, but the number of working months funded from the cultural resource program had grown by nearly 50 percent, despite significant inflation in the level of salaries. Funding for operations for cultural resource work had also grown, leading to an increased capability in excess of what might be expected from just comparing the number of full-time positions. BLM and other agencies also make extensive use of temporary positions to provide personnel for work on a short-term basis, and that capability is not represented in a count of full-time positions. Taking BLM as representative, there appears to have been significant growth in funding levels for cultural programs for federal agencies in Alaska over the past two decades.

#### TIMELINE OF CRM POSITIONS

It is beyond the scope of this paper to try to describe in detail the history of the growth of CRM positions throughout Alaska. However, a sequence of when each state or federal agency began employing full-time archaeologists can be reconstructed, and from this a sketchy picture of the development of CRM archaeology in Alaska over four decades emerges.

The first permanent position for an archaeologist in a state or federal agency with responsibilities for cultural resource management was filled in 1972 when the Division of Parks hired Karen Workman. The position was supposed to be designated as the state archaeologist, but Workman, growing impatient with state government’s unwillingness to confer the title, simply took it upon herself and went about her job – thereby demonstrating a firm grasp of the principle that it is often easier to obtain forgiveness than it is to get permission (Karen Workman 2003, personal communication).

In 1974, federal agencies hired their first archaeologists when Douglas Reger went to work as the regional archaeologist for the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management hired Gary Matlock as the first state office

*Table 1. Estimated growth of full-time CRM positions, 1973–2003.*

|                                   | 1973 | 1984 | 2003 |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|------|
| Air Force                         | 0    | 0    | 1    |
| Army                              | 0    | 0    | 3    |
| Bureau of Indian Affairs          | 0    | 2    | 7    |
| Bureau of Land Management         | 0    | 7    | 7    |
| Corps of Engineers                | 0    | 1    | 2    |
| Fish and Wildlife Service         | 0    | 1    | 2    |
| National Forest Service           | 0    | 5    | 12   |
| National Park Service             | 0    | 4    | 11   |
| Office of History and Archaeology | 1    | 6    | 7    |
| Alaska DOT-PF                     | 0    | 1    | 0    |
| Total government positions:       | 1    | 27   | 52   |
| Private consultants               | 0    | 5    | 8    |
| Native corporations               | 0    | 0    | 3    |
| Total private sector:             | 0    | 5    | 11   |
| Total CRM Positions:              | 1    | 32   | 63   |

archaeologist.<sup>1</sup> Reger worked for the Forest Service from February 1974 to May 1975, then left to take the state archaeologist job that had been vacated by Karen Workman. Gerald Clark replaced him as the Forest Service regional archaeologist after about a year. Matlock worked for BLM for not more than two years, then transferred to Colorado shortly after his wife died in an airplane accident late in 1975 (Herrick Hanks 2003, written communication; Ray Leicht 2003, written communication; Curtis Wilson 2003, written communication). Ray Leicht replaced Matlock in May of 1976. Sometime in 1975, the BLM began filling positions at the district level.

In 1976, the Fish and Wildlife Service hired their first archaeologist in Alaska when Curtis Wilson filled the regional archaeologist position in Anchorage. Shortly thereafter, the service hired Michael Yarborough to work for Wilson and for a brief period also employed Robert Shaw as an archaeologist on what was then called the Clarence Rhodes Refuge, now the Yukon Delta Refuge.

The National Park Service hired their first permanent full-time archaeologist in 1978, when Dick Hsu took the position overseeing the surveys mandated by Section 105(c) of the National Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976. Hsu hired the foursome of Craig Davis, Dana Linck, Kenneth Schoenberg, and Harvey Shields. Following completion of the NPR-A project, Hsu left Alaska for other employment and was replaced by Davis (Kenneth Schoenberg 2003, written communication).

In 1979 or 1980, the Corps of Engineers hired its first full-time archaeologist, Julia Steele, and in 1980 the last of the Department of the Interior agencies hired its first archaeologist when the Bureau of Indian Affairs hired Robert Waldman.

In 1999, the first archaeologist was employed by one of the service branches other than the Corps of Engineers when the U.S. Air Force hired Karlene Leeper. The Army in Alaska followed suit in 2001, when Russell Sackett moved from the Office of History and Archaeology to become the first cultural resource manager for Alaska's large military bases.

In summary, the state was the first to hire an archaeologist, and then the major land-managing agencies hired their first archaeologists in the mid- to late-1970s, followed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers in the early 1980s and the military branches in the late 1990s. This sequence of initial hires reflects,

in general, the order in which various agencies developed CRM programs.

Two sets of historical circumstances may help explain this progression. First, Section 106 of the NHPA requires that federal agencies consult with the SHPO before any undertakings that may affect significant cultural resources, including historic and prehistoric remains. This imposed an early burden on the state and on major multiple-use agencies to develop cultural resource expertise in order to conduct routine daily business. Agencies with narrower mandates were slower to hire archaeologists. Second, the sequence of first hires may simply be the result of the history of public land management in Alaska. Before passage of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) in 1980, almost all public lands in Alaska were managed by the state, the U.S. Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management, which were the first agencies to hire archaeologists.

#### TRENDS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRM IN ALASKA

A few trends are apparent in the growth of CRM in Alaska since 1966. Two that seem particularly important are changes in the personnel conducting CRM projects and changes in attitudes toward CRM, from both within and outside the discipline. During the first part of the period, from 1966 to about 1979, university-based researchers played the central role in CRM, perhaps because they were essentially the only source of the necessary expertise. Federal agencies only began to hire CRM staff in the mid-1970s, and there were few private consultants active in Alaska until about this same time. The two-volume report produced by the Iroquois Research Institute under contract to the Federal Power Commission (Humphrey et al. 1975) is an example of work done during the early years by a consultant based outside of the state. Early work done by in-state private consultants includes that done by Linda Yarborough in 1975 (2007, personal communication) and the work of Alaskarctic (Bacon 1978; Bacon and Holmes 1980).

More typical of archaeological work done during this period are projects completed by individuals or groups associated with institutions of higher learning, such as the TAPS project, intensive survey of the area around Fort Egbert done by Shinkwin et al. (1978), survey along the

---

1. There is some uncertainty as to exactly when Matlock was hired. It could have been as early as late 1973 or as late as early 1975.

route of the proposed natural gas line completed by Aigner and Shinkwin (1978), and Edwin S. Hall's surveys for the U.S. Geological Survey on the North Slope (1977, 1978).

A second period of CRM work in Alaska (roughly 1980 to 1993) can be characterized as being done primarily by agency personnel and part-time contractors. Many of the uncertainties about land status that had been typical of earlier times were resolved through passage of ANILCA in 1980, and the major land-managing agencies had by this time hired enough archaeologists to deal with routine work related to Section 106 of the NHPA. Agencies began acquiring baseline inventory data as required by Section 110 of the act. The National Park Service in particular completed several major inventory projects (Griffin and Chesmore 1988; McClenahan and Gibson 1990; Kunz 1991; Schaaf 1988). Other agencies completed smaller-scale projects (Smith 1983; Will 1986). A few intensive excavation projects were also completed by federal land managing agencies during this period. Probably the most sustained effort was by the National Park Service in southeast Alaska (Blee 1988; Blee et al. 1986; Rhodes 1988; Spude et al. 1993), but other significant projects were also completed during this period (Davis 1989; Schoenberg 1985; Wilson 1991).

During the middle period, universities all but ceased operating as CRM contractors in Alaska, perhaps in part because of issues relating to public institutions competing with private consultants. In the private sector a few contractors were beginning to find steady if not full-time work. Ed Hall and Jack Lobdell are examples of academicians who incorporated private consulting firms and worked extensively as CRM consultants during this period (Hall 1977; 1978, 1980, 1982, 1983, 1988; Lobdell 1979, 1980, 1981).

The final period—roughly 1994 to the present—involved continued activity by agency personnel, growing opportunities for private consulting by individuals, and development of Alaska's first full-time cultural resource management firms. Agency budgets had generally grown from the levels in the earlier periods and Section 106 compliance had become more routine, allowing agencies to expand their efforts into other kinds of work. Inventory projects continued to be completed by agencies (Crowell and Mann 1998; Saleeby 2000; Smith and Vreeman 1995; VanderHoek and Myron 2004) and several more intensive investigations were also completed (Cooper 2001; DePuydt et al. 1997; Kardatzke 2002; Kunz 2003; Späth et al. 2000).

Several individuals continue to work as private consultants. Notable examples include Michael Yarbrough, Robert Shaw, Douglas Reger, Charles Mobley, and Chris Wooley. Northern Land Use Research of Fairbanks was established in 1991 and has continued since then with a small full-time staff, providing another source of employment and an indication of the growth of CRM consulting as an industry in Alaska.

One significant development in recent years has been the reemergence of universities as active participants in CRM archaeology in Alaska. For the past several years the Center for Environmental Management of Military Lands at Colorado State University, under contract to the Army, has conducted extensive inventory work on bases in Alaska, resulting in a significant increase in the number of known sites (Hedman et al. 2003; Raymond-Yakoubian 2006; Raymond-Yakoubian and Robertson 2005; Robertson et al. 2004).

Attitudes toward CRM have changed over the past 40 years. While much depends on individual managers and specific agencies, there has been a general trend from outright hostility to benign neglect to a time when many agency managers support and encourage the goals of CRM. During the initial years after passage of the NHPA, agency CRM personnel had to concentrate almost exclusively on Section 106 compliance, and agency managers often saw the requirements of the law as unnecessarily restrictive. Determinations of eligibility, because they required consultation outside of the agency, were often a source of conflict between CRM staff and managers. While such disagreements have not entirely disappeared, compliance with Section 106 has, by and large, become far more routine. As a consequence, many agencies have moved beyond Section 106 to more proactive management of cultural resources.

Attitudes have changed within the discipline as well. While it is difficult to measure attitudes without some form of broad survey, one indication of changing attitudes about CRM can be seen in the inclusion of CRM courses in the standard curriculum of the University of Alaska. For many years the university displayed a marked reluctance to teach CRM. There were scattered and sporadic attempts to present courses on the subject beginning in the early 1970s, but only since the late 1990s have such courses been incorporated as a standard part of the curriculum of anthropology departments. The University of Alaska Fairbanks began offering a CRM course in 1999, and the University of Alaska Anchorage now offers a master's degree with a concentration in CRM.

## CONTRIBUTIONS OF CRM

Granted that most archaeologists in Alaska are employed in positions that are CRM-related and that CRM has become an accepted part of the discipline, it is fair and even essential to ask if the work accomplished in CRM contexts has resulted in a significant contribution to the advancement of knowledge about Alaska's history and prehistory. There are at least three areas in which this has been the case.

First, work done primarily for CRM purposes has added significantly to the database of known sites. In 1975, when federal agencies had just begun to hire archaeologists in any numbers in Alaska, the Alaska Heritage Resources Survey (AHRS) database contained slightly more than 4,000 entries (Bacon 1975:8). Thirty years later, the total number of entries in the database had grown to well over 30,000. While it is not possible to precisely divide this growth into CRM and non-CRM sources, almost all of the work producing this information was generated directly or indirectly for CRM purposes. This growth in the number of known sites is hardly surprising, given that one of the major charges for federal agencies is to inventory their lands to determine what cultural resources are present. Over the past three decades, baseline inventories of federal lands have become common, in addition to the work done to comply with Section 106 of the NHPA. Sometimes these inventories are large, multiyear projects such as the work done in the National Petroleum Reserve in the late 1970s (Davis et al. 1981), the numerous surveys completed for different units of the national park system (Crowell and Mann 1998; Kunz 1991; Schaaf 1988), or the recent inventories of army lands (Hedman et al. 2003; Raymond-Yakoubian 2006; Raymond-Yakoubian and Robertson 2005; Robertson et al. 2004). More modest efforts have also contributed (Smith 1983; Smith and Vreeman 1995; Will 1986), and there is also a constant trickle of new sites being added to the database from unpublished inventory efforts done to comply with Section 106 of the NHPA.

While additions to the AHRS database represent a significant contribution to Alaskan archaeology, there are two characteristics of the data that seriously detract from its utility for research purposes. The first of these seems to be prevalent in CRM work in general and results from the frequently poor level of publication. Many CRM reports are published in very limited numbers or not at all. Work done for compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA in particular may be documented only by memoranda in agency

files or as part of annual reports submitted to the SHPO. Identifying and accessing such material can be difficult or impossible for a researcher trying to obtain more information than is available in the basic AHRS records. The last comprehensive attempt to organize Alaska's CRM gray literature was the West and Stern bibliography (1987), now twenty years out of date. Current plans for upgrading the AHRS include development of a citations database that should help with this problem (David McMahan 2007, written communication).

A second limiting characteristic of site data from CRM work in Alaska is the lack of a consistent and comprehensive method for capturing negative information. The AHRS contains information on site locations, but without reliable data on areas where inventory has been completed but no sites have been located, the utility of the AHRS for statistical analyses of site distribution is severely diminished. Historically Alaska has presented problems in gathering accurate locations, including a near total lack of survey monuments and other cultural features, holes in the coverage of large-scale maps, and terrain that is nearly featureless or covered with dense forest. The availability of inexpensive hand-held global positioning system receivers shows considerable promise for collecting accurate site locations in Alaska. This technology has also been used to gather data describing survey areas or transects, but we currently lack any statewide repository for such information. Other states have incorporated negative information into their statewide databases, and perhaps what has been done elsewhere can serve as a model for long-term expansion of the AHRS.

A second major contribution of CRM relates to the increase in work in historical archaeology in the past two decades. Despite the commendable efforts of the National Park Service in southeast Alaska, one of the problems of CRM archaeology identified by Workman (1985:85) was that "deficiencies are noted in the amount of effort expended on historical archaeology in Alaska." This situation has improved since then, often because federal agencies in several parts of the state have had to deal with a resource base that includes a high proportion of historic materials and because circumstances since the mid-1980s have forced agencies to deal more thoroughly with the impacts of placer mining, which often has potential to impact historic resources (Bowers 1998; Saleeby 2000; Smith 1996).

Finally, there is the question of the extent to which CRM archaeology has produced significant new research that adds to an understanding of regional history and

prehistory. A frequent charge made about CRM work is that it fails to achieve its full research potential. This is true more often than might be desirable. Intensive research *per se* is not one of the primary tasks with which federal land-managing agencies are charged, and in the constant press of compliance work and baseline inventory it can often be difficult to sustain the kind of long-term support necessary to complete significant research. Nevertheless, agencies have managed to complete projects that have made significant contributions. Sometimes this occurred when an individual had a vested interest in completing a major report and the opportunity to do so in an extra-agency context, such as when agency-sponsored work has been used as the basis for a doctoral dissertation (Schoenberg 1985; Wilson 1991). In other cases significant research has simply been completed in a CRM context (Davis 1989; Kunz 2003; Kunz and Reanier 1994).

### CONCLUSIONS

In the 40 years since the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act, the growth of cultural resource management has had a profound impact on the field of archaeology in Alaska. Archaeology has grown from a few academic researchers at a handful of universities to a discipline overwhelmingly represented by individuals working for various state and federal agencies and as private consultants. As a result of this transformation, the nature of archaeological projects has changed from almost exclusively research-oriented to address a range of management concerns. State and federal agencies now routinely include prehistoric and historic resources as part of their mandates, often funding archaeological research and publication. Our knowledge of the resource base has grown accordingly, both in terms of the sheer numbers of known sites and in the nature of sites being investigated. Without the development of CRM, much of the archaeological work completed in Alaska in the last 40 years would not have occurred.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As trite as it may be to say, it is nevertheless quite true that this article would not have been possible without the assistance of many individuals. William Hanable and Ty Dilliplane provided useful information about the history of Alaska's state historic preservation officers. Becky Saleeby contributed information on the Susitna Hydroelectric Project and on activities of the National Park Service.

Debbie Corbett supplied information on projects in the southern part of the state and also many useful review comments. To these individuals and the numerous other friends and colleagues who were willing to discuss our recent past: Thank you.

### REFERENCES

- Aigner, Jean S., and Anne D. Shinkwin  
 1978 1978 Archaeological Survey of Selected Portions of the Gas Pipeline Alignment from Delta Junction to the Yukon Border. Preliminary Report to Northwest Alaska Pipeline Co. Institute of Arctic Biology, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks.
- Alaska Division of Parks  
 1974 Alaska Heritage Resource Survey Index. Miscellaneous Publications, History and Archaeology Series No. 3. Manuscript on file, Office of History and Archaeology, State of Alaska Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation, Department of Natural Resources, Anchorage.
- Alutiiq Museum  
 2006 Alutiiq Museum and Archaeological Repository. <http://www.alutiiqmuseum.com/>
- Andrews, Elizabeth F.  
 1977 *Report on the Cultural Resources of the Doyon Region, Central Alaska*. Occasional Paper No. 5 (2 vols.), Anthropology and Historic Preservation, Cooperative Park Studies Unit, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks.
- Bacon, Glenn  
 1975 The Impact of Recent Federal Legislation on Historic Preservation Efforts in Alaska. Paper presented at the 2nd Annual Meeting, Alaska Anthropological Association, Fairbanks. Ms. on file, Office of History and Archaeology, State of Alaska Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation, Department of Natural Resources, Anchorage.
- 1978 Archeology in the Upper Susitna River Basin, 1978. Report prepared for the Alaska District, Corps of Engineers by Alaskarctic. U.S. Corps of Engineers, Alaska District, Anchorage.
- Bacon, Glenn, and Charles Holmes  
 1980 Archeological Survey and Inventory of Cultural Resources at Fort Greely, Alaska, 1979. Report prepared for the U.S. Corps of Engineers by Alaskarctic. U.S. Corps of Engineers, Alaska District, Anchorage.

- Blee, Catherine Holder  
1988 *Archeological Investigations in Skagway, Alaska, Volume 2: The Moore Cabin and House, Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park*. National Park Service, Denver.
- Blee, Catherine Holder, Marianne Musitelli, Linda J. Scott, D. Kate Aasen and Stephen A. Chomko  
1986 *Wine, Yaman and Stone: The Archeology of a Russian Hospital Trash Pit, Sitka National Historic Park, Sitka, Alaska*. National Park Service, Denver.
- Bowers, Peter M., and Brian Gannon (Compilers)  
1998 Historical Development of the Chena River Waterfront, Fairbanks, Alaska: An Archaeological Perspective. Report prepared for the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities. CD-ROM. Northern Land Use Research, Inc., Fairbanks.
- Cook, John P. (Editor)  
1971 Final Report of the Archaeological Survey and Excavations along the Alyeska Pipeline Service Company Pipeline Route. Department of Anthropology, University of Alaska Fairbanks.  
1977 Archaeological Investigations along the Trans-Alaska Pipeline. Institute of Arctic Biology, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks.
- Cook, John P., E. James Dixon, and Charles E. Holmes  
1972 Archaeological Site Report, Site 49 RAT 32, Amchitka Island, Alaska. Atomic Energy Commission contract AT(29-2)-20. University of Alaska, prepared for Holmes and Narver, Inc., Las Vegas.
- Cooper, Doreen C.  
2001 *A Century at the Moore/Kirmse House: Archeological Investigations in Skagway, Alaska, vol. 8*. U.S. Department of the Interior, Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park, Skagway.
- Crowell, Aron L., and Daniel H. Mann  
1998 *Archaeology and Coastal Dynamics of Kenai Fjords National Park, Alaska*. Research/Resources Management Report ARRCR/CRR-98/34. Alaska Support Office, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Anchorage.
- Davis, Stanley D. (Editor)  
1989 The Hidden Falls Site, Baranof Island, Alaska. *Aurora Monograph* No. 5. Alaska Anthropological Association, Anchorage.
- Davis, Craig W., Dana C. Linck, Kenneth M. Schoenberg, and Harvey M. Shields  
1981 *Slogging, Humping and Mucking Through the NPR-A: An Archeological Interlude*. Occasional Paper No. 25, Anthropology and Historic Preservation, Cooperative Park Studies Unit, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks.
- Desautels, Roger J., Albert J. McCurdy, James D. Flynn, and Robert R. Ellis  
1971 Archaeological Report Amchitka Island, Alaska 1969-1970. U.S. Atomic Energy Commission Report TID-25481. Archaeological Research, Inc., Los Angeles.
- DePuydt, Ray, Gwen Hurst, Stephanie Ludwig, and Alfred Cammisa  
1997 *Archaeological Investigations in Skagway, Alaska, Volume 5: Additional Investigations at the Mill Creek Dump and the Peniel Mission*. U.S. Department of the Interior, Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park, Skagway.
- Dixon, E. J., G. Smith, W. Andrefsky, B.M. Saleeby, and C. J. Utermohle  
1985 Susitna Hydroelectric Project: Cultural Resources Investigations 1979-1985 (5 vols.). Alaska Power Authority, Anchorage.
- Griffin, Kristen P., and E. Richard Chesmore  
1988 An Overview and Assessment of Prehistoric Archaeological Resources, Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve, Alaska. Research/Resources Management Report AR-15. National Park Service, Anchorage.
- Hall, Edwin S., Jr.  
1977 Cultural Resource Survey and Clearance in NPR-A, 1977. U.S. Geological Survey, Anchorage.  
1978 Cultural Resource Survey and Clearance: National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska. U.S. Geological Survey, Anchorage.  
1980 Cultural Resource Survey and Clearance: National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, 1980. U.S. Geological Survey, Anchorage.  
1982 A Cultural Resource Site Reconnaissance Performed in Conjunction with Development of the Red Dog Mine, Northwestern Alaska. Technical Memorandum #1. Edwin S. Hall and Associates, Brockport.  
1983 A Cultural Resource Site Reconnaissance Performed in Conjunction with Development of the Red Dog Mine, Northwestern Alaska: Phase

- II. Technical Memorandum #5. Edwin Hall and Associates, Brockport.
- 1988 Test Excavations at NOA-081: Cultural Resource Site Investigations in Association with Development and Operation of the Red Dog Mine, Northwestern Alaska. Technical Memorandum #27. Edwin S. Hall and Associates, Brockport.
- Hedman, Bill, Aaron Robertson, Nancy Fichter, and Kirsten Anderson  
2003 Interim Report: Archaeological Survey and Evaluation Fort Richardson and Fort Wainwright, 2002. Center for Environmental Management of Military Lands, Colorado State University, Fort Collins.
- Humphrey, Robert Lee, Cecil R. Brooks, Camilla D. Luckey, Bernard W. Poirier, George H. Walker, Mary Elizabeth Chambers, Juanita M. Tucker, and Kira Bowman  
1975 A Study of Archaeological and Historic Potential along the Trans-Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Routes. Iroquois Research Institute, Falls Church.
- King, Thomas F.  
2004 *Cultural Resource Laws and Practice: An Introductory Guide*. Second Edition. Altamira Press, Walnut Creek.
- Kardatzke, Tim A.  
2002 *Archeological Investigations in Skagway, Volume 9: Excavations at the Pantheon Saloon Complex*. National Park Service, Anchorage.
- Koutsy, Kathryn  
1981–1982 *Early Days on Norton Sound and Bering Strait: An Overview of Historic Sites in the BSNC Region*. Occasional Paper No. 29 (8 vols.), Anthropology and Historic Preservation, Cooperative Park Studies Unit, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks.
- Kunz, Michael L. (compiler)  
1991 Cultural Resource Survey and Inventory: Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve, Alaska. *Research/Resources Management Report AR-18*. National Park Service, Anchorage.
- Kunz, Michael L.  
2003 The Mesa Site: Paleoindians above the Arctic Circle. *BLM-Alaska Open File Report No. 86*. Alaska State Office, Bureau of Land Management, Anchorage.
- Kunz, Michael L., and Richard E. Reanier  
1994 Paleoindians in Beringia: Evidence from Arctic Alaska. *Science* 263:660–662.
- Lobdell, John E.  
1979 Archaeological reconnaissance of proposed construction localities at Prudhoe Bay, Alaska, for 1979. Atlantic Richfield Oil and Gas Company, Anchorage.
- 1980 Coastal and barrier island archaeological localities in the Beaufort Sea of Alaska, Colville to Staines Rivers. Environmental Conservation Dept., ARCO, Anchorage.
- 1981 The Putuligayuk River Delta overlook site: fragile traces of ancient man at Prudhoe Bay, Beaufort Sea, Alaska. Environmental Conservation Dept., ARCO, Anchorage.
- McClenahan, P. L., and D. E. Gibson  
1990 *Cape Krusenstern National Monument: An Archeological Survey*. Volume 1. *Research/Resources Management Report AR-17*. National Park Service, Anchorage.
- McGimsey, Charles R. III, and Hester A. Davis (Editors)  
1977 *The Management of Archaeological Resources: The Airlie House Report*. Special Publication of the Society for American Archaeology, Washington, D.C.
- Raymond-Yakoubian, Julie  
2006 Archaeological Survey and Evaluation: Fort Richardson and Fort Wainwright, 2005. Center for Environmental Management of Military Lands, Colorado State University, Fort Collins.
- Raymond-Yakoubian, Julie and Aaron Robertson  
2005 Archaeological Survey and Evaluation: Fort Richardson and Fort Wainwright, 2004. Center for Environmental Management of Military Lands, Colorado State University, Fort Collins.
- Rhodes, Diane Lee  
1988 *Archeological Investigations in Skagway, Alaska, Volume 3: The Mill Creek Dump and the Peniel Mission, Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park*. National Park Service, Denver.
- Robertson, Aaron, Nancy Fichter, and Kirsten Anderson  
2004 Annual Report: Archaeological Survey and Evaluation Fort Richardson and Fort Wainwright, 2003. Center for Environmental Management of Military Lands, Colorado State University, Fort Collins.

- Saleeby, Becky M.  
2000 The Quest for Gold: An Overview of the National Park Service Cultural Resources Mining Inventory and Monitoring Program. *Research/Resource Management Report* ARRCR/CRR-2000/37. National Park Service, Anchorage.
- Schaaf, Jeanne  
1988 *Bering Land Bridge National Preserve: An Archeological Survey*. Research/Resources Management Report AR-14. National Park Service, Anchorage.
- Schoenberg, Kenneth M.  
1985 The Archaeology of Kurupa Lake. *Research/ Resources Management Report* AR-10. National Park Service, Anchorage.
- Shinkwin, Anne D., Elizabeth Andrews, Russell H. Sackett, and Mary V. Kroul  
1978 *Fort Egbert and the Eagle Historic District: Results of Archaeological and Historic Research, Summer 1977*. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Fairbanks.
- Smith, Howard L.  
1983 Mineral Exploration and Cultural Resources in the De Long Mountains, Northwest Alaska. *Contract Abstracts and CRM Archaeology* 3(2):119–123.  
1996 BLM Projects in Mining History and Historic Archaeology in Northern Alaska. Paper presented at the 23<sup>rd</sup> annual meeting, Alaska Anthropological Association, Fairbanks.
- Smith, Howard L., and Janet Vreeman  
1995 *Cultural Resource Inventory in the Bendeleben and Darby Mountains, Seward Peninsula, Alaska*. BLM-Alaska Open File Report 57. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Anchorage.
- Späth, Carl, Kurt P. Schweiger, and Robin O. Mills, with contributions by David R. Huelsbeck, Linda Scott Cummings, and Thomas S. Moutoux  
2000 *Archaeological Investigations in Skagway, Alaska, Volume 7: Block 37, Lot 1, Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park, Alaska*. U.S. Department of the Interior, Klondike Gold Rush Historical Park, Skagway.
- Spude, Catherine Holder, Douglas D. Scott, Frank Norris, David R. Hulesbeck, Linda Scott Cummings, and Kathryn Puseman  
1993 Father Turnell's Trash Pit, Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park. *Archeological Investigations in Skagway, Alaska, Volume 4*. National Park Service, Denver.
- VanderHoek, R., and R. Myron  
2004 Cultural Remains From a Catastrophic Landscape. National Park Service, Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve. *Research/Resources Management Report* AR/CRR-2004-47.
- West, C. Eugene, and Richard O. Stern  
1987 *Bibliography and Index of Alaskan Archeology. Aurora Monograph No. 3*. Alaska Anthropological Association, Anchorage.
- West, Frederick Hadleigh  
1965 Archaeological Survey and Excavations in the Proposed Rampart Dam Impoundment, 1963–1964. Report of contract between the University of Alaska and the National Park Service. University of Alaska, Fairbanks.
- Wilimovsky, Norman J., and John N. Wolfe (Editors)  
1966 *Environment of the Cape Thompson Region, Alaska*. U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Division of Technical Information. Reprinted by the Technical Information Center, Energy Research and Development Administration, Oakridge, TN.
- Will, Susan M.  
1986 Beaver Creek National Wild River Cultural Resources Inventory. *Open File Report 19*. Bureau of Land Management, Anchorage.
- Wilson, Curtis James  
1991 An Indigenous Nineteenth-Century Settlement/ Subsistence System in the Area of Demarcation Bay, Alaska. Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York, Binghamton.
- Workman, William B.  
1976 Archeological Investigations at GUL 077: A Prehistoric Site near Gulkana, Alaska. Manuscript on file at the Office of History and Archaeology, State of Alaska Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation, Department of Natural Resources, Anchorage.
- Workman, William B. (compiler)  
1985 Cultural Resource Management Archeology in Alaska: Current Status and Future Prospects. *Alaska Historical Commission Studies in History* No. 148.

