

*Preservation Technology and Training Board  
Annual Report  
1994-1995*

*Table of Contents*

Establishment of the Center

Legislative Background

Preservation Technology and Training Board Appointments

Center Program Development and Activities

April 1994 Symposium

FY'94 Grant Program

Staff Appointments

Staff Activities

FY'95 Grant Program

Board Meetings and Five-Year Plan

Appendices

Appendix A: Preservation Technology and Training Board Charter

Appendix B: April 1994 Symposium--Summary of Recommendations

## *Establishment of the Center*

### Legislative Background

In 1992 the National Historic Preservation Act was amended to include Title IV, calling for the establishment of a National Center for Preservation Technology and Training. The revised Act stated that "given the complexity of technical problems encountered in preserving historic properties and the lack of adequate distribution of technical information to preserve such properties, a national initiative to coordinate and promote research, distribute information, and provide training about preservation skills and technologies" was needed.

## *Appointment of Board Members*

By February 1993 twelve board members were appointed by the Secretary of the Interior including the Secretary's designee, six representatives of Federal State and local agencies, state and local historic preservation commissions and other public and international organizations; and six individuals recognized for their outstanding qualifications in the fields of archaeology, architecture, conservation, curation, engineering, history, historic preservation, landscape architecture, planning, or preservation education. With a ratified Board Charter (Appendix A), the first Board Members appointed were:

Dr. Neville Agnew  
*Associate Director, Programs*  
*The Getty Conservation Institute*

Mr. Nicholas Gianopolis  
*Chairman*  
*Keast & Hood Company, Structural Engineers*

Dr. Jon Gibson  
*Director, Center for Archeological Studies*  
*University of Southwestern Louisiana*  
*(resigned from the Board 10/95)*

Dr. Alferdteen B. Harrison  
*Director*  
*Margaret Walker Alexander National Research Center*  
*Jackson State University*

Dr. James K. Huhta  
*Director, The Center for Historic Preservation*  
*Middle Tennessee State University*

Dr. W. James Judge  
*Professor, Department of Anthropology*  
*Fort Lewis College*

E. Blaine Cliver, Chief  
*Preservation Assistance Division*  
*National Park Service*  
*Secretary of the Interior's Designate*

Dr. Elizabeth A. Lyon  
*Former Chief, Office of Historic Preservation*  
*Georgia Department of Natural Resources*

Mr. Robert Z. Melnick, ASLA  
*Head, Department of Landscape Architecture*  
*University of Oregon*

Mr. F. Blair Reeves, FAIA  
*Professor of Architecture, Retired*  
*University of Florida*

Ms. Carolyn L. Rose  
*Senior Research Conservator*  
*National Museum of Natural History*

Mr. Frank Emile Sanchis, III  
*Vice President, Stewardship of Historic Properties*  
*National Trust for Historic Preservation*

Dr. Patty Jo Watson  
*Chair, Department of Anthropology*  
*Washington University*  
*(stepped down from the Board 11/95)*

*Note: In November 1995 Christy Johnson McAvoy*  
*Principal, Historic Resources Group, was appointed*  
*to the Board and another Board appointment is pending.*

## *Center Program Development and Activities*

### *April 1994 Symposium*

In conjunction with the first meeting of the Preservation Technology and Training Board in April 1994, a symposium was convened by the National Park Service to bring together representatives of national preservation and conservation organizations so that they might provide advice to the Center on the field's preservation/conservation research, education/training, and information management needs.

A summary of the symposium discussions [Appendix B] includes specific research, training, and information management recommendations by professionals in the field. It also highlights the group's consensus definition of preservation technology:

Preservation Technology refers broadly to any equipment, methods, and techniques that can be applied to the discovery; analysis; interpretation; restoration; conservation; protection; and management of cultural property, including prehistoric and historic sites, structures, objects and landscapes.

### *1994 and 1995 Preservation Technology and Training Grants*

The first round of Preservation Technology and Training Grants was awarded in September 1994. Fifteen grants totaling \$479,965 were awarded to private organizations, state and federal agencies and academic and international institutions to support research and training projects. The disciplines within the field that were served include archeology, history, museum conservation, historic landscapes, and historic architecture. A brief description of each project, the audience served and the products is provided below.

#### **Research '94:**

	Recipient Organization	Project Description	Location of Project Work	Discipline Served	Amount Awarded
1.	Center for Advanced Spatial Technologies, University of Arkansas	Developing a low-cost photogrammetric data archival system	Arkansas with national impact	Archeology	\$37,428.00
2.	Conservation Analytical Laboratory, Smithsonian Institution	Developing guidelines for allowable temperature fluctuations in museums and historic properties	Washington, DC with national impact	Materials Conservation	\$38,998.00

3.	Inspired Partnerships	Investigating the effectiveness of protective glazing for historic stained glass windows	Illinois and throughout the U.S.	Materials Conservation	\$34,320.00
4.	Conservation Analytical Laboratory, Smithsonian Institution	Developing efficient techniques for analyzing blood residues on tools from archeological sites	Washington, DC with national impact	Archeology	\$36,524.00
5.	The Arnold Arboretum, Harvard University	Developing methods and technologies for preserving woody plants in historic landscapes	Massachusetts with a national impact	Historic Landscapes	\$40,000.00
6.	New York State Office of Parks and Recreation and Historic Preservation	Investigating improvements of existing heating and air conditioning systems in historic structures	New York with a national impact	Historic Architecture	\$40,000.00
7.	Historic Preservation Commission, City of Monterey	Investigating the preservation of historic carved sandstone buildings in marine environments	California with a national impact	Historic Architecture and Materials Conservation	\$31,925.00
8.	National Council for Preservation Education	Developing a database for the study of 20th century building materials	Throughout the U.S.	Historic Architecture	\$40,000.00
9.	Vermont Division for Historic Preservation	Testing the energy performance of historic wood windows in cold climates	Vermont with national impact	Historic Architecture	\$40,000.00

**Training '94:**

	Recipient Organization	Project Description	Location of Project Work	Discipline Served	Amount Awarded
1.	Arizona Archeological Commission	Conducting a <i>Native Americans and Archeology</i> workshop	Hopi Nation with a regional impact	Archeology	\$ 6,470.00
2.	Society for American Archaeology in cooperation with the National Park Service Archeological Assistance Division	Conducting workshops for methods of archeological site discovery and evaluation	Throughout the U.S.	Archeology	\$27,600.00
3.	American Society of Landscape Architects	Creataing a training video on preserving historic landscapes: <i>America's Landscape Legacy</i>	Throughout the U.S.	Historic Landscapes	\$20,000.00
4.	Bureau of Land Management Department of the Interior	Designing an interactive multimedia training program for advanced mapping technologies	Arizona with a national impact	Archeology	\$40,000.00
5.	American Public Works Association	Developing a survey, teleconference and training manual on preserving historic public works projects	Throughout the U.S.	Historic Architecture/Engineering	\$39,200.00
6.	US Committee on International Council on Monuments and Sites	Editing the proceedings of The Uses of Garden Archaeology conference held in London, England in summer 1995	London, England and Washington, DC with national impact	Historic Landscapes and Archeology	\$ 7,500.00

In addition, the Center undertook cooperative agreements with several organizations to initiate specialized research and training projects that compliment the mission of the newly-formed organization. Among

these were agreements with Northwestern State University of Louisiana to establish an Internet gopher site at the Center which would allow the Center to build a network of access for practitioners to receive preservation information electronically; and to undertake archeological and oral history studies in two Louisiana regions. Agreements were also undertaken with: the U.S. Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites to prepare a report on U.S. and international training activities and programs in historic preservation; with National Trust Library (NTL) at the University of Maryland to make the NTL Periodicals Index available on-line to the preservation community through the Center; with the National Council for Preservation Education to provide internships in archeological discovery and evaluation techniques, and in information management; and with the National Institute for Conservation of Cultural Property to develop a methodology for assessing appropriate climatic conditions for historic structures that house museum collections.

The second round of Preservation Technology and Training Grants was awarded in September 1995. Thirty one grants totalling \$932,921 were awarded.

**Research '95:**

	Recipient Organization	Project Description	Location of Project Work	Discipline Served	Amount Awarded
1.	City of Macon, Georgia	Researching the use of oral histories to interpret African-American theaters in the south	Georgia with regional impact	History	\$39,988.
2.	Frank Lloyd Wright Building Conservancy	Establishing a conservation inventory of Frank Lloyd Wright structures	Throughout the U.S.	Historic Architecture	\$30,000.
3.	Indiana University Art Museum	Analyzing the effects of an indoor air pollutant on traditional easel paintings	Indiana with a national impact	Materials Conservation	\$38,815.
4.	Office of Community Preservation, Louisiana State University	Investigating relationships between historic preservation and economic development in rural areas, using the Bayou Teche Heritage Corridor as a model	Louisiana with a regional impact	Historic Landscapes	\$39,978.

5.	National Preservation Institute	Documenting the movement of historic objects using advanced computer simulation	Washington, DC with a national impact	Interdisciplinary	\$36,000.
6.	National Gallery of Art	Developing protective coating systems for outdoor bronze sculptures and ornamentation	Washington, DC with a national impact	Materials Conservation	\$37,500.
7.	New Jersey Historic Trust	Studying the economic impact of historic preservation in our nation's most densely populated state	New Jersey with a national impact	Historic Architecture	\$40,000.
8.	Nautical Archaeology Program, Texas A&M University	Investigating the use of silicones for the treatment of wet or waterlogged organic and siliceous materials	Texas with a national impact	Materials Conservation	\$39,641.
9.	Preservation Science and Technology Unit, University of California at Riverside	Field testing remote sensing systems for protecting historic sites and monuments from vandalism	California with a national impact	Archeology	\$40,000.
10.	Washington State University	Developing agent-based computer simulations for identifying and interpreting archeological sites	Washington with a national impact	Archeology	\$35,463.
11.	Center for Archeological Stabilization, University of Mississippi	Evaluating the impact of revegetation on the preservation of archeological sites	Mississippi with a national impact	Archeology	\$20,000.

12.	University of Arizona, Arizona State Museum	Preparing a directory of chemical spot tests for materials characterization	Arizona with a national impact	Materials Conservation	\$28,310.
13.	Newberry College	Investigating the biogeo-chemical relationship between prehistoric rock paints and natural rock accretions	South Carolina with a national impact	Archeology	\$29,070.
14.	Ft. Lauderdale Research and Education Center, University of Florida	Field testing non-invasive and non-toxic baiting system for protecting historic structures from subterranean termites	Florida with a national impact	Historic Architecture	\$40,000.
15.	Tri-Services Cultural Resources Research Center, US Army Corps of Engineers Construction Engineering Research Laboratories	Designing a controlled test site for evaluating non-invasive technologies for archeological site assessment	Illinois with a national impact	Archeology	\$37,250.
16.	Ohio Historical Society, Ohio State Historic Preservation Office	Investigating the use of turn-of-the-century whitewares as economic indicators for evaluating sites for eligibility in the National Register for Historic Places	Ohio with a national impact	Archeology	\$10,394.

**Training '95:**

	Recipient Organization	Project Description	Location of Project Work	Discipline Served	Amount Awarded
1.	Historic Windsor, Inc.	Teaching historic preservation skills to craftspeople	Louisiana with a regional impact	Historic Architecture	\$40,000.
2.	Slater Mill Historic Site	Training preservation professionals in the maintenance of historic buildings and museum collections	Rhode Island with a regional impact	Materials Conservation	\$19,813.
3.	Dartmouth College	Converting a book repair manual to multi-media information available via Internet	New Hampshire with a national impact	Materials Conservation	\$6,290.
4.	The Friends of Meridian Hill	Developing technical training for comprehensively diagnosing moisture in buildings	Washington, DC with a national impact	Historic Architecture	\$40,000.
5.	University of Vermont	Developing historic preservation training for vocational-technical instructors in the building trades	Vermont with a national impact	Historic Architecture	\$33,401.
6.	Maryland State Historic Preservation Office	Producing a video on lead-based paint abatement in historic structures	Maryland with a national impact	Materials Conservation	\$19,500.

7.	Boston University	Producing a video that provides technical information on fire protection and detection systems for historic properties	Massachusetts with a national impact	Historic Architecture	\$40,000.
8.	Crow Canyon Archaeological Center	Developing workshops to train museum staffs in Native American issues in historic preservation	Colorado with a regional impact	Archeology	\$19,320.
9.	Southern Cultural Heritage Foundation	Conducting training on landscapes for historic properties	Mississippi with a regional impact	Historic Landscapes	\$6,850.
10.	Mystic Seaport Museum	Developing a training program in three-dimensional coordinate measurement of historic artifacts	Connecticut with a national impact	Inter-disciplinary	\$23,821.
11.	Wilkinson County Museum	Conducting a seminar on historic preservation methodologies and strategies for private owners of historic properties	Mississippi with a regional impact	Inter-disciplinary	\$19,883.
12.	Cornerstones Community Partnerships	Conducting training for young people in vernacular architecture and associated cultural traditions	New Mexico with a regional impact	Materials Conservation	\$39,868.
13.	Morgan County Landmarks Society	Preparing a teacher's manual for enhancing heritage education through historic landscapes	Georgia with a regional impact	Historic Landscapes	\$6,937.

14.	Caribbean Heritage	Producing a preservation technology manual for construction professionals in the Caribbean	Puerto Rico with a regional impact	Historic Architecture	\$34,803.
15.	Georgia Department of Archives and History	Conducting training for local governments in preserving historic public records	Georgia with a national impact	Materials Conservation	\$40,000.

***Appointment of Center's Professional Staff: Profiles***

In September 1994 **John Robbins** became *Executive Director* of the Center. Mr. Robbins came to the Center from Oxford, Mississippi where he had been the principal in his own architectural firm specializing in historic preservation. During his career, he has had previous affiliations with the National Park Service through the Denver Service Center, and the North Atlantic Historic Preservation Center, the latter for which he was the project architect for the restoration of the Statue of Liberty. Mr. Robbins won awards for his work on Fort Stanwix and Lowell National Historical Park. He earned a Bachelor of Architecture degree from the University of Virginia and was recipient of the first Richard Morris Hunt Fellowship in Historic Preservation in 1990.

**Mary Carroll** joined the Center from the Central Arizona Project Repository in Tucson, Arizona--an archaeological repository serving Federal and Arizona state agencies. As *Information Management Specialist*, Ms. Carroll is responsible for the Center's information and technology transfer activities. She earned Bachelor and Master degrees from Arizona State University and has over fifteen years experience in developing computer applications for cultural resources management.

**Frances Gale** joined the Center from a career in preservation education, research and product development for universities and private industry. As *Training Coordinator*, Ms. Gale is responsible for developing the training aspects of the Center's mission. She earned a graduate degree in historic preservation from Columbia University, served as Associate Director for Projects at Columbia's Center for Preservation Research, and has taught in the preservation programs at Columbia and the University of Pennsylvania. Just prior to her work with the Center, Ms. Gale served as Director of Technical Research for ProSoCo, Inc. of Kansas City and as a architectural conservation consultant in private practice.

**Mark Gilberg** joined the Center as a conservation scientist and serves as the Center's *Research Coordinator* developing research projects that fulfill the Center's interdisciplinary research mission. Dr. Gilberg earned Bachelor and Master degrees from Stanford University and a doctorate from the University of London's Institute of Archaeology. Prior to his work with the Center, he was associated with the Australian Museum at Sydney, first in their Materials Conservation Division and later as their Scientific Officer. He also consulted privately on cultural heritage management and objects conservation.

Mary Striegel joined the Center as research scientist and *Research Associate*. Dr. Striegel earned a Bachelor degree from the University of Louisville, and Master and doctoral degrees from Washington University in St. Louis. Prior to the Center, Dr. Striegel was a conservation scientist with the Getty Conservation Institute, where her work focused on the conservation of metals. At the Center, Dr. Striegel's chief responsibility is the management of the Materials Research Program, a diverse program of research into the deterioration and conservation of architectural and monumental stones and metals.

*Staff Activities* [relating to the development of program elements of the Center]:

In March and April 1995, the Preservation Technology and Training board and the Center's staff convened three working groups to help define the Center's research, training and information management activities. All were held on the Natchitoches campus of the Northwestern State University of Louisiana and were attended by national-recognized experts in the fields of conservation science, information management and training in cultural resources management.

The training working group identified several key issues for the Center to consider. These included developing public awareness about preservation, coordinating training work undertaken by local, state and federal preservation agencies, collaborating with nonprofit organizations in providing training, and serving as a clearinghouse for information on training activities. It was also recommended that the Center take a leadership role in providing "convenience-based" education for preservationists using new technologies such as the Internet, videos and distance learning.

Discussions at the research working group emphasized the need to define the Center's client base and to establish a clear concept of its research objectives in order to engender support from within and outside the National Park Service. Though mandated to serve the entire preservation community at the city state and federal levels, support of State Historic Preservation Offices is considered crucial. Particular attention was devoted to the need to establish research priorities given the limited amount of funds available. Strategies for establishing research priorities that meet national preservation needs were outlined, including the use of the modified Gordon conferences in which a select number of professionals from one field would participate in an intensive workshop. One of the principal outcomes would be a prioritized list of project proposals. It was generally agreed that the Center should also enlist the assistance of various national organizations such as the American Institute of Architects, Society for American Archaeology, and Society of American Landscape Architects to help identify long term research needs in their various disciplines.

Regarding in-house research, the group discussed the Center's role in accelerating the technology transfer process. From a practical standpoint, it seemed more advantageous for the Center to concentrate its research efforts on the identification and application of new technologies (and hence become more treatment or process oriented) rather than on their actual development. It was also stressed that whenever possible, research should be undertaken in collaboration with other research facilities active in historic preservation.

Discussion at the information management workshop focused on the need to define the Center's audience, the nature of the information to be disseminated, and the role of the NCPTT in information management for the preservation community. The participants strongly recommended that the Center concentrate on activities related to training the preservation community and the public about the available information

technology and its benefits to potential users. Other suggestions made by participants included: develop guides to accessing and using the Internet; investigate the development of listservs (electronic discussion lists); survey the resources on the Internet and be the experts on what's out there; view SHPOffices as potential information providers; produce Frequently Asked Questions(FAQ) on specified topics; encourage compiling of data that nonprofits can use; and act as a clearinghouse in order to build bridges between diverse professions and to reduce duplication of effort.

### ***Board Meetings and the Center's Five-Year Plan***

The Preservation Technology and Training Board has met five times since its inception [April 1994 in Natchitoches, Louisiana, June 1994 in Atlanta, Georgia, November 1994 in Natchitoches, May 1995 in Washington, DC and November 1995 in Natchitoches]. Each fall meeting has been scheduled in Natchitoches to provide Board members an opportunity to review the development of the Center's facilities and programs. The Board reserves the opportunity to hold their spring meeting at a facility convenient to the majority of Board members and in a location well suited to advancing the field's understanding of the programs of the Center. In May 1995 the Center held its Board meeting in Washington, DC, to afford the greatest opportunity for related preservation organizations be part of meeting discussions and events.

Over the course of its first five meetings, the Board developed a preliminary strategic plan that provides the staff with recommended goals and objectives to pursue in the next five years. In the course of developing these recommendations, the Board crafted the following mission statement for the organization:

The National Center for Preservation Technology and Training promotes and enhances the preservation of historic and prehistoric resources in the United States for present and future generations through the advancement and distribution of preservation technology and training.

The Center, created by Congress, is an interdisciplinary program of the National Park Service to advance the art, craft and science of historic preservation in the fields of archeology, historic architecture, historic landscapes, materials conservation and interpretation. The Center serves public and private practitioners through research, education and information management.

Among some of the more specific Board recommended goals were: to ensure that resources are sufficient to allow full implementation of the Center's legislated purpose and mission in research, training, and information management; to ensure public awareness and cooperation with the goals and programs of the National Center; to increase access to historic preservation information and user knowledge of how to access electronic information; to establish the Center as a clearing house of preservation information; to disseminate information to a broad historic preservation constituency in a wide variety of media; to employ the most recent means of information management and dissemination; to make the Center a national leader in preservation training and education; to encourage a broad perspective on preservation training and education that--coordinated with the preservation education community--encompasses the entire continuum from specialized professional training to public awareness and education; to enhance and support existing training programs; to increase access to all types of historic preservation training by making the Center a clearinghouse of information about training opportunities across the country; to develop an assessment of the national research needs in the field of historic preservation and identify priorities in specific disciplines; to determine who is doing research, who can do it, and what needs to be done at the Center; to coordinate

and sponsor specialized research; to transfer technologies and technical information among agencies and organizations and between disciplines; to publish and distribute the results of preservation research; and to increase access to research information and scientific expertise that is relevant to all aspects of historic preservation.

Standing Committees of the Board address special issues in the three major program areas:

***Information Management***

Blaine Cliver [chair]  
Robert Melnick  
Frank Sanchis

***Training/Education***

Jim Huhta [chair]  
Blair Reeves  
Christy McAvoy

***Research***

Jim Judge & Alferdteen Harrison [co-chair]  
Neville Agnew  
Nick Gianopulos  
Carolyn Rose

Ad hoc liaison groups have also been established to facilitate Board assistance to the Center in the following areas:

***Finance/Budget***

Frank Sanchis  
Carolyn Rose

***Grants***

Alferdteen Harrison  
Carolyn Rose

***Cooperative Agreements***

Carolyn Rose  
Blaine Cliver  
Robert Melnick  
Liz Lyon  
Alferdteen Harrison

***Private Support***

Robert Melnick  
Liz Lyon

***Center Building Renovation***

Blair Reeves  
Nick Gianopulos

CHARTER

PRESERVATION TECHNOLOGY AND TRAINING BOARD

1. The official designation of the committee is the "Preservation Technology and Training Board" for the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training, located at Northwestern State University in Natchitoches, Louisiana.
2. The purpose of the Board is to advise the Secretary of the Interior regarding the operations of the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training. The specific duties of the Board are to: (1) provide leadership, policy advice, and professional oversight to the Center; (2) advise the Secretary on priorities and the allocation of grants among the activities of the Center; and (3) submit an annual report to the President and the Congress.
3. This charter is for the period October 30, 1992 to October 30, 1994. The Board is subject to rechartering every biennial anniversary of October 30, 1992. The Board shall not meet or take action unless the chartering requirements of sections 9 and 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. Appendix (1988), have been complied with.
4. The Board is expected to remain in existence for as long as the Center remains in existence, or until terminated by act of Congress.
5. Support for the Board will be provided by the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. The Board reports to the Assistant Secretary for Fish Wildlife and Parks, Main Interior Building, Washington, D.C. 20013-7127.
6. The estimated annual operating cost of the Board is \$95,000, which includes approximately one-half year of staff support and travel.
7. The duties of the Board are solely advisory and are as stated in paragraph 2 above.
8. The Board will meet approximately twice yearly at the call of, or with the advance approval of, the Designated Federal Officer or his designee. All meetings shall be subject to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.
9. The Board may make such rules and bylaws as it deems necessary to carry out its duties, and as may be consistent with Federal law. The Board may select a member to serve a 2-year term as chairperson, and may form subcommittees drawn in whole or in part from the full committee, provided that the role of such subcommittees shall be only to provide information and recommendations for consideration by the full committee.

**National Center for Preservation Technology and Training  
Symposium, April 11-14, 1994  
SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS**

Following selection of the Preservation Technology and Training Board in February, 1994, the National Park Service decided to bring together representatives of national preservation and conservation organizations to provide advice to the newly appointed Board. With the close cooperation of Northwestern State University of Louisiana, this symposium took place in Natchitoches from April 11 through April 14, 1994.

Symposium participants, representing a broad range of national and international organizations and representing a range of disciplines, were asked by the National Park Service to formulate recommendations for the Technology and Training Board in the areas of preservation/conservation research, education/training, and information management. Another part of the assignment for symposium participants was to identify the types of activities that might best support existing organizations and programs in the technical preservation/ conservation fields. A list of symposium participants is found in Appendix 3.

The following is a series of observations, considerations, and recommendations resulting from the symposium in Natchitoches.

**General Comments:** at the outset, symposium participants agreed to the following definition of preservation technology, to guide discussions over the two days:

Preservation technology refers broadly to any equipment, methods, and techniques that can be applied to the discovery; analysis; interpretation; restoration; conservation; protection; and management of cultural property, including prehistoric and historic sites, structures, objects, and landscapes.

Participants also agreed that the Center needs to provide programs and services for the following individuals and organizations, based on an interpretation of the 1992 Amendments: federal, state and local resource preservation professionals; cultural resource managers; maintenance personnel; students (where there is a demonstrated need); and others working in the preservation field.

All participants expressed strong support for the broad goals of the Center and indicated a willingness to assist the National Park Service and Northwestern State University in meeting these goals and in promoting the Center as an electronic and information hub in the field of conservation and preservation. There was recognition that the Center must develop a working relationship with international programs and resources, including ICOMOS, ICOM and ICCROM.

The recommendations that follow in the next three sections represent the efforts of the three working groups; all were presented to the full symposium and reflect a consensus.

## **I. Preservation/Conservation Research Working Group Observations, Considerations, Recommendations**

### **Participants**

Ward Jandl, facilitator  
Ann Looper, recorder  
Nellie Longworth  
William Feist  
Martin Weaver  
Michael Lynch  
John Myers  
T. Douglas Price  
Bert van Zelst  
Edward Graham  
Michael Tomlan  
John Isaacson  
Elizabeth Brabec

1. As a first step, the Center should provide funds to compile a listing of research facilities that have a preservation overlay.
  - \* This list need not include all research facilities because they number in the thousands.
  - \* This inventory needs to be dynamic and kept up to date by the Center.
  - \* This information should be on the Internet and readily accessible.
  - \* The list will likely need to be compiled by more than one individual or organization, given the range of disciplines that are included in the Center.
  - \* A list of indicators should be developed, so that information is in a reasonably consistent format.
  - \* This project should be seen as a high priority for the Center and started as soon as possible.
  
2. Grants should be given to support a range of activities, and not reserved exclusively for scientific and technical research.
  - \* Criteria need to be established to reflect this broad approach.
  - \* Pre-applications should be encouraged, using a Broad Agency Announcement model.
  - \* The Center should conduct an annual review of priorities.
  - \* The Center may want to focus on certain types of research for a given year or years, but should not exclude other worthy projects.
  - \* The Getty Architectural Conservation grants might serve as a model, with a three-tiered review process: outside peer review by discipline, panel review at the discipline level, and general award panel. (NEA was not considered an appropriate model, given the interdisciplinary nature of their review panels.)
  - \* Should substantial sums of money be available for grants, there will need to be a bureaucracy in place to handle the workload. Every effort should be made to simplify the grants process.
  - \* Match funds should be encouraged but not required: there is recognition that certain types of research will not be able to obtain matching funds and the Center should be prepared to assume total costs in these cases.
  - \* The Center should approach other grant-giving organizations to coordinate and match grant funds. This would enable the Center to maximize its available dollars.
  
3. The Research Working Group identified certain broad research priorities, based on their perceptions. These areas are all interdisciplinary in nature:
  - a. nondestructive discovery, characterization, and investigation techniques for cultural property.
  - b. molecular identification and characterization.
  - c. characterization of deterioration mechanisms.
  - d. social, economic, and cultural trends.

- e. technology transfer.
4. The Center should enlist professional organizations to identify longterm research needs in the various disciplines; this is too large an undertaking for any one organization or individual.
    - \* Organizations include those of the participants at the symposium, as well as others: AASLH, ALA, ASCE, IIC, APA, Society of American Archivists, Society for the Preservation of Natural History Collections, the Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation, Heritage Areas Coalition, etc.
    - \* The activity of identifying research needs could occur as part of annual conferences or membership meetings.
    - \* Center staff or Board members should be encouraged to facilitate at such meetings: this would also have the benefit of providing needed visibility for the Center.
    - \* Where possible, organizations should prioritize their research needs.
    - \* This activity might take several years to complete (recognizing that the needs and priorities will change over time).
  5. All results of research funded by the Center should be made available digitally--on computer. Where warranted, research results should also be published.
  6. The Center should establish a bulletin board on Internet to identify current research in the conservation/preservation field. Information would be supplied by those doing the research.
  7. The Center's research facility should serve primarily a teaching function and used to support training activities of the Center.
    - \* Fully equipped research facilities are prohibitively expensive to operate, funds that the Center may not have. Therefore, the Center should not expend limited resources to develop substantial new laboratories.
    - \* Hard scientific research should be left to other facilities that currently exist, many of which are underutilized.
  8. The Center needs to work closely with private industry to coordinate and stimulate preservation/conservation research.
    - \* The Center's research program should not be dictated by dollars from private industry.
    - \* The Center should explore opportunities to work with private industry and might consider holding a symposium to discuss coordination.
    - \* It is important for the Center to work with industry yet at the same time keep its independence.
    - \* The Center will need to recognize when approaching private industry that it may be competing with other preservation groups at the local, regional, or national level; available dollars are limited and a balance is needed.
  9. The Center should consider organizing and holding research symposia on specific topics and publishing the proceedings.
    - \* Consider providing fellowships to do the necessary planning work.
    - \* Keep the size of the symposia small, to 20-25 individuals.

Other Issues relating to Research:

- \* The Research Work Group expressed concerns regarding the relatively low salary level of the Center's research coordinator position.
- \* The Center might want to consider evaluating and certifying preservation/conservation products, much the way the Underwriters Laboratory evaluates electrical products. Alternatively, the Center may want to establish standards for such products.

## II. Training/Education Working Group Observations, Consideration, Recommendations

### Participants

Kathleen Byrd, facilitator  
Roy Graham, recorder  
Timothy Crimmins  
Debbie Hess Norris  
John McGaw  
Kenneth H. P'Pool  
Michael Tomlan  
Connie Wyrick  
Constance Ramirez  
Mary Wood Lee  
Colin Wagner  
Elizabeth Reitz  
Marc Laenen  
Billy Cypress

The following are the results of two sessions undertaken by the Training Work Group on April 12 and 13, 1994. Since these two sessions were far ranging, the comments have been divided into three sections.

1. Much of the first day was devoted to identifying the major user groups for any training effort. Although this list is incomplete, the following groups were mentioned: decision makers at all levels; administrators; museum conservators; private citizens; planning officials; local land use managers; housing officials; professionals; non-professionals such as building managers; and mid-career professionals.

Since most preservation occurs at the local level, the feeling of the group was that the local people, the owners of houses and archaeological sites and local government officials who regulate activities that occur on cultural properties, were a prime target group for training or sensitization.

Several topics were also identified during the first day's discussions. These include disaster preparedness, living cultures, repatriation concerns, conservation management in tourism areas, how to use the National Center's resources, technology transfer techniques, and scientific standards and ethics.

2. During the second day, the discussion concentrated on identifying points of consensus on training/education. These points are listed in general priority order:
  - a) The Center should identify training needs. A number of studies have been undertaken by various organizations concerning kinds of programs that are needed. These existing studies need to be compiled and, if needed, an additional professionally conducted poll or survey undertaken. Groups to be consulted should include federal agency officials, SHPOs, historic district commissions, local government officials, mid-career professionals, and others.
  - b) The Center should identify and evaluate existing training programs and develop partnerships on the national and international level with those already undertaking training efforts. The existing training programs may be interested in the Center's support. Any specific training needs that are not being fulfilled should be identified and programs developed. Training/educational needs can best be identified through consultation with professional association boards such as the SAA, AIA etc. and can be developed in concert with these organizations.
  - c) The Center needs to be aggressive in publicizing, marketing, and promoting training programs. Over half the people in the session on training were not aware of the CRM Bulletin's Short Course publication.

d) The Center should develop training programs in several different ways. One method could be by supporting a resident (or non-resident) fellowship or internship program. Such a fellow could work with the Center and a particular user group to develop curriculum and materials, design course offerings, demonstrations or pilot courses, and make necessary modifications. All courses should be carefully developed with extensive written materials (case studies) and should be visually appealing and constantly assessed. Examples of successful short courses that could serve as a model for training efforts are the Getty Conservation Institute and the Campbell Center.

e) The Center should attempt to match the training needs with an appropriate delivery system. For some training this may include telecommunication. For others, a "hands on" experience at Natchitoches or elsewhere may be more appropriate. The need to train "trainers" was also discussed. Some members felt that the quality of the training is diminished at each level removed from the primary instructor. Others felt that training trainers is the only way to meet certain needs.

f) Existing training or educational materials should be repackaged and redistributed to meet the needs of regional, state, or local use. A "Reader's Digest" language format might be more effective to reach certain user groups than a more detailed scholarly report.

g) The Center should develop a mechanism to test the adequacy and effectiveness of any training effort and should document success stories and distribute the results.

h) The Center should promote symposia on specific topics. These symposia could result in a scholarly publication which could be distributed to those interested in timely research (training the professionals in new techniques).

i) The Center should attempt to make training offerings as cross disciplinary as possible and reach all layers of preservation.

j) All material developed by the Center for training should be graphically designed in such a way as to be user friendly and visually inviting.

k) The Center might provide stipend support to students for on-site study.

3. Other topics mentioned in the first day of discussion are listed below:

- \* The Center should be concerned with needs for regional and locally focused training programs.
- \* The Center should establish a national agenda for preservation training.
- \* The Center should establish an infrastructure for training efforts.
- \* The Center could develop training models for governmental agencies.
- \* The Center could work closely with trade unions to alert building craftsperson, maintenance people, and others to preservation concerns.
- \* The Center should bring professionals together.
- \* The Center could provide a focus for the concerns of Native Americans, African-American, and other minorities.

### III. Information Management Working Group Observations, Considerations, Recommendations

#### Participants

Sally Sims Stokes, facilitator  
Peter Stott, recorder  
Ada Jarred  
Terry Morton  
Lawrence Reger  
John McGaw  
Robert Field  
Loretta Neumann  
Michael Tomlan  
Frank McManamon  
Louis R. Shaffer  
Patricia Gay  
Norman Koonce  
Karen Forbes

The group started out by adopting a modified version of the issue list originally proposed by the symposium organizers. The participants agreed with the general theme of the session, and of the draft report on Information Management, that the Center should serve as an ELECTRONIC GATEWAY or HUB for national and international databases and other services.

However, an important function of the center should also be to dramatically increase public awareness of not only existing preservation tools, but the Center itself. (Several times during the symposium, participants noted that even within the preservation community itself, important publications were not well known.) Indeed, if the Center was to get off the ground, PUBLIC AWARENESS of the center had to be an immediate priority.

In addition to its electronic role, however, the Center must also consider other publication media, especially print, CD-ROM, and video. The CENTER AS PUBLISHER, was thus a third issue the group participants addressed.

The linkages and overlaps between the different components of the Center (Research, Training, and Information Management) were noted throughout the symposium. The fourth issue that the Information Management working group addressed was the RELATIONSHIP between the three areas.

#### 1) Public Awareness

- \* The existence of the Center and its future role should be widely broadcast, particularly through the organizations participating in the symposium. To this end, organizations should be provided soon with a press release about the Center and the Symposium, as well as other types of promotional information.
- \* Industry could be an important ally of the Center. It could provide thematic issues (the model of the 'Windows' conference was cited), allowing preservation standards to help shape product development. Industry could help pay for the Center if they see it as a way to sell their product. The Center should immediately reach out to industry for support, perhaps through an initial workshop or series of workshops.
- \* Conferences were also considered as a means of increasing the Center's exposure. NSU's existing teleconferencing facilities could be employed, and thematic teleconferences could be a source of revenue to the Center. But conferences that the Center chooses to hold in Natchitoches MUST BE SPECIAL. It should consider a program like the Gordon conferences, where experts are invited to discuss a single theme over several days. Unlike the Gordon conferences, the proceedings should be published, in electronic and print form, as appropriate.

\* An immediate action would be to develop an Internet "gopher" for the Center, which could be incorporated into NSU's existing gopher. It could include the Center's newsletter, Center updates, and other announcements.

2) Center as an Electronic Hub

\* The Center should be an electronic resource clearinghouse for organizations to learn of the activities of other organizations, potentially partnering organizations on collaborative projects. This role could be particularly important for those U.S. organizations which may not be familiar with the work of international organizations.

\* The Center's clearinghouse function could be particularly valuable in emergency response situations; it could provide listings of individuals with needed specialties. In planning for emergencies, endangered archaeological resources should not be neglected.

\* The Center should provide a clearly organized user-friendly menu-driven electronic link to other online databases and other types of resources dealing with cultural property. It must also provide search capability for individual databases, and for searching multiple databases.

\* The list of potential databases outlined in the draft Information Management Report needs to be expanded. It was agreed that the report would be sent out officially to all participants to invite their comments and additions to the database list by May 10th. Among the databases cited as available were the Department of Defense's DENIX bulletin board system, and Envirotex.

\* The Center should also promote the online availability of new databases. Access to existing online databases (e.g., the National Register Information System) should be extended; and encouragement should be offered to bring existing PC-based office databases onto the Internet (e.g., Inventories of the State Historic Preservation Offices). There was extensive discussion of the need for cultural resource inventories in both disaster preparedness and disaster response.

\* A psychological barrier inhibits many individuals from taking advantage of the electronic resources that the Internet and computers in general have to offer. The Center should make every effort to overcome this phobia through workshops, brochures, print, videotapes, telephone hotlines, local community colleges; and other conventional and unconventional means. Community colleges might also be used to provide computer training for interested groups.

\* The Center might consider constructing a user-friendly affinity network (with low or non-existent rates) to bring the computer-inhibited into the electronic age. The network would offer e-mail and access to all of the Center's database menus.

\* In order to accomplish many of the goals set out in this section, the Center must also be seen as an "Enabler," building the capacity of other institutions to take advantage of existing resources, as well as begin to develop new resources of their own. To this end, the group recognized that the Center should have a strong program of technical and financial aid. Among the targets of this aid: a) examine and publish existing federal funding sources for electronic connectivity; b) link SHPOs and other organizations with the Internet and Center; help SHPOs and other organizations prepare existing cultural property databases for online access; c) through mutual discussions among interested groups, develop proposals for new databases, which might be developed with financial or technical aid from the Center, or from outside groups; d) consider outsourcing information, where the center's staff might be limited, or lacking the expertise in given areas;

\* The Center must recognize that a some of its potential users will not have access to the Internet. Assistance must be available through other means including toll-free telephone, fax, videotape, and print media.

### 3) The Center as Publisher

The group recognized that the term "publish" was an all-inclusive term, not limited to the print media. Ultimately, consideration should be given to dissemination of information by CD-ROM and video-disk as appropriate. If the results of all of the Center's research and training activities were to be published (see below), then it was important that both electronic and conventional print media be used. One issue discussed was whether the Center should be concerned about duplication of the work of other organizations. Although there was no clear consensus on the issue, it was generally felt that the field did not suffer from duplication--that similar publications encouraged demand for those publications. Cooperative publishing arrangements should be considered where appropriate.

The group also discussed how such a publication program was to be paid for. If revenues were to be derived exclusively from sales, then perhaps a revolving loan fund should be set up to cover initial costs, to be paid back by sale receipts.

Finally it was recognized that without an editor or publications staff, a publications program from the Center might not be put in place for some time.

### 4) Information Management vis-a-vis Research and Training

- \* All the research and training activities should also be published -- in print and electronic form;

#### TRAINING

- \* Consider training programs -- especially for SHPO offices to introduce them to Internet and networked databases; develop continued relationship to continue that assistance.
- \* On the model of earlier NPS training courses on CRM databases, consider training courses in the use of datasharing; and training in the input of data.
- \* Consider that the staff of the center itself will need training, especially in areas outside their immediate expertise.

#### RESEARCH

- \* Consider the center's research as focusing on telecommunication applications to cultural resource management; install a teaching lab with a room full of Work stations to teach NSU students and others how to apply GIS and other techniques to cultural resource management. Take up the offer of USA-CERL to develop civilian applications for XCRIS and other CERL programs.
- \* Consider the Center as a kind of Underwriters' Lab; not that the Center would necessarily do the testing, which could be farmed out to existing testing institutions; but that the Center could issue a "seal of approval" if a product met certain standards, which could be set by a high-level standards committee.

#### Other Recommendations

- \* Concern was raised about the information management position; it was felt that the emphasis on computer skills might deter applicants with broader communication skills. Perhaps some of these computer skills could be provided by the University. The group proposed criteria to be considered in the choice of a Chief of Information Management:
  - \* broad communication skills, capable of dealing with all disciplines and at all levels;
  - \* full knowledge of information systems, including print, CD-ROM, video, radio, television;
  - \* editing experience, if not publication design;
  - \* demonstrated commitment to preservation.
- \* There was a general concern that the symposium members didn't know enough about the capacity of the University in order to determine the necessary level of expertise of the Chief of Information Management.

What existing technical restraints need to be addressed? If the university already had the necessary computer facilities and expertise, then the new position required fewer hardware skills. The group felt that a small workshop this summer might answer this question.

\* Symposium members should be kept involved in the process. To do so, the group recommended that: 1) a standing committee be established in each subject area (Research, Training, Information Management) with both board members and interested symposium members; 2) a computer mailing list ("listserv") be setup out of NSU to distribute information and allow dialogue about the continuing planning process. Fax transmission should be used for those without e-mail. The group felt that this form of rapid communication was particularly important in the planning stage, to keep all aspects of the plan on track; 3) obtain and circulate e-mail and fax numbers of all participants and board members.

\* The Center's Research and inquiries should be on the cutting edge of new technologies, especially in areas such as GIS. At the same time, it must also serve the vast majority of the preservation community which will be at every possible stage of development. It must have the physical equipment to deal with both communities: telephone help lines, as well as print, video, fax, e-mail, listserv, and other electronic media.

## **Appendix 1: Proposal to Assess Relationship between University and National Park Service.**

The following proposal was presented orally and discussed at the end of the symposium; there was not sufficient time to give it full discussion. The proposal, as written, has not had full review by symposium participants but is included here for consideration by the Board.

In order to provide the best possible foundation for the future growth and development of the National Center, we recommend that the Center's Board engage a small, independent, expert consulting committee (with experience in establishing and/or operating similar centers in university settings) to review and assess the relationship between the National Park Service and Northwestern State University. Such an assessment would include a review of all the relevant NPS documents and working papers and the recommendations of the symposium, comparing them with the University's plans, policies, programs, personnel and faculties. Ideally, the consulting committee would meet with the Board (or a committee of the Board), then spend 3 days on campus, interviewing the University administration, faculty, students, and staff. An equal amount of time should be spent with the representatives of the federal, state and local public, private and non-profit organizations and agencies. The consulting committee should give special consideration to what it takes to create and sustain first-class research and education programs on-site for off-site collaborators and participants. The committee should then work with the representatives of the NPS and NSU to draft a short-term (1 year?), three year (?), and five year implementation plan.

## **Appendix 2: Recommendations of Individual Symposium Participants to Bring Visibility to the Center and to Build Credibility for the Center**

The following ideas were presented by participants at the end of the symposium. They are presented here, based on notes taken at this final session. Some of the recommendations are repetitive but provide many ideas for the Center to consider:

- Immediately establish an electronic bulletin board.
- Profile potential users of the Center.
- Mount a directory of Internet resources as per ICOMOS/Stott report.
- Create a program of small grants to carry out the recommendations of the working groups at the symposium.
- Initiate partnerships with ICCROM, ICOMOS/Paris, UNESCO, etc.
- Coordinate with CERL to obtain access to information/research relating to preservation/conservation.
- Develop a logo that is user-friendly.
- Credibility for the Center will come only through associations with other organizations.
- Develop a strategy for "exposure" of the Center.
- Develop high quality programs that will attract academia.
- Host a Federal Preservation Forum meeting at Natchitoches.
- Bring a series of small groups to NSU.
- Hold a series of small workshops at the Center.
- Prepare a press release and/or press kit that can be made available to newsletters and journals of other professional organizations.
- Develop a staffed exhibit for the Center and utilize it at national professional conferences.
- Encourage organizations to indicate on their letterhead that they are a sponsor of the Center.
- Identify a specific problem--such as disaster response--and plan a training activity in Natchitoches around that problem.
- Start with small projects and work up to larger projects.
- Focus on the usefulness, necessity, and quality of products
- Get grants program going quickly.
- The Center should reinforce high standards and consider a system of accreditation.
- Involve the Advisory Council in future deliberations.
- Develop an initiative relating to disaster preparedness.
- Make use of "off the shelf" training courses at the Center.
- Identify solvable critical issue and undertake training/research in that area.
- Sponsor tracks at national conferences; have Center become a cosponsor of workshops and conferences organized by others.
- The Center needs to address the loss of historic buildings that is occurring in towns and cities in the U.S.
- The AIA Committee on Historic Resources might consider a meeting in Natchitoches in 1996.
- The Center might be able to participate in an AIA conference on courthouses in 1995.
- Make the goals and vision of the Center widely known: the vision statement needs to be clear.
- The National Trust can bring products, programs, and constituents to the Center.
- Prepare a press release on the Center.
- Prepare a leaflet on the Center and distribute it widely at conferences.
- Utilize the Folklife Center at NSU.
- Consider a workshop on disaster preparedness.
- Hold research symposia as per recommendations of the Research working group.
- Keep in mind that most research is done by individuals, not organizations.
- Seek out organizations for their opinions.
- Refine the concept paper and distribute it widely.
- Consider membership organizations for the Center.
- Use teleconferencing capability of NSU for training on disaster preparedness.
- Keep professional organizations informed and up to date on a regular basis.
- Use national organizations to support goals of Center.

Establish a periodical publication for the Center.

Consider a 1-800 number for the Center when it is staffed.

Have Center staff and Board members "spread the word" at conferences and workshops.

**Appendix 3: List of Participants at the Symposium on the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training, April 11-14, 1994**

1. Ms. Elizabeth Brabec  
American Society for Landscape Architects  
4401 Connecticut Avenue, NW, 5th Floor  
Washington, DC 20008-2303
2. Mr. Timothy Crimmins, Board Member  
National Alliance of Preservation  
Commissions  
c/o Georgia State University  
University Plaza  
Atlanta GA 30303-3083
3. Mr. Billy L. Cypress, Vice President  
Keepers of the Treasures  
c/o Seminole Tribal Museum Authority  
3240 North 64th Avenue  
Hollywood, FL 33024
4. Mr. Douglas Faris  
Southwest Regional Office  
National Park Service  
P.O. Box 728  
Santa Fe, NM 87504-0728
5. Dr. William C. Feist, Research Chemist  
Forest Products Laboratory  
U.S. Forest Service  
Madison, WI 53705
6. Mr. Robert Field, AIA  
Committee on Historic Resources  
American Institute of Architects  
1735 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006
7. Ms. Karen Forbes  
Federal Emergency Management Agency  
500 C Street, SW Room 714  
Washington, DC 20472
8. Ms. Patricia H. Gay  
Executive Director  
Preservation Resource Center  
of New Orleans  
604 Julia Street  
New Orleans, LA 70130-3722
9. John Isaacson  
U.S. Army Construction Engineering  
Research Laboratories  
P.O. Box 4005  
Champaign, IL 61820-1305
10. Mr. Norman Koonce, President  
American Architectural Foundation  
1735 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006-5292
11. Ms. Mary Wood Lee, Director  
Campbell Center for Historic Preservation  
Studies  
203 E. Seminary, P.O. Box 66  
Mt. Carroll, IL 61053
12. Mr. Marc Laenen, Director  
ICCROM  
13, Via di San Michele  
I-00153 Rome RM, Italy
13. Mrs. Nellie L. Longworth, President  
Preservation Action  
1350 Connecticut Ave NW, Suite 400-A  
Washington, DC 20036
14. Mr. Michael Lynch, President  
Association for Preservation  
Technology International  
c/o New York State Parks, Recreation  
and Historic Preservation  
Pebbles Island, P.O. Box 189  
Waterford, NY 12188-1089
15. Mr. John McGaw, Program Manager  
National Main Street Center  
National Trust for Historic Preservation  
1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20036
16. Dr. Frank McManamon  
Departmental Consulting Archeologist  
Archeological Assistance Division  
National Park Service  
P.O. Box 37127  
Washington, DC 20013-7127

17. Mrs. Terry Morton, Chairman  
U.S./International Council  
on Monuments and Sites  
1600 H Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006
18. Mr. John H. Myers, Director  
Center for Architectural Conservation  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
Atlanta, GA 30332-0155
19. Ms. Loretta Neumann, President  
Conservation Environment  
& Historic Preservation Inc.  
1133 20th Street, NW, Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20036
20. Ms. Debbie Hess Norris, President  
American Institute for Conservation  
of Historic and Artistic Works  
106 Danforth Place  
Wilmington, DE 19810
21. Ms. Donna Owen  
(invited, but unable to attend)  
Shreveport Office of  
Senator Bennett Johnston  
300 Fannin Street Suite 2240  
Shreveport, LA 71101
22. Mr. Kenneth H. P'Pool  
National Conference of State  
Historic Preservation Officers  
Mississippi Dept. of Archives and History  
618 East Pearl Street  
Jackson, MS 39201
23. Mr. T. Douglas Price, Member Representing  
Society for American Archeology  
University of Wisconsin, Dept of  
Anthropology  
Social Science Building  
Madison, WI 53705
24. Dr. Constance W. Ramirez  
Department of the Army  
Environmental Programs Directorate  
ATTN: DAIM-ED-N  
600 Army Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20310-0600
25. Mr. Lawrence Reger, President  
National Institute for the Conservation  
of Cultural Property  
3299 K Street, NW, Suite 403  
Washington, DC 20037
26. Dr. Elizabeth Reitz, President  
Society for Historical Archeology  
Department of Anthropology  
University of Georgia  
Athens, GA 30602
27. Dr. Louis R. Shaffer  
Deputy/Technical Director  
U.S. Army Construction Engineering  
Research Laboratory  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
P.O. Box 4005  
Champaign, IL 61820-1305
28. Dr. R.E. Taylor, Chair  
National Executive Board  
National Coalition of Applied  
Preservation Technology  
Radiocarbon Laboratory  
University of California at Riverside  
Riverside, CA 92521
29. Dr. Michael A. Tomlan, Chair  
National Council for  
Preservation Education  
College of Architecture, Art and Planning  
210 W. Sibley Hall  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, NY 14853-6701
30. Dr. Lambertus van Zelst, Director  
Conservation Analytical Lab  
Smithsonian Institution(MSC)  
Washington, DC 20560
31. Mr. Colin Wagner  
Arts & Historic Preservation  
Public Buildings Service  
General Services Administration  
18th and F Streets NW.  
Washington, DC 20405

32. Mr. Martin Weaver, Director  
Preservation Research Center  
Columbia University  
c/o 22 Keppler Crescent  
Nepean, Ontario K2H5Y2 CANADA
33. Ms. Connie Wyrick  
Director of Development  
Historic Charleston Foundation  
108 Meeting Street  
Charleston, SC 29401

Representatives from Northwestern State University

1. Dr. Edward W. Graham  
Vice President of Academic Affairs  
Northwestern State University  
Natchitoches, LA 71497
2. Dr. Ada D. Jarred  
Director of Libraries  
Northwestern State University  
Natchitoches, LA 71497

Discussion Facilitators and Recorders

1. Mr. Ward Jandl, Deputy Chief  
Preservation Assistance Division  
National Park Service  
P.O. Box 37127  
Washington, DC 20013-7127
2. Ms. Ann Looper, Director  
Government Affairs  
American Institute of Architects  
1735 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006
3. Ms. Kathleen Byrd  
Northwestern State University  
Natchitoches, LA 71495
4. Mr. Roy E. Graham, AIA  
3133 Connecticut Avenue, NW #221  
Washington, DC 20008
5. Ms. Sally Sims Stokes  
National Trust Preservation Library  
c/o McKeldin Library  
University of Maryland, College Park  
College Park, MD 20742
6. Mr. Peter Stott, Consultant  
23 Bellevue Street  
Medford, MA 02155
7. Ms. Carol S. Gould, Historian  
Preservation Assistance Division  
National Park Service  
P.O. Box 37127  
Washington, DC 20013-7127