

# The Business of Heritage



# The Business of Heritage:

*Global Archaeology and  
International Consultancy*

Edited by

Darran Jordan

**Cambridge  
Scholars  
Publishing**



The Business of Heritage:  
Global Archaeology and International Consultancy

Edited by Darran Jordan

This book first published 2020

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2020 by Darran Jordan and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-5053-2

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-5053-7

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations .....	vii
List of Illustrations .....	xi
List of Tables .....	xv
Chapter One.....	1
Heritage as Big Business: International Approaches to Consultant Archaeology Darran Jordan	
Chapter Two .....	15
The Ulster Scots Archaeological Services Project: Bringing to Life the Early Seventeenth Century Archaeology of Northern Ireland James Lyttleton and Neil Macnab	
Chapter Three .....	39
Science and Serendipity: Geophysical and Archaeological Investigations of Nineteenth Century Fort McNair Scott K. Seibel	
Chapter Four .....	71
Long Term Short Term: Aboriginal Midden Monitoring at Summerland Point, Australia Darran Jordan	
Chapter Five .....	85
A1 Dishforth to Barton: Designing around Roman Archaeology in North Yorkshire, UK Helen Maclean and Jonathan Shipley	
Chapter Six .....	111
Cultural Resources Management at NASA Ames Research Center: Reconciling Operational Needs of a Scientific Institution with Historic Preservation Responsibilities M.K. Meiser	

Chapter Seven.....	137
Luxulyan Valley: A Unique Industrial Landscape in Cornwall Mark Service	
Chapter Eight.....	157
Palimpsests and Persistent Place Use: Investigating Prehistoric Aboriginal Place Use on Sydney’s Cumberland Plain, New South Wales, Australia Andrew P. McLaren and Geordie Oakes	
Chapter Nine.....	189
Connections and Disconnections: Opportunities for the Future of Global Archaeology Darran Jordan	
Contributors.....	195
Bibliography.....	201

# ABBREVIATIONS

As these abbreviations are from various locations around the world, the source country of the abbreviated term has been included in brackets at the end where relevant.

AAJV - AECOM Aurecon Joint Venture (Australia)

AACP - Advisory Council for Historic Preservation (USA)

AD - Anno Domini, Latin for in the year of the Lord, used to denote a dating system counting years from the start of the epoch traditionally estimated as the birth year of Jesus Christ

ADTOAC - Awabakal Descendants Traditional Owners Aboriginal Corporation (Australia)

AECOM - Architecture, Engineering, Consulting, Operations and Maintenance

AHF - Aerodynamic Heating Facility (USA)

AHIMS - Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System (Australia)

AHIP - Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (Australia)

AIMA - Australian Institute for Maritime Archaeology (Australia)

AHF - Aerodynamic Heating Facility (USA)

ARC - Ames Research Center (USA)

ASHA - Australasian Society for Historical Archaeology (Australia)

ATOAC - Awabakal Traditional Owners Aboriginal Corporation (Australia)

bgl - Below Ground Level

BHDA - Box Hill Development Area (Australia)

BIM - Building Information Modelling (UK)

BLALC - Bahtabah Local Aboriginal Land Council (Australia)

BP - Before Present, meaning the number of years before the present, with "present" defined as 1950 AD, reflecting the year of origin that practical radiocarbon dating commenced

c. - circa

CBD - Central Business District (Australia)

cm - centimetre

CMP - Conservation Management Plan

CMR - Cornwall Minerals Railway

CMSJV - Carillion/Morgan Sindall Joint Venture (UK)

DC - District of Columbia (USA)

DEFRA - Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (UK)

DGPS - Differential Global Positioning System

DLALC - Darkinjung Local Aboriginal Land Council (Australia)

EM - electromagnetic

FEMA - Federal Emergency Management Agency (USA)

FGS - Fine-Grained Siliceous (Australia)

GIS - Geographic Information System

GPR - Ground Penetrating Radar

GTLAC - Guringai Tribal Link Aboriginal Corporation (Australia)

HLF - Heritage Lottery Fund (UK)

IAC - Irish Archaeological Consultancy (UK)

ICRMP - Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (USA)

IHF - Interactive Heating Facility (USA)



in - inch

JBM-HH - Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall (USA)

Jr - Junior

km - kilometres

kPa – kilopascal (a unit of pressure measurement)

m – metres

mm - millimetre

MAGUS - Ministerial Advisory Group for the Ulster Scots Academy (UK)

MHz - megahertz

MMP - Maintenance Management Plan (UK)

MNF - Minimum Number of Flakes (Australia)

NACA - National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (USA)

NAS - Naval Air Station (USA)

NASA - National Aeronautics and Space Administration (USA)

NFAC - National Full-Scale Aerodynamics Complex (USA)

NHL – National Historic Landmark (USA)

NHPA - National Historic Preservation Act (USA)

NPR - NASA Procedural Requirement (USA)

NPS - US National Park Service (USA)

NRHP - National Register of Historic Places (USA)

NSW - New South Wales (Australia)

OA - Open Area (Australia)

OEH - NSW Office of Environment and Heritage (Australia)

- OUV - Outstanding Universal Value (UK)
- PTF - Panel Test Facility (USA)
- RAP – Registered Aboriginal Party (Australia)
- RPA - Registered Professional Archaeologist
- SMR - Sites and Monuments Record (UK)
- STP - Shovel Test Pit
- SVS - Steam Vacuum System (USA)
- TFD - Turbulent Flow Duct (USA)
- TPG - Technical Practice Group
- TPS - Thermal Protection Systems (USA)
- UID - Unique Identifier
- UK - United Kingdom
- UNESCO - United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
- US/USA - United States of America
- USACE - United States Army Corps of Engineers (USA)
- USGS - United States Geologic Service (USA)
- V/STOL - Vertical/Short Take-off and Landing
- WHS - World Heritage Site
- YAC - Young Archaeologists' Club (UK)

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

- Figure 1-1: AECOM Sydney Heritage Team Display Case featuring circa 1840s historical material from the Woolloomooloo area (top two shelves) and reproductions of traditional Indigenous objects, manufactured by AECOM heritage team members as tools for learning and teaching (lower two shelves)
- Figure 2-1: Map of Ulster showing lands granted to English, Scottish and Irish grantees
- Figure 2-2: Thomas Raven's map of one of the plantation villages in County Londonderry in 1622 – the Drapers' village of Moneymore T510/1/37. The fortified house was protected within a bawn (courtyard), and placed at the head of the village, dominating the main thoroughfare. The village is centred on a crossroads with a market cross, and the villagers dwelled in various building types, namely timber-framed houses, stone-built houses and smaller thatched cabins (Courtesy of the Deputy Keeper of the Records, Public Record Office of Northern Ireland)
- Figure 2-3: Thomas Raven's map of the houses at Servants Hill outside Bangor, County Down in 1625
- Figure 2-4: Archaeological excavation at Servants Hill uncovered the remains of Bronze Age houses, though nothing of the early modern houses depicted by Raven in his 1625 map
- Figure 2-5: A school group is shown how a historic building like Derrywoone Castle in County Tyrone is studied by archaeologists. In the background, at first-floor level, in the re-entrant angle between the two wings, is a corbelled stone turret which contained a stairwell that allowed access to the upper floors
- Figure 2-6: Members from the Cavanaleck Community Association excavate in the shadow of Monea Castle in County Fermanagh
- Figure 2-7: A member of *Claiomh*, a military 'living history' group, displaying seventeenth century blacksmithing in the grounds of Monea Castle, County Fermanagh during an open day for members of the public to view the results of the excavation there
- Figure 2-8: The results of the archaeological excavations carried out at Servants Hill, Derrywoone Castle and Monea Castle formed the basis of an education resource pack for use within the Northern Irish school system
- Figure 2-9: Students in Carrickfergus, County Antrim, handling artefacts recovered from the excavations of seventeenth century sites, as well as replica weapons from the early modern era
- Figure 3-1: Project site boundary shown in relation to the wider Washington area. United States Geologic Service (USGS)
- Figure 3-2: Project site boundaries overlaid on contemporary aerial imagery. Bing, Microsoft Corporation, <http://bing.com>, accessed 15 December 2011

- Figure 3-3: Project site boundaries overlaid on Albert Boschke's 1857 Map of Washington City, DC, seat of the federal government: respectfully dedicated to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of North America. Library of Congress, Geography and Map Division Washington, DC. G3850 1857 B62 Vault
- Figure 3-4: Andrew Russell's 1863 image - Arsenal yard, Washington, DC, from roof of model arsenal. Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Civil War Photographs, LOT 11486-H, no. 3 [P&P]
- Figure 3-5: Bell and Brothers undated photograph of the US Arsenal at Washington, DC. Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Civil War Photographs, LOT 4149-8 [item] [P&P]
- Figure 3-6: Project site boundary overlaid on 1835 layout from William Crawford, esq., on the Penitentiaries of the United States. Home Office of Great Britain, London. Electronic document, <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=umn.31951002343340d>, accessed 15 March 2018
- Figure 3-7: 1865 photograph of Washington Penitentiary, photographer unknown. Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Civil War Photographs
- Figure 3-8: Undated photograph of Washington Penitentiary, National Defense University (NDU) Digital Collections Library, Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall
- Figure 3-9: Execution of the conspirators: View of the scaffold. 1865 photograph by Alexander Gardner. Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Civil War Photographs, LC-B817- 7759 [P&P] LOT 4195
- Figure 3-10: Project site boundaries overlaid on the 1881 Plan of the Washington Barracks by Adolph Cluss and Paul Schulze, US Army Quartermaster Department, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC
- Figure 3-11: Project site boundaries overlaid on the 1904 Map of the City of Washington, for the use of the Engineer Department, Washington, DC. Electronic document, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, <http://historicalcharts.noaa.gov/historicals/preview/image/DC1904C>, accessed 15 December 2011
- Figure 3-12: Undated aerial photograph of Washington Penitentiary area post-demolition. National Defense University, Digital Collections Library, Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall
- Figure 3-13: GPR data overlaid on Albert Boschke's 1857 Map of Washington City, DC, Library of Congress, Geography and Map Division Washington, DC. G3850 1857 B62 Vault
- Figure 3-14: GPR data overlaid on contemporary aerial. Bing, Microsoft Corporation, <http://bing.com>, accessed 15 December 2011
- Figure 3-15: GPR results showing possible heritage features. Bing, Microsoft Corporation, <http://bing.com>, accessed 15 December 2011
- Figure 3-16: GPR data overlaid on 1835 layout from William Crawford, esq., on the Penitentiaries of the United States. Electronic document, <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=umn.31951002343340d>, accessed 15 March 2018

- Figure 3-17: GPR data overlaid on contemporary aerial. Bing, Microsoft Corporation, <http://bing.com>, accessed 15 December 2011
- Figure 3-18: GPR results showing possible heritage features. Bing, Microsoft Corporation, <http://bing.com>, accessed 15 December 2011
- Figure 4-1: Survey point locations with the shell midden shown as a dotted area, based on the 1994 recording of surface shell distribution
- Figure 4-2: Exposed shell visible on the walking track during the 2015 inspection (photo by the author)
- Figure 4-3: Eroding midden deposits impacted by wave motion noted during the 2015 inspection (photo by the author)
- Figure 5-1: Location Plan. 1. Little Holtby. 2. Bowbridge Lane. 3. Marne/Bainesse enclosure. 4. Cataractonium. 5. Gatherley Villa. 6. Scurragh House. 7. Scotch Corner
- Figure 5-2: Geophysical survey result from Healam Bridge, showing extensive Roman remains surviving as subsurface features. The survey clearly shows remains of the Roman fort, as well as the associated settlement and field system to the south, and to a lesser degree, the north
- Figure 5-3: Geophysical survey plan of Bainesse Farm
- Figure 5-4: Sheet Piling and Archaeology
- Figure 5-5: Soil nails at Catterick Cutting
- Figure 5-6: Excavations of the northern suburbs of Cataractonium looking south towards the River Swale. Traces of Dere Street are visible in the section on the left, while the remains of some of the earliest structures can be seen under excavation
- Figure 5-7: The northern suburbs under excavation. The area fenced off in the centre of the images represents the section of the settlement selected for retention under embankment
- Figure 5-8: Pea shingle layer over the archaeology
- Figure 5-9: Geotextile layer over the archaeology
- Figure 5-10: An example of the complex archaeology that formed the area retained under embankment, as well as the northern suburbs in general. The full section through the retention area was recorded and cut back with sample area excavated in order to characterise the archaeology and help with dating
- Figure 5-11: Archaeological features at Fort Bridge
- Figure 5-12: Leather shoe from Fort Bridge
- Figure 5-13: An extract of the BIM produced as part of the scheme. This screenshot shows the Fort Bridge area as Catterick Road crossed the A1, with the predicted level of archaeological deposits plotted against the proposed drainage and new road heights required to accommodate the new bridge
- Figure 5-14: Geophysical survey plan of Scotch Corner
- Figure 5-15: Pre-Excavation Plan of Scotch Corner
- Figure 5-16: Local community members at Open Day
- Figure 6-1: ARC located at the southern end of San Francisco Bay
- Figure 6-2: ARC areas of development
- Figure 6-3: Hangar One (Source: AECOM)
- Figure 6-4: NAS Sunnyvale (Hangar One)

- Figure 6-5: NAS Sunnyvale (Hangar One at centre), 1934 (Source: Moffett Field Historical Society)
- Figure 6-6: Moffett Field, 1972 (Source: Moffett Field Historical Society)
- Figure 6-7: Site of Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, view facing south-east (Hangar One at left, mooring circle at right), 1940 (Source: NASA Headquarters Archives)
- Figure 6-8: ARC, 1964 (Source: NASA Headquarters Archives)
- Figure 6-9: The National Full-Scale Aerodynamics Complex (NFAC) (Source: NASA)
- Figure 6-10: Shenandoah Plaza (Source: NASA)
- Figure 6-11: Ames Administration Building (Source: AECOM)
- Figure 6-12: Vertical Motion Simulator (Source: NASA)
- Figure 6-13: TPS testing in the IHF (Source: NASA)
- Figure 6-14: The Arc Jet Complex in 1974 (Source: NASA)
- Figure 7-1: Treffry Viaduct
- Figure 7-2: Location of Luxulyan Valley
- Figure 7-3: The Fowey Consols Leat
- Figure 7-4: The Carmears Incline
- Figure 7-5: Treffry Viaduct
- Figure 7-6: Carmears Leat launder
- Figure 7-7: The Velvet Path
- Figure 7-8: Stone Mills at Carmears
- Figure 7-9: The Central Cornwall Dry
- Figure 7-10: Gazetteer Sample Page
- Figure 8-1: Map of the greater Sydney region and Cumberland Plain (dashed line) showing location of Box Hill Development Area (BHDA) and the distribution of the St Marys and Rickabys Creek Gravel Formations referred to in-text
- Figure 8-2: 2016 aerial photograph of the BHDA showing location of OA1, OA2 and OA3 within open artefact sites BH1, BH4 and BH-AS2-14, as well as other relevant features (Base aerial photography from Nearnmap™, used under AECOM Australia Pty Ltd license, 2018)
- Figure 8-3: Distribution of flaked stone artefacts across OA1 (excluding heat shatters and other technologically non-diagnostic items) - pre-existing test excavations unit shown as outlined square
- Figure 8-4: Distribution of flaked stone artefacts across OA2 (excluding heat shatters and other technologically non-diagnostic items) - pre-existing test excavations units shown as outlined square
- Figure 8-5: Distribution of flaked stone artefacts across OA3 (excluding heat shatters and other technologically non-diagnostic items) - pre-existing test excavations unit shown as outlined square

## LIST OF TABLES

- Table 4:1 Recordings taken at intervals along #45-7-0189
- Table 4:2 Recordings from replacement locations along #45-7-0189
- Table 8-1: OSL dates for the clay B soil horizons within OA1, OA2 and OA3
- Table 8-2: Simplified typological breakdowns of OA1, OA2 and OA3 lithic assemblages
- Table 8-3: Summary of artefact density for OA1, OA2 and OA3 (excluding heat shatters and other technologically non-diagnostic items)
- Table 8-4: Raw materials within OA1, OA2 and OA3 by Minimum Number of Flakes (MNF), number of individual pieces and weight (percentage in brackets)
- Table 8-5: Frequency and proportion (in brackets) of complete core types per assemblage
- Table 8-6: Frequency and proportion (in brackets) of rotated versus non-rotated core forms per assemblage
- Table 8-7: Mean length, width and thickness of complete cores in the OA1, OA2 and OA3 assemblages
- Table 8-8: T-test results for comparisons of mean core dimensions between OA1, OA2 and OA3
- Table 8-9: Descriptive statistics for number of complete and partial scars (>5mm) preserved on complete non-bipolar cores
- Table 8-10: Non-cortical to cortical artefact ratio for OA1, OA2 and OA3
- Table 8-11: Descriptive statistics for size of unmodified flakes in the OA1, OA2 and OA3 assemblages
- Table 8-12: T-test results for comparisons of the size of complete flakes in the OA1, OA2 and OA3 assemblages
- Table 8-13: Frequency and proportion (in brackets) of striking platform types per assemblage
- Table 8-14: Frequency and proportion (in brackets) of tool types in OA1, OA2 and OA3 assemblages





## CHAPTER ONE

# HERITAGE AS BIG BUSINESS: INTERNATIONAL APPROACHES TO CONSULTANT ARCHAEOLOGY

DARRAN JORDAN

The broader study of grey literature in general has been undertaken since at least 1975 when the first edition of Auger's *Use of Reports Literature* was published. Although the book discusses grey literature, that specific term was not used at the time, coined instead through the later work *Information Sources in Grey Literature* (Auger, 1989). Since then the study has developed, with publications and conferences devoted to defining, assessing and categorising the vast amounts of material produced each year that fall outside the bounds of traditional publication. In the past this has been largely focused on reports, whether scientific, government or private industry, with reference to the Luxembourg definition of what constitutes material falling into the category of grey. The Third International Conference on Grey Literature in 1997 was where the Luxembourg definition was first decided, stating that grey literature consisted of: "that which is produced on all levels of government, academics, business and industry in print and electronic formats, but which is not controlled by commercial publishers" (Schöpfel, 2010). While the increased volume of material, speed of production, scale of replication and temporality of publication associated with the internet has led to new definitions and the revision of past approaches (Schöpfel, 2010), the Luxembourg definition of grey literature is appropriate to refer to when discussing the contents of this volume, which is primarily concerned with the grey literature of commercial archaeology and heritage, as opposed to the broader grey literature of the world at large (Seymour, 2009; 2010).

A number of repositories for grey literature have developed internationally, including the University of New South Wales (NSW) Library in Australia, which maintains an Open Access institutional repository, and the National Technical Reports Library in the United States of America (USA), which is a repository for Government-sponsored research and development reports. In Europe the OpenGrey literature database curates reports on a variety of subject areas, including public health and health related studies. The Australian Web Archive, accessed through the National Library of Australia web archive TROVE, collects grey literature gathered since 1996, originally contained within separate collections such as the PANDORA Archive, the Australian Government Web Archive and various other library collections. There are of course heritage specific archives as well, such as the Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System (AHIMS) register for NSW, Australia, focussing on Aboriginal heritage reports. In 2019 the Department of Premier and Cabinet in Australia commenced a programme of digitisation for grey literature contained within the NSW Heritage Library, containing archaeological reports, research designs and excavation methodologies produced under the *Heritage Act 1977*. As noted by Seymour (2010) the prejudice of perceived inaccessibility relating to heritage grey literature is one of the reasons it often remains unreferenced in academic works.

When Dr Andrew McLaren, one of the contributing authors of this volume, was undergoing the peer review process to finalise an academic paper for journal inclusion, he noted that one of the reviewers commented on the inclusion of archaeology consultancy reports in the reference list. The reviewer's comments suggested that he remove such references, stating that unpublished reports were effectively unavailable to researchers, concluding that in the context of academia it was as if they did not exist. In stark contrast to such a perceived availability of archaeology consultancy reports is the relevance of their content. Across the world vast amounts of archaeological investigation is being undertaken each year by consultants whose primary method of publication output is through grey literature.

The reasons for the limited dissemination of archaeology and heritage consultant research are multiple. These investigations are funded by a client that has commissioned a specific body of work with a predetermined scope and budget. This is not research for research's sake, the majority of clients being motivated by legislative requirements, with their preferred outcome being to have their project supported and approved irrespective of the heritage findings. This could consist of anything, from mining to

residential development or government infrastructure associated with power, roads and water. Should the project prove to be sensitive in some way, such as for commercial reasons or due to identified cultural sensitivity, the client may not wish to have the report made public, in which case it might only ever be seen by the consultant, the client and the appropriate government legislator, unless it is made available later to heritage consultants undertaking subsequent work within or adjacent to the same area. Petitions from the consultant to write an academic paper to disseminate the findings to a wider audience may in such cases be refused.

Another reason for the lack of published material resulting from consultant investigations is the time pressure associated with working within a commercial industry. Consultancies operate competitively in a commercial world, with deadlines and budgets both constraining factors. Before one project is completed the next is already underway, and there is seldom time in the working day for consultants to transform their grey literature into academic material and remain up to date with the sizeable volume of relevant published literature. This is not always the case, and many practitioners strive to allocate time for producing published outputs when costing at the proposal stage of a new assessment. The reality is though that the volume of grey literature reports far outweighs the publication of academic papers. The scale of this is in some ways evidenced by the fact that in 2018 the Australasian Society for Historical Archaeology (ASHA) and the Australian Institute for Maritime Archaeology (AIMA) ran a joint conference under the theme of *The Clearinghouse*. The conference was announced with the tag lines: “Come see all the research that’s been hiding! Come hear all the results that haven’t seen the light of day! Come and listen to all the wondrous things people have done in the past!” The intention behind this was to encourage presentation of research that had not yet been published, or “for the “I really should do something with that” to finally have something done with it” as they put it in their call for abstracts (ASHA, 2018).

The volume of archaeological investigation that is only documented in consultancy reports is significant. Taking the example of the Cumberland Plain in NSW, Australia, due to residential development across its bounds it has been intensively investigated by consultant archaeologists, through survey, Aboriginal consultation and programmes of both subsurface testing for the presence or absence of cultural deposits and salvage excavation. Although it can be said that the number of consultancy reports detailing these investigations totals at least in the thousands, it is difficult to verify an exact number since many reports are not distributed further

than the consultant and their client. Despite the exact number of past reports remaining unverified, those that are known suggest that this is one of the most intensively investigated areas in Australia. Regardless, there remains a paucity of published material about it, the data having been primarily captured through grey literature alone. As of 2018 there are still only a handful of papers published in academic journals that detail the archaeological findings across this region (Smith, 1986; Jo McDonald CHM, 2005; Williams *et al.*, 2014:739–742; Owen and Cowie, 2017; McLaren *et al.*, 2018). There is also a self-sustaining quality to the grey literature of archaeology, in that the predictive models, assessments of significance and findings therein tend to refer to and build on those from other grey literature reports. The resulting web of self-referential grey literature studies thus have less need to interact with publications beyond the existing bounds and become part of a self-supporting structure.

This, therefore, presents a paradox. Across the world there is an increasing scale of ongoing archaeological investigation undertaken by consultant archaeologists, yet the work of these heritage professionals often remains unseen beyond a small circle due to the specific requirements of the assessments they produce. As stated by Seymour (2010) “non-traditional publication venues have a range of benefits including speedy distribution, presentation of abundant amounts of data, inclusion of in-depth analyses, consideration of a range of methodological and theoretical issues using sizable datasets, often rigorous multi-tiered peer review, and avoidance of many of the stifling political hurdles and time delays of traditional publishing”. All of which points to the importance and validity of heritage grey literature produced by commercial archaeology, in contrast to the limited audience reading the work. The purpose of this book is both to highlight this situation and to examine what it means for global archaeology when a vast amount of heritage investigation is driven by business concerns, with environmental consultancies motivated by the economic opportunity to provide services for clients seeking to comply with specific legislative requirements. To examine how big business connects to ongoing heritage investigation on a global scale, this volume has taken as its case study an international consultancy company that employs archaeologists throughout the world.

The company AECOM (Architecture, Engineering, Consulting, Operations and Maintenance) was founded by Richard Newman in the United States in 1990. It stemmed from an employee buyout of parent company Ashland Technology Corporation, which was itself originally comprised of five

legacy corporations<sup>1</sup>. Originally focussed on the markets of the United States (US), a culture of diversification and expansion led the company to increase over time into a global organisation (Rodengen, 2010:iv). Since 1990 the company's expansion has been undertaken through regular mergers with other companies, in order to diversify AECOM further in the global market. This included Maunsell in 2000, a company that had industry presence in the Middle East, Hong Kong/China and Australia. In 2002 the AECOM company merged with Oscar Faber which led to increased services being offered in the United Kingdom (UK). Then in 2005 the company merged with ENSR International, an environmental management firm which included heritage consultation services as one of its departments. These and other mergers have continued to grow AECOM's market reach and available services, which now include global environmental services, under the auspices of which sits heritage and archaeological consultation (Rodengen, 2010:6-43).

As of 2019 AECOM has a market presence in over 150 countries and employs in excess of 400 archaeologists and heritage specialists. Its primary focus is on designing, building and operating buildings and infrastructure assets. Environmental services are just one small part of the larger business structure. The focus of this volume is on work and publications in the English-speaking world, meaning that the grey and scholarly literature cited is necessarily in English. AECOM's non-English resources are therefore beyond the scope of this volume, but it should be acknowledged that an international company does present opportunities to examine different heritage systems and processes across the globe in relation to different countries and cultures.

AECOM archaeologists and heritage specialists are grouped in disparate locations across the globe, working primarily on projects that are local to them, but there are a number of ways in which they are connected within the larger company they work for. Until her departure from the company Dr Amy Ollendorf, based in the Minneapolis office, produced a regular cultural heritage newsletter and world heritage news report that were distributed electronically to all archaeologists and heritage specialists throughout the company. The newsletter particularly focussed on what projects the various AECOM heritage teams were working on, with the capacity for sharing knowledge on field techniques, excavation finds, laboratory results and the latest technological innovations. Further to this

---

<sup>1</sup> Consoer, Townsend & Associates Inc.; Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall; Frederic R. Harris Inc.; Holmes & Narver Inc. and P&D Technologies Inc.

are company-wide paper presentations, as of 2018 organised by Dr Jonathan Shipley from the Newcastle upon Tyne office in the UK. Presented through an online conferencing system called WebEx, these papers are also recorded and maintained in an online video register under a Technical Practice Group (TPG) webpage on the AECOM intranet. The Cultural Resources TPG, led by Cultural Resources Team Lead Dr Gordon C. Tucker Jr. based in Colorado in the US, also contains a Technical Papers Library featuring conference proceedings, posters and webinars, a resource maintained as of 2018 by archaeologist Daniel Cassidy, based at the Raleigh office in North Carolina, US. The TPG also offers a social tool, originally Chatter, updated in 2020 to Teams, that allows archaeologists to connect through posted messages, discussing everything from their latest projects to changes in legislation and the latest discoveries in world heritage. In Australia the Sydney based heritage team present artefacts through a display cabinet, providing insight to other business groups on recent finds and project outcomes (see Figure 1-1).

All of these points of connection denote a community of archaeologists and heritage practitioners tied together by a shared employer, rather than being linked, as would be more traditional, through a heritage specific organisation or educational institution. The AECOM corporate culture actively encourages collaboration and connection across the wider business, the benefit being that should a project require a mix of skills, such as ecological, engineering or visual specialist inputs for example, experts in those fields can be sourced through internal company contacts and a collaborative assessment produced. Knowledge sharing between archaeologists and heritage specialists increases their own awareness and information, just as collaboration with other fields allows increased opportunities for studies to incorporate a variety of techniques and meet a range of legislative and client needs. Such interdisciplinary engagement opportunities are made possible and actively encouraged in AECOM's business structure.

There is a stark difference however between being linked through a business and being linked through a historical society or archaeological association. The latter organisations operate with a constitution, charter and code of ethics, with principles specifically relating to, for example, archaeology, Indigenous peoples and local communities. A company like AECOM of course does have its own codes and principles, with employees required to undertake inductions and online courses across such topics as safety, quality, anticorruption and conduct. Indigenous Cultural Competency Training was trialled with select company representatives in

Australia in 2018, through an online course presented by Shelley Reys (Arrilla Services, 2018).



**Figure 1-1: AECOM Sydney Heritage Team Display Case featuring circa 1840s historical material from the Woolloomooloo area (top two shelves) and reproductions of traditional Indigenous objects, manufactured by AECOM heritage team members as tools for learning and teaching (lower two shelves)**

Regardless, there is currently no uniform constitution relating specifically to heritage and archaeology at AECOM. This is not a problem, in that most employees are simultaneously members of societies and associations that provide for those needs. AECOM's employees also operate as consultants under set legislative requirements which may require compliance with government guidelines. Beyond this, the shared foundations for consultant archaeologists come from their qualifications, gained through study at recognised educational institutions. The reason for drawing this distinction is to point out that while companies can connect employees in a number of different ways, they are not the sole organisation to which a heritage specialist will belong or have obligations. It should also be noted that practitioners are likely to move from job to job over the course of their career, and while a company like AECOM might be their primary connection point while they work there, heritage specific organisations will necessarily provide continuity on forms of professional conduct and ethical behaviour relating to heritage and archaeology, should they move on to work at other consultancies. Regardless, the number of specialists joined together by commercial enterprises and the sheer volume of output evidenced by their combined grey literature points to the significance of companies as global entities contributing to the development of knowledge on the broader stage of world heritage and archaeology.

This book seeks to provide a cross section of the type of projects, approaches and outcomes evident through commercial enterprises engaging in heritage and archaeology. In this case a variety of archaeologists and heritage specialists from across the globe, connected through their shared employer AECOM, have produced papers describing projects they have undertaken. These include contributions on archaeology projects undertaken in Northern Ireland, the US, Australia and Great Britain. It should be noted that these papers are a limited representation of the variety of projects undertaken by AECOM archaeologists and the volume of assessment reports produced each year. Given the space constraints of this volume it has been necessary to select key papers as indicative examples only, to provide points for discussion and comparison about the larger body of corporate heritage work of which they form a part.

The first of the papers to be included in this volume is by James Lyttleton and Neil Macnab, who describe their work on the Ulster Scots Archaeological Services Project in Northern Ireland. This was a multidisciplinary project involving a number of archaeological consultancies and organisations, from excavation partners to cross-community outreach and engagement officers, schools and clubs for young archaeologists. The



project involved archaeological excavation at three locations, Servants Hill located in the suburbs of Bangor, Derrywoone Castle in County Tyrone and Monea Castle in County Fermanagh, along with survey and mapping for related sites in the surrounding landscape. The main focus for AECOM involvement however was in how the archaeological information could be most effectively communicated to the broader community, considering the specific needs of a variety of community groups, from school students to pensioners. The involvement of various community groups in field based activities as well as the production of books aimed at such markets as education, tourism and heritage management, sought a holistic approach which recognised the importance of archaeological sites in contemporary society and their position as an ongoing part of the living landscape. The palimpsest provided by the ancient extruding into the modern landscape provides an opportunity to engage the wider general public in connecting with the past through an exploration of it within the familiar surroundings of their contemporary lives. The political and religious associations of the past were also noted as still relevant in the present, as the archaeological investigations identified historical affiliations with Protestant and Catholic artefacts and histories. The inherently political nature of archaeology was highlighted as an aspect of this project which required targeted application in how it was presented to the descendant communities of present day.

The next paper documents Scott Seibel's geophysical and archaeological investigations into Fort McNair in Washington, District of Columbia (DC), in the US. The historical narrative of the area evidenced consistent military use from the American Civil War through to World Wars I and II and beyond. It was also the location for the incarceration, trial, execution and temporary burial of conspirators in the assassination of President Abraham Lincoln. While Seibel's investigation uncovers the arbitrary nature of preservation and destruction over time and limitations in fully reconstructing specific periods or historical moments, it also highlights the rich palimpsest of archaeological material that gathers over multiple periods of time within a limited geographical area. The geophysical and archaeological findings evidenced a narrative of development and change, telling an archaeologically specific story that could not be accessed in any other way. Necessarily that story also includes the method of discovery itself, as Seibel's own investigation becomes a part of the material history of Fort McNair, made possible by developments in technology allowing for widespread investigation while limiting further ground disturbance.

Following this is a study of the long-term monitoring of an Aboriginal shell midden site, undertaken by the editor of this publication, at

Summerland Point, NSW, Australia. Consisting of the accumulated layers of refuse from meals of oyster and other marine resources by Aboriginal people over long periods of time, the primary archaeological significance of a midden is in the information it can provide of past dietary intake. In NSW however, where the invading culture has caused discontinuous cultural transmission within the Aboriginal community and there is widespread continuing site destruction, midden sites have taken on additional cultural significance as markers in the landscape that provide tangible links to ancestors. For this reason the Summerland Point site was both preserved and monitored to ensure no adverse impacts were caused by an adjacent mining project. Archaeological sites, by their nature, are features of both time and space, but analysis of them (particularly in consultant archaeology) is often constrained to a short period. The Summerland Point project provided a unique opportunity to note both natural and human based impacts to a large-scale site over an extended period of time.

Similarly, searching for efficient methods of long-term preservation in relation to archaeological material, Helen Maclean and Jonathan Shipley's paper details design solutions used to avoid Roman Archaeology in North Yorkshire, UK, during the construction of the A1 roadway between Dishforth and Barton. A collaborative approach and the capacity to provide archaeological input prior to the finalisation of designs meant that deeply stratified deposits associated with the Roman town of Cataractonium were able to be preserved *in situ*. The capacity to ensure the deposits were not impacted by the required construction works included investigation into the impacts of pressure on the buried archaeological deposits. Protective layers to preserve these deposits were employed, just as areas either side of the protected deposit were subject to archaeological excavation to answer targeted research questions about how the settlement evolved, its character, and the relationship of the town's defences to the settlement.

The project resulted in archaeologically significant information, identifying a previously unknown Roman settlement established during Emperor Nero's reign (AD 54-68), far earlier than any other known northern frontier settlement, dating to within 20 years of the Roman invasion of Britain in AD 43. These discoveries were communicated to the general public through presentations, museum displays, publications and finds handling sessions. Ownership of the past was not restricted to the purview of the archaeologist but was shared as widely as possible with the local populace to encourage their interaction with their own heritage. Another

important outcome separate from the finds was the development and refinement of new archaeological techniques, such as the use of pea shingle, a self-compacting material, as a protective layer to protect *in situ* deposits, and the use of Building Information Modelling (BIM) to assist in identifying potential impacts on archaeological remains. Without a collaborative approach many of these innovations would not have been possible and may have led to increased destruction of valuable archaeological deposits, rather than their ongoing protection.

In her chapter on the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Ames Research Center, M. K. Meiser details the conflicts that arise when the need for historical preservation is set against the operational requirements of a scientific institution. It is a highly significant facility with associated heritage significance for its contribution to the development of space exploration technology. It is also an active technical and scientific facility with an important role in contemporary testing and development. NASA's cultural resources management policy guides restoration, preservation and new development at this location, attempting to balance these requirements with remaining at the cutting edge so that new discoveries can be made. Within the ever developing context of space exploration, looking now towards manned missions to Mars, it remains important that NASA allows the facilities to develop rather than stagnate. They have also come to recognise, however, that an understanding and recognition of the past is an important foundation from which to build. The heritage features covered by the management policy are culturally and symbolically important for a variety of reasons, as defined and contextualised by Meiser. It provides an interesting contrast that in the ongoing business of space exploration, with its associated images of futurity, the past has become important as an ongoing consideration in the decision making process at NASA.

Following Meiser is Mark Service's paper on Luxulyan Valley, an area that contains an eighteenth century industrial landscape. Located in mid-Cornwall, UK, the Valley contains a number of nationally and regionally significant heritage assets. Being designated as part of the Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape World Heritage site, managed by Cornwall Council under a Conservation Management Plan (CMP). Service outlines the challenges faced in updating the CMP, which required condition assessments and a holistic understanding of the site, including item uses, significance and accessibility. The process of undertaking this work led to new information being identified and the expansion of the CMP to include item specific recommendations for ongoing management.

Service outlines the process, the challenges and the opportunities that resulted from this work, including engaging with the local communities of the valley through various initiatives. The outcome was that the resulting CMP will continue to guide the conservation and maintenance of the site for years to come. The driving point of this paper however is to outline the various factors that feed into management documents and the opportunities this provides to heritage specialists.

Finally, Andrew P. McLaren and Geordie Oakes outline the new archaeological information they have identified regarding Aboriginal place use through archaeological testing on the Cumberland Plain in Sydney, Australia. Where erosion has caused the loss of stratigraphic integrity at sites on the Cumberland Plain, this has led to deflated assemblages of Aboriginal stone tools, indicative of spatial activity but creating a palimpsest of temporal use. By defining the salvaged sites detailed in this paper as representative of multiple settlement systems, McLaren and Oakes have engaged with the landform elements of the Cumberland Plain as representative of repeated use by Aboriginal people over prolonged periods of time. The complexity of assemblage formation in this area is investigated in relation to lithic reduction and use as well as the intensity of core reduction at different locations. Although occupational histories and environmental, economic and social phenomena cannot be reconstructed solely from an examination of salvaged lithics, McLaren and Oakes attest that the complexities they have identified hint at variable occupation histories in this area.

Each of the papers in this volume is an example of archaeological work undertaken within the bounds of a larger corporate structure. The works have been motivated by various needs, from a government directive to raise awareness of history, heritage and culture for the Ulster Scots Project in Northern Ireland, to development in the grounds of Fort McNair in Washington, USA and at the NASA Ames Research Center in California, USA. Roman Archaeology was identified in North Yorkshire, UK due to the development of the A1 Dishforth to Barton road. In Australia the opportunity to monitor changes to a midden site over time and to salvage artefacts from sites within the Cumberland Plain occurred due to mining and residential development activity. Consultant archaeology across the world is often on the front line with regard to the identification, preservation and salvage of cultural deposits, historical relics and sites. As human development and expansion continues across the globe under the economic system of capitalism, it is perhaps fitting that commercial enterprises offering heritage services have the opportunity to provide

balance, considering our human past in the context of the rapid expansionist activity of our present and future. As was previously noted, the work of commercial archaeology and heritage can lack in the dissemination of findings to a wider audience beyond the realms of grey literature; this volume aims to go some way towards addressing that by presenting this limited representation of what the consultants of one company have contributed to our knowledge of the human past.

