

## Minutes

## A303 Stonehenge – Amesbury to Berwick Down

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Scientific Committee</b>		
<b>Date:</b>	02 July 2019	<b>Time:</b>	11:00 – 14:00
<b>Location:</b>	Wiltshire and Swindon History Centre Cocklebury Road, Chippenham, SN15 3QN.		

### Invited Attendees:

#### **Scientific Committee**

Professor Sir Barry Cunliffe  
 Professor Andrew Fitzpatrick  
 Dr David Field  
 Professor Josh Pollard  
 Mike Pitts  
 Dr Colin Shell  
 Professor Mike Parker Pearson  
 Professor Vince Gaffney (Phone)  
 Professor Oliver Craig (Phone)  
 Professor Nicky Milner (Phone)

#### **HMAG**

Melanie Pomeroy-Kellinger (Wiltshire Council)  
 Rachel Foster (Wiltshire Council)  
 Dr Nicola Snashall (National Trust)  
 Dr Helen Woodhouse (Historic England)  
 Dr Hayley McParland (Historic England)

#### **Highways England**

Andrew Clark (Highways England)  
 James Hunter (Highways England)  
 Chris Moore (AmW)  
 Neil Macnab (AmW)  
 Dr Matt Leivers (Wessex Archaeology)

**Chair:** Sir Barry Cunliffe

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1. Welcome and Apologies</b> Apologies were received from the following members: Dr Heather Sebire (English Heritage) Dr Mike Allen Professor Clive Ruggles Professor Tim Darvill	
<b>2. Minutes of Last Meeting and Actions</b> Minutes accepted by all present. Hydrology report is in the Examination HE to follow up.	<b>AC</b>
<b>3. Matters Arising</b> Blick Mead SoCG when agreed to be circulated to members for information.	<b>AC</b>
<b>4. Discussion Points</b> a. Overview of updates/changes since D2 submission – <i>AmW presentation (15 mins)</i>  Deadline 4 DAMS has been circulated to committee members as part of the submission, main change is Archaeological Research Strategy is its own section.	

## Minutes

## A303 Stonehenge – Amesbury to Berwick Down

<p>Appendix D is a single appendix for all details of proposed mitigation responses. PACE is now Appendix E.</p> <p>b. Research strategy – <i>discussion and request for inputs re. research questions (30 mins)</i></p> <p>Contributions requested on specific themes: Mesolithic etc... (on Slide) ML discussed Research Framework.</p> <p>(JP) Think of Both Eastern and Western Portal connected as a transect across the site from the riverside up to the plain. We should seek to identify how the dynamics of landscape use changes from the Early Neolithic through to the Early Bronze Age within this transect. Research questions need to be focussed at the landscape as well as local (site, feature-specific) scale.</p> <p>(MPP) Distribution of long barrows in the west of the WHS is not mirrored to the east, could be that the eastern side was used for settlement whilst the west for funerary activity.</p> <p>(DF) Degree of woodland to grassland not well understood in the early Neolithic. Was it burned regularly in the Neolithic., can we identify when the landscape became open grassland? Transitions between Mesolithic (settlement focussed on the river) and Neolithic (spreading out over the plain). Was this well-established occupation or occasional hunting with the main activities in the valleys? The Till valley section of the Scheme may help understand this and how the landscape looked in this period.</p> <p>(CS) Looking at this in temporal blocks is not the right way to approach this. Interest in Western portal is the continuity of use from Early Neolithic Longbarrow to the later Bronze Age field systems, with a major focus for barrow cemeteries and funerary activity including Beaker flat graves, noting difficulty in finding these until they are excavated. Is it possible to attempt to identify where these may be in advance of excavation? Pits with Grooved Ware found previously south east of Longbarrow. Transitions are important – Mesolithic to Early Neolithic; Late Neolithic to Early Bronze Age.</p> <p>(BC) Look for continuities across transitions not specific periods and discontinuities. Encourage those undertaking the work to look more widely at the Stonehenge landscape not just the road corridor on its own.</p> <p>(MPP) Lithic scatter in Rollestone, we must make sure we don't forget this site as the third area, we must try and find what date this is, through Ploughsoil mitigation.</p> <p>(ML) Most of the Lithics came from a single tree hollow in the southern part of the Rollestone evaluation area, very diffuse scatter across the rest of the site from the test pitting here.</p> <p>(AF) Beaker burials are often stereotyped as single inhumation burials, which glosses over and obscures the considerable variety in which the body was treated at, and after, burial. Accordingly, attention should be paid to characterising the range of secondary burial rites evident in Beaker funerary practices. Careful attention should also be given to finds of complete objects in non-funerary contexts, for example Beaker vessels, as their deposition echoes their selection as grave goods.</p> <p>The Scientific Committee's input on the research framework and suggestion of specific research questions to include was requested. Look at Timing on comments – Comments to be received within a week - <u>9<sup>th</sup> July 2019</u> - to incorporate into the research strategy. Would be submitted as part of the draft DAMS Deadline 6 submission (26<sup>th</sup> July).</p>	<p><b>ALL</b></p>
--	-------------------

## Minutes

## A303 Stonehenge – Amesbury to Berwick Down

Any additional research questions submitted by the Scientific Committee will be considered for inclusion upfront as overarching themes.

- c. *Artefact / ploughsoil sampling strategy – presentation of data/statistical analysis, discussion of scope/extent, methodology (30 mins)*

The draft DAMS submitted at Deadline 4 proposes five areas for artefact recovery, via a scalable (increasing density) test pit sampling strategy.

(JP) Comments on the material viewed at Wessex Archaeology (16<sup>th</sup> May). Variation in terms of the material (reduction strategies), and a lot that was in relatively good condition. Need to be careful not to write it all off as plough damaged material that will yield little information. Not just a homogenous assemblage – there is spatial variation and condition variability. Material was mostly from the western portal, and here Late Neolithic into Bronze Age flint work. Earlier element within the scatter, but minimal. Cortical flakes and non-cortical flakes show different reduction stages present. Easy to get locked into the Western Portal, Eastern Portal is still significant in its differences to the Western Portal. There is clearly some Early Neolithic material that is otherwise not well represented in the landscape.

(CS) Not a specialist in dating of flint scatters. Interested in HMAG comments.

(NS) agrees with comments made by JP, important to remember scale at which we address the material in the assemblages will enable or limit our understanding of them and their context. And to ensure some ability for reflexivity when the work is ongoing in the field. The lithics either come from being ploughed out of features or from material dropped on open surface sites.

(JP) point of the scatters is that the scale is important. At a localised level much may be linked to temporary shelters / houses etc, so the scatters have been produced in localised areas from day-to-day life and activities.

(CS) matters of the day to day life is more of the unknown than the ritual as it is presently known.

(JP) Material is often pushed into features rather than pulled out of them.

(CM) How do we investigate a representative sample of this material, taking account of relevant research questions. What questions should we ask of the data and for the statistical analysis to try to answer. Suggest comments on this.

(MP) Statistical analysis is not meaningful. If your original sample is not random.

Sampling should be based on what we know about the landscape and how it was used.

(MPP) The problem with statistical analysis is that it works for some but not all data. The important stuff from the assemblage is about 1.5% so statistical analysis won't produce a sampling recommendation that will help you to find it.

(MPP Slides) Stonehenge Riverside Project trenches in the Palisade Field, west of Stonehenge. EH and NT required that topsoil was sampled at 100%. Four trenches (SRP trenches 52-55). Trench furthest West (Trench 52) was dense in Lithics, much lower densities in the Easternmost trench (Trench 55). Results from all were well worth doing at 100%. Extreme variance between volumes in adjacent areas. Bronze Age ditch trapping material coming down the hill Trench 53. Most lithics recovered were undistinguished, restricted tool types, very few blades, prolific scrapers. Slide illustrating application of 4% and 16% and 32% sample sizes in retrospect against results for scraper recovery from 100% sieving in Trench 52 (10m x 30m). Even at 64% we get 4 scrapers out of 7, so it is representative of the sample at that level. We need to see the entire assemblage to understand the context. Total area of these trenches was 700m<sup>2</sup>, all sieved in approximately 10 working days by a team of 100, average topsoil was 25~30cm thick. Tr. 52 has a concentration of retouched flakes;

## Minutes

## A303 Stonehenge – Amesbury to Berwick Down

16% sample would have missed these. North East corner of the field (Trench 55) showed a minimal scatter, but a surprising number of diagnostic tools. (arrowhead not identifiable). Specialised activity, placed in wider context with geophysics (tree holes), this kind of assemblage could be to do with working in the woodland (in the Early Neolithic). Areas with the Bronze Age ditch (Trench 53), relatively low densities, quite a lot in the early to Middle Bronze Age assemblage: at 16% you would only have recovered 3 of the blades. Other arrow heads, Flint Axe etc. Trench 54, at end of Stonehenge Palisade, very dense distribution with blades, bladelets and blade sized flakes. 16% coverage produces 10 locations, not nearly enough to show the full density. Early part of the Late Neolithic, shows the transition from Blade industries to flake industries. Dense activity before 2500BC, but not a single feature to go with it. Reiterate, within the same area you get extraordinary variances with the assemblage, my hope is that you can tease out the specifics of the individual location.

(BC) Can this information be given to the statistician?

(MPP) Yes, it should be provided.

(MPP and JP) It (100% sieving of topsoil) pays dividends for the material that is identified, economy of scale, bulk shifting it metre by metre the attempt to do less [is labour intensive], you might as well do more.

(BC) Can this be compared to the volume of work that was undertaken by the evaluation, so a comparison can be made to (MPP's calculation on work days required to sieve the material to compare.

(NS) No hard and fast rule on 100% topsoil sieving within the WHS has been applied by the National Trust, other areas have not been undertaken at 100%.

(MPK) The Council does not have any records of the Council having ever asked for 100% topsoil sampling on research excavations in the WHS.

(NS) We should be looking at what is the appropriate approach for the particular case.

(AF) flip it around, have we considered what happens when you place a trench in an area that has suggested relatively few features / no features to target.

(JP) We got good results (in both the Stonehenge and Avebury landscapes) when looking for Neolithic activity from areas where we were not targeting features visible from geophysical survey.

(BC) 3 potential ways of undertaking, dig it off by machine, process it in situ by machine, dig it by hand. Are there possible compromises between the strategies across the area?

(MPP) Clear conditions for why you wouldn't do it as opposed to not doing it in the first place. Sharp distributions found in the lithic plots. Strategy of targeting the Palisade Field was based on it not having been ploughed heavily, then finding it had been.

(DF) Also important to consider material from right across the area, the whole topography rather than selected units.

(MPP) Ditches acting as traps for ploughsoil, it is probably Bronze Age that this area is being ploughed for the first time, and the ditches get filled, and thereafter material remains.

(NS) Resolution of scale. Previous research has shown scatters retain internal integrity – a holistic approach to assessment of material from scatters and features will allow us to answer research questions about landscape inhabitation.

(JP) Lithic scatter material is moved around by plough (there is oscillation of a metre or two around points), but rarely do we see large scale movement.

(MPP) Salisbury Museum has recently discarded the non-diagnostic material from the Stonehenge Environs Project. Student did a 25% sample on it, but it is up to the

## Minutes

## A303 Stonehenge – Amesbury to Berwick Down

curator for what they keep and don't keep. I think we should collect the material first, not - prejudge the issue on whether a Museum would keep the material or not.

(CS) if you sample 16%, and you have the material within the plough soil that is stripped off the site being re-distributed across the scheme, it has to be put somewhere, it is a problem: reused elsewhere on Scheme.

(JH) it will be clear that it is re-distributed material.

(JP) It is an issue with time and money. Surely there is a way that it can be automated. So that rates of excavation and recovery are increased.

(NM) Point of mechanisation, Mesolithic site in Cumbria (Stainton West), series of mixers to wash soil and to extract lithics. Huge quantities of soils were washed and lithics gained. Support 100% sample as the process will account for the relatively intact yet discreet material. At Star Carr also 3D located and recorded the material (probably too much detail for this project) quantities should be spatial as well. Star Carr midden was full of burnt flint, distribution of lithics has helped better understand the use of the area. At Howick, only once a trench was opened did we find the initial 1x1m test pit was in the centre of a structure. Further work at Star Carr suggests that different Mesolithic structures have different lithic signatures. Some have a lot, others very little (kept clean).

(JH) Meso-American archaeologists, sampling was applied to identify the area, assuming that we can't answer the questions on that basis. You cannot pitch sampling strategy against 100% sieving – both are chosen for particular purposes and to answer particular questions.

(MPP) We should be sampling for the diagnostic material, not the overall assemblage.

(HW) Robust series of research questions and strategy required to inform approach. Posed question to Scientific Committee to expand upon what research questions cannot be answered by employing anything less than a 100% sample?

(MPP) We couldn't answer the Mesolithic or early Neolithic questions without 100% as these are crucial to answering those questions. We won't learn anything about the context unless we look at 100% plough soil sieving, to understand the spatial relationship of the material in relation to the features excavated. Durrington Walls survival beneath ramparts - we can see how the pits relate to the thin occupation layers that are normally missing. We have to assume likewise, the ploughsoil will contextualise the pits below.

(AF) my impression is you get more of the same from the increasing sample size, is there a tipping point where the returns diminish?

(MPP) no half measures here, we need to recover the entire WHS assemblage.

(MP) helpful to put it into wider context, if we had unlimited funds and unlimited skilled archaeologists, none of us would dispute that the whole thing should be sampled. In the real world, we don't have those resources. We need to focus the available funds and the works on both sampling the topsoil as well as the features beneath. We cannot forget the archaeological features beneath – these need to be the focus of concerted effort. By 100% sieving you do not get more clarity on Mesolithic activity on the plain. Able to isolate areas of settlement by fieldwalking the area frequently. The Stonehenge WHS has been ploughed to oblivion, it's only the diagnostics that help us, what can you tell us from the lithics that we don't already know?

(MPK) We are conscious of our obligation to ask for archaeological mitigation in line with the NPPF which refers to be proportionate and reasonable in relation to the significance of the site. We must remember that the road line is a transect through the landscape and the mitigation of the road line offers research opportunities.

(JP) noted that the material from the evaluation suggests it is not all plough rolled, some maintains good condition. Even if it isn't in exactly the place where it was

**Minutes****A303 Stonehenge – Amesbury to Berwick Down**

dropped / denuded, it does maintain spatial distribution. All work is guided by research questions. We must be careful to not be blinkered or constrained by the questions within the current research framework. Have to be careful that the research strategy doesn't pre-judge the answers / results. We know so little about the lithics in these areas and why they are in these particular areas. We have to be careful, we might be able to tell what features have been ploughed out from the plough soil scatters – we need to work at micro- as well as macro-scale.

(MPP) field walking and plotting of finds as an undergraduate was redone by an undergraduate some 35~40 years later. The distributions are identical, so we need more faith in the process.

(DF) As its generally accepted that 95% of the evidence lies in the ploughsoil it's important to arrive at a strategy to correctly focus on it and to spend more time on retrieving evidence from it. We know about the cut features that are likely to survive beneath the ploughsoil, but they represent only a minor part of the evidence. To get to grips with settlement we need to focus on the evidence in the ploughsoil.

(NMac) We need to look at the topography of the landscape, there are dry valleys both in the western and eastern portals and approaches.

(MPP) Proportionality needs to be applicable across the board, not linked to scale.

(BC) We need to give our best professional advice. I would find it difficult to justify sampling of 100% of the ploughsoil to a member of the public when there are other priorities for public money. In the WHS we should do to the highest of standards. We should be looking to technology to help us and also use our professional understanding of the landscape and the character of the scatters. Professionally, hand sieving of the ploughsoil is an incredibly tedious task for young professional archaeologists to undertake. I know of young archaeologists who have left the profession because they have been undertaking this task. There is a personal factor here which we need to consider. We need to understand, that if we as a Committee insist on 100%, what will that take in terms of person days and costs.

(MPP) We should not be looking at the cost, we should be looking at the minimum standards.

(BC) We should be looking at providing the best advice as possible.

(MPP) If the time and the cost was already in place we wouldn't be debating this.

(MPK) We wouldn't need to do 100% everywhere within the WHS. A blanket 100% sampling approach is disproportionate and not everywhere in the WHS, particularly in any areas we know are disturbed or where the evaluation has indicated very low concentrations, will require this approach.

(BC) Can we confirm the number of person days it would take to cover the whole corridor at 100%, it won't influence my academic judgement, but we need to cover the point, so we are considering all factors.

(MP) We need to consider the wider argument of what are we doing in the WHS that has this expenditure attached to it when compared to equally significant sites outside the WHS.

(CS) We are the Scientific Committee and should not be considering the costs, we should be giving advice on the archaeological research value. In a Dutch example, the whole Hoge Vaart site (state funded A24 highway scheme) was extracted in 50cm square c. 5cm deep georeferenced and bar-coded spit samples to be wet sieved off site. I am not suggesting this here, but the approach can be scaled up for topsoil sieving, and it has been done elsewhere using technologies – banks of mechanised sieves.

(BC) The advice we give should be based on the standards we think should be adopted. I am not clear in my own mind, are we talking about total sieving of all the plough soil in the WHS? Or are we saying there are some areas in the WHS where total sieving must be done, and other areas where sampling should be undertaken?

## Minutes

## A303 Stonehenge – Amesbury to Berwick Down

<p>(MPP) Need 100% across the whole WHS where it is impacted by the scheme.</p> <p>(BC) There might be a time when resources are constricted.</p> <p>(MPP) Then the tunnel project should not go ahead.</p> <p>(NM) Star Carr – dry land 100% - other areas very clayey not producing any lithics. Thinking about how we could sieve efficiently, project considered banks of sieves in 4-unit blocks. 4 sieves could sieve 2 tonnes a day with high clay content. There are methods which can speed up the sieving process.</p> <p>(AF) Would rather be in a position where the process is flexible - an absolute yes or no is not helpful. Not persuaded that 100% sieving of all the topsoil is the right approach, particularly in areas with lower density distributions.</p> <p>(MPP) there are very few areas of blank areas in the areas that have been evaluated, I can't see any part where you could say you don't need to do it to the 100% detail.</p> <p>(JP) do we have any blank areas?</p> <p>(ML) It depends on your definition of a blank area. There are test pits in the evaluated distribution which don't have any lithic material from them.</p> <p>(JP) Blank areas still have meaning, it depends on what it is. Where there are just a few lithics the signature may still be important – for instance in relation to short lived occupation or ephemeral structures.</p> <p>(CS) IN relation to cost, there is a point at which it is not worth doing a low percentage sample as it doesn't give you any answers. A lot of the funding for the tunnel project is based on a cultural benefit. So, we should ensure that there is a knowledge benefit to accompany the expenditure, i.e. the sample should not be so small as to be worthless.</p> <p>(MPK) We do have the data we have got from the evaluation which has informed the approach so far. So, we are not approaching this scheme from a position of no knowledge. We have already undertaken a 1% sample test pitting within the WHS.</p> <p>(HM) What mesh sizes for the sieve would you recommend?</p> <p>(MPP) Sieve sizes, Stonehenge Riverside Project used 10mm mesh size, except where floating. Thanks to (NM's) advice a 4mm sieve was used on a 1% sample to recover Mesolithic microliths.</p> <p>(MP) Suppose we sieve 100% of the topsoil and we have found a few microliths. What would that tell us that we don't already know?</p> <p>(MPP) We need a sampling strategy for the Mesolithic – microlithic cores and long blades, we need definition for it and what the strategy for that would be. How much have we learned from the 4mm mesh size sampling?</p> <p>(MP) we know they are there, a sampling for microliths won't change that view, so what would we learn.</p> <p>(MPP) extensive sampling is needed, using the appropriate mesh size, to ensure that we can answer the research questions.</p> <p>(NM) on Dry land we sieved through plough soil and then trowelled, we tend to put that together with the 3D stuff we have recorded. We found that spatial context is well maintained at Star Carr. You can see through the fieldwalking evidence that there is strong correlation with sampled material from the sieved soil and then the excavated material beneath.</p> <p>(NMac) what area of landscape was covered in this way at Star Carr, which is situated by a lake?</p> <p>(NM) covered a 4-mile area of the lake edge with test pitting. The coverage was important, to know where they are undertaking activities and where they were not – both important for understanding landscape use.</p> <p>(NMac) Salisbury plain is a different landscape.</p>	
---	--

## Minutes

## A303 Stonehenge – Amesbury to Berwick Down

(NM) [there are] Other areas where people have collected lithics from other sites. Cannot yet make it clear that water's edge is the only place it is important to look at. Important to sample for Mesolithic activity on the plain.

(BC) A good discussion well made. It is clear further work is required by a statistician to provide detail on statistically relevant sampling, what the data we have can tell us and what could be asked and what might be asked.

(HW) We have provided Highways England with advice to assist them in compiling a brief to draw as much information out of the statistical analysis as possible in order to help inform the development of the approach to archaeological mitigation further.

(BC) As much information as possible should be fed into this process so it would be helpful if the work that has been produced by MPP as put forward in his presentation could also be offered to the statistician.

- d. Excavation & sampling strategy (features) and mechanisms to support its implementation – *proposals and discussion (20 mins)*

(CM) Section 6.3 of the draft DAMS contains a selection of minimum sample sizes. Provides a framework on which to start from.

(JP) Any linear you feel might be of later prehistoric date, given the possibility of burial deposits within them, it is probably best to go with 100% excavation.

(CM) Given that the excavations will be monitored by HMAG we will be firmly directed to the application of the strategy in that way.

(BC) Irish norm is for 100% excavation of linears.

(JP) suggested placing a 1m<sup>2</sup> test pit into the middle of each tree throw (as identified).

(MPK) the smaller ones its necessary to uncover an edge to identify it as a tree throw.

(JP) rapidly evaluate each one by the excavation of the 1m<sup>2</sup>.

(MPP) will all tree throws be trenched to ascertain to see if they contain cultural material?

(CM) all tested (hand excavated slot across them) to test that whether they are natural or anthropogenic in nature.

(ML) then 10% of the tree throws were excavated

(CM) not bound to 10%, proposal is to look at these on an area basis to relate them to the topography, confirmed archaeological features, lithic scatters and cultural material being recovered from them to influence the sampling strategy.

(MPP) it is a crucial point in relation to the rates of deforestation in the early prehistoric period. It is important to understand which tree throw has nothing in it and which has cultural material in it - this needs testing.

(CM) all are tested in the first instance to help identify the sampling strategy.

(MPP) one of the features in the evaluation was a solution hollow. How do we ensure that sufficient investigation is undertaken to an appropriate depth?

(BC) features like that require a strategy for them within the DAMS.

(MPP) is there something in the strategy to cover these?

(MPK) the DAMS has something in it already regarding these features, but probably requires further detail.

(AF) assume that you reach the depth required by using machine excavation to reduce the surrounding area in steps?

(MPP) How deep is the Wilsford Shaft?

(NMac) 30m deep, and it was fully excavated.

(AF) Sampling of material from features – need to ensure resources for scientific dating.

## Minutes

## A303 Stonehenge – Amesbury to Berwick Down

(CM) dating strategy in the DAMS has taken advice from Historic England, how best to target for maximum recovery of dating material.  
 (CS) Email from MPP had reference to Colin and Vince, about Geophysics, Strategy doesn't seem to include a geophysicist?  
 (CM) this is an omission in the team list which needs rectifying.  
 (CS) needs to be an approach in the strategy to cover geophysics to be undertaken after topsoil is cleared. Close interval geophysical survey needs to be undertaken - shows magnetism of the fills of small features had the same correlation to larger features which correlate the two features as of the same period/date (example from a project in Denmark).  
 (BC) would this method be used in areas where the topsoil doesn't come down onto solid chalk?  
 (CS) No we should undertake this on chalk too as this can pick up (for example) post holes which are not visible.  
 (HM) Are you all comfortable with the whole earth environmental sampling strategy as laid out?  
 (BC) No comments made – Assumed that the strategy is ok.

e. Public Archaeology and Community Engagement – *proposals and discussion (20 mins)*

(CM) Draft DAMS – Big statement of intent to collaboratively engage a wide audience to create a lasting legacy from the archaeology and the works.  
 (BC) should one think be involving one or two universities – getting to large audiences, developing an online course for example, that can be used around the world. E.g. Oxford online courses.  
 (HM) Recently (NM) developed a module focused on the excavation of Star Carr on Future Learn. Requested she provide further detail from her experience as this would be helpful. University of Reading (Silchester) also conducted a similar exercise.  
 (NM) Started on the 1st July, lasts for 4 weeks, going out to 2,000 people.  
 (MP) Presenting the results and engaging the public with the results is good, but such work should be undertaken during the works as well. It's a national issue that locally people would like to engage with. There needs to be an engagement strategy during the works. The public should be given the opportunity for a greater understanding of the principles, methods and the research questions etc.  
 (MPK) absolutely agree with MP, talking to ensure this strategy tries to do that, so that we record and capture and engage during the process.  
 (AF) you need the staff, and to think about it in advance, presenting what you want to know is a good story. Lots of case studies out there, best practice as well. Staff must sign up to the strategy in advance as well to enthuse and engage them in that aspect, to ensure engagement with the public.  
 (BC) appointing one person is not sufficient  
 (AF) There were 2 people full time undertaking Community Archaeology on site on the East Kent Access Road and it was successful.  
 (MPK) what we hope is that more detail will be put into the DAMS, so it is included. An action plan needs to be developed.  
 (CS) Cambridge University excavation – live web cam used and fed to a TV screen at the university. Suggest you look carefully at (Ian Hodder's example) Çatalhöyük project – make all the information available, people's personal views (multi-vocal) individual excavators with their own blogs, so not just "one official" view, continued across a 25yr period.  
 (BC) Liaison with schools etc, is assumed?

## Minutes

## A303 Stonehenge – Amesbury to Berwick Down

<p>(CM) yes. Whole project engagement, archaeology is one facet of this.          (NS) A WHS Learning Group already exists – this needs to be engaged with.          (JP) there is a decline in student numbers at university due to schools dropping A-level Archaeology course as well as issues with recruitment. Engaging with schools can help students understand what archaeology is about and how it is undertaken. Think of archaeology as a profession. It's the Stonehenge label that will garner a wider audience. There's considerable potential for out-reach and engagement here.          (HW) Is there potential for an archaeology apprenticeship scheme?          (JH) Highways England is already engaged on that.          (BC) Highways England should work closely with Universities to provide fieldwork opportunities. Engagement could help provide that access. Both sides benefit.</p> <p>f. Implementation and future role of Scientific Committee – <i>discussion (20 mins)</i></p> <p>(CM) Appendix A4 sets out the relationships across the project. Involvement of the Scientific Committee within the fieldwork phases and beyond.</p> <p>What happens next - Further submission at Deadline 6 (26<sup>th</sup> July) continue engagement and take away from today. Research questions in sampling and statistical analysis. Telephone conference opportunity in the next week or so?          (JP) Timing is not good.          (BC) Research Questions for statistical analysis to be sent in within the next week rather than trying to arrange a call.          (CM) General comments on the draft DAMS as issued at Deadline 4 need to be with Highways England by the 17<sup>th</sup> July latest for consideration in Deadline 6 update of the document. We are being driven by the examination deadlines and running this group in parallel.          (BC) AC to provide dates for early August to meet to discuss the Deadline 6 submission.</p>	
<p><b>5. AOB</b>          Nothing Raised</p>	
<p><b>6. Date of next meeting</b>          AC to provide dates for early August to meet to discuss the Deadline 6 submission.</p>	