

12-31-2006

## Oliver Ranch Science School Complex & Wild Horse and Burro Facility: Final Close-Out Report

Margaret N. Rees

*University of Nevada, Las Vegas, [peg.rees@unlv.edu](mailto:peg.rees@unlv.edu)*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/pli\\_red\\_rock\\_learning\\_center\\_oliver\\_ranch](https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/pli_red_rock_learning_center_oliver_ranch)



Part of the [Desert Ecology Commons](#), [Earth Sciences Commons](#), and the [Science and Mathematics Education Commons](#)

---

### Repository Citation

Rees, M. N. (2006). Oliver Ranch Science School Complex & Wild Horse and Burro Facility: Final Close-Out Report. 1-11.

Available at: [https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/pli\\_red\\_rock\\_learning\\_center\\_oliver\\_ranch/12](https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/pli_red_rock_learning_center_oliver_ranch/12)

This Report is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Report in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Report has been accepted for inclusion in Oliver Ranch Project by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact [digitalscholarship@unlv.edu](mailto:digitalscholarship@unlv.edu).



## **FINAL CLOSE-OUT REPORT**

University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Project Term June 1, 2004 – December 31, 2006

Assistance Agreement Number FAA010017  
Task Order Number FAF040019

Oliver Ranch Science School Complex & Wild Horse and Burro Facility

### **HISTORY OF THE PROJECT**

*“The mission of the Red Rock Desert Learning Center is to instill stewardship and respect by increasing knowledge and understanding of the Mojave Desert ecosystems and cultures through a unique experiential discovery program.”*

The Oliver Ranch Science School Complex & Wild Horse and Burro Facility (later renamed the Red Rock Desert Learning Center) was funded through the 1998 Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act, which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of federally owned land within a specified boundary around Las Vegas, with the proceeds to be used, in part, to complete capital improvement projects in surrounding conservation areas and recreational areas.

The desert learning center was approved as a Round 3 Capital Improvements project for the purpose of teaching participants about the natural world through inquiry-based experiential and interdisciplinary methods in a residential outdoor setting in Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area. The intent was for students, teachers, and researchers to gain an appreciation of desert ecosystems and to begin to apply and connect their knowledge to world ecological systems. Fifth grade students would be encouraged to develop their own conclusions about how environmental stewardship fosters the continued existence of the natural world and the sustainability of resources.

The residential component and on-site laboratory and classroom facilities were designed to provide educators with the necessary time and organization to maximize the exploration of scientific topics. There currently is no residential field school in Southern Nevada, and very few study centers for arid lands exist in the United States. The Red Rock Desert Learning Center was intended to fill an important niche that is lacking in the educational programming now available in Southern Nevada. Located on the site of the former Oliver Ranch, the school was designed to allow fifth graders to encounter not only the cultural history and natural sciences of the area but also to learn about sustainable living and building practices from the campus design.

The Wild Horse and Burro Facility adjacent to the Desert Learning Center offered an opportunity to educate the public about the National Wild Horse and Burro Program and the challenges of maintaining these animals in ecological balance. The Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area has an active Herd Management Area, with horses and burros living in the immediate vicinity. While the Bureau of Land Management currently operates other wild horse and burro facilities in the western states, those facilities typically serve as large sanctuaries and adoption

facilities. The local facility was planned as a relatively small “storefront” operation for encouraging adoptions and promoting education about wild horses and burros.

Both the Desert Learning Center and the Wild Horse and Burro Facility were designed by Line and Space Architects of Tucson, Arizona, with environmental sustainability in mind. After initial architectural programming took place, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas was brought into the project as part of a Round 4 Conservation Initiative project for the purpose of assisting the BLM with project coordination, curriculum development, operational analysis, and community outreach.

### **Task 1: Project Coordination**

*Assist in project coordination between numerous stakeholders such as the Clark County School System, Desert Research Institute, Community College of Southern Nevada, UNR Cooperative Extension, Nevada State College, local museums, state parks, non-profit organizations, federal agencies, and the public to ensure appropriate educational curricular activities and venues are provided for in the conceptual design of the School and the Wild Horse and Burro facility where appropriate as well as assist in the NEPA process as needed. The activities will be conducted at least in part by university faculty, staff and students as part of the university’s research, teaching, and service mission.*

**June 2004 – December 2006**

#### **COORDINATION & FACILITATION OF PUBLIC MEETINGS**

Over the 2.5-year duration of the Oliver Ranch Science School project, the Public Lands Institute facilitated 17 public meetings of the Red Rock Desert Learning Center Core Group and participated in 17 committee chairs’ meetings and numerous sub-committee meetings. A copy of all Core Group meeting agendas, minutes, subcommittee notes, and handouts are included in a Project Coordination final product that is provided with this report.

The Public Lands Institute received very positive feedback from the Core Group on the quality of its communication and coordination efforts. Two examples include:

*“There sure has been a huge improvement in the quality of the notes and communications since your arrival!”*

*“Oh, kudos and 'wow!' re: your notes, minutes, comments about the Oliver Ranch facility. I've seen more write-ups from you in the last two weeks than in the years that the project has been underway. Fabulous. Absolutely fabulous. Please continue this practice.”*

In Year 1 of the project, agendas and minutes were produced for 10 Core Group meetings on May 18, June 15, July 20, August 17, September 21, October 19, November 16, 2004, and January 18, March 15, and May 17, 2005.

In Year 2 of the project, agendas and minutes were produced for 7 Core Group meetings on July 19, August 16, September 20, October 18, and December 6, 2005, and January 17 and March 21, 2006. The Bureau of Land Management chose not to schedule any meetings after March 2006, with the exception of a “Stakeholder Phasing Meeting” held on October 5, 2006, to which a small, select group of Core Group members were invited to meet with Las Vegas Field Office

Manager Juan Palma to discuss the future of the Oliver Ranch Science School project and possible phasing options. To our knowledge, as of the writing of this close-out report, the project has been at least temporarily suspended as a result of several significant, unresolved issues, including water rights, environmental assessment, funding for ongoing operations and maintenance costs, and selection of a school operator.

## **COORDINATION OF OTHER PUBLIC MEETINGS**

In January and April 2006, the university was asked to plan several public hearings on behalf of BLM. The January 2006 open house was intended to provide a general overview of the project to the Las Vegas community. We reserved a meeting room in town, developed a mailing list, and created a printed and electronic flyer before being informed by BLM at the last minute that the hearing was being cancelled for unspecified reasons.

At the March 21, 2006, Core Group meeting, the BLM announced that it was going to proceed with an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, apparently as a result of findings contained in the Environmental Analysis (EA) report completed by Otak, Inc. under a separate contract. As part of the EIS process, the university was asked to plan the first of several required public hearings in either April or May 2006. We again reserved a meeting room and began preparations for the public notice, but that public meeting, too, was ultimately cancelled for unspecified reasons. Since May 2006, we were intermittently put on alert by the BLM Project Coordinator to be ready to reschedule the EIS public hearings, but ultimately the agency chose not to hold these meetings.

## **PROJECT HISTORICAL DOCUMENTATION**

The university also examined the entire existing historical documentation for the Oliver Ranch project dating back to its inception in 1999. This involved numerous conversations with key BLM staff, interviews with community members, and collection of relevant materials. The materials were summarized into a historical project timeline and verified with BLM staff and Core Group members.

Similarly, the university compiled a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document for the project website. The FAQ provided the agency and Core Group members with a common, agreed-upon response to questions that might be posed by the community at large. These items are included in the Project Coordination final product that is provided with this report.

## **PROJECT OVERSIGHT & COORDINATION**

Another coordinating effort the university undertook during the term of the task agreement was a comprehensive listing of feedback and concerns that had arisen since the project's inception. This effort sought to guide the BLM in developing an ongoing tracking mechanism for the resolution of project issues and was a result of feedback received from Core Group members. Some form of electronic tracking mechanism is typically standard in construction management as a means to document and follow progress on project decisions over time. Following conversations with the agency in May 2005, the university provided BLM with a comprehensive listing of project concerns and feedback developed through an exhaustive review of Core Group and subcommittee minutes. The BLM Project Coordinator used that information to complete a tracking matrix, which was distributed at the August 16, 2005, Core Group meeting and is included with the minutes for that meeting.

Over the life of the project, the university also provided active representation and expertise on the BLM's Building Committee through David Frommer of the UNLV Planning and Construction Department. According to Angie Lara, Associate Field Manager of the Las Vegas Field Office, David was a valued and trusted contributor to the project as it progressed through the architectural programming and design development phases.

### **Task 2: Educational Curricular Coordination**

*Provide educational thematic and curricular coordination between numerous stakeholders such as the Clark County School System, Desert Research Institute, Community College of Southern Nevada, UNR Cooperative Extension, Nevada State College, local museums, state parks, non-profit organizations, federal agencies, and the public and help develop a written curriculum that synthesizes the input of these stakeholders. In addition, suggest other compatible uses for the School including but not limited to science and educational research. The activities will be conducted at least in part by university faculty, staff and students as part of the university's research, teaching, and service mission.*

**June 2004 – December 2006**

#### **CURRICULUM FRAMEWORK & TIMELINE**

The area in which the university made its most significant contribution to the Oliver Ranch Science School project was in the coordination and development of the curriculum. The Public Lands Institute's curriculum coordinator, Dr. Jeanne Klockow, began by devising an overall framework for the curriculum, in order to link it effectively to other Conservation Initiative (CI) education projects being funded by the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act. In particular, the university wanted to ensure the Oliver Ranch project complemented the Education in the Environment Strategic Plan that was then under development for all of southern Nevada. The Institute's curricular framework ensured that the Oliver Ranch curriculum would conform to the objectives of the area-wide strategic plan.

Next, the Institute developed a rationale for the curriculum design that addressed the mission statement of the BLM, the objectives of the SNPLMA Education in the Environment initiatives, the mission statement of the Oliver Ranch Science School, and the needs of the Clark County School District. This document assisted in keeping all stakeholders moving toward the same vision. As part of the overall curriculum coordination, the Institute also developed a timeline for development of the curriculum and a process by which "strands," or lesson plans would be created.

#### **ECOSYSTEMS SCIENCE CURRICULUM**

When the university formally began work on the Oliver Ranch Science School project in June 2004, an inquiry-based science curriculum designed around "essential questions" was already underway through a separate federal grant awarded to Dr. Paul Buck of the Desert Research Institute (DRI). Under Dr. Buck's direction, a total of eight ecosystems science strands were completed by the Educational Programs Subcommittee in calendar year 2004 – four in Physical Science/Earth Science and four in Biology/Ecology. This curriculum was developed with the assistance of teachers in the Clark County School District, UNLV faculty, and research faculty from DRI.

## OLIVER RANCH SCIENCE SCHOOL CORE CURRICULUM

During Year 1 of the university's task agreement (2004-2005), while the Educational Programs Subcommittee continued its work on the ecosystems science curriculum, the Public Lands Institute began coordinating the development of the broader core curriculum in close collaboration with the BLM and other stakeholders. First, through extensive conversations with the Core Group and the agency, the university guided consensus agreement upon eight desired common experiences:

- Understanding Ecosystems
- Sustaining Health Ecosystems
- Geology
- Wild Horse & Burro
- Historical Figures
- Cultural Connections
- Night Sky
- Green Building Technology.

This consensus-building task became a critical blueprint by which the architects could complete schematic design, allowing them to adequately address all foreseeable facilities and outdoor venues that would be needed to deliver the planned curriculum.

In Year 2 of the task agreement (2005-2006), small working groups of local schoolteachers, agency staff, and interested community members were formed to complete essential questions and lesson plan activities for these core topics. Each curriculum was designed using a specific framework that included the following components:

- 1) *Introduction*: Provides a review and link to previous experiences and poses the essential questions.
- 2) *Exploration*: Provides students with the opportunity to have first hand experiences with the materials.
- 3) *Concept Development*: Students share observations and understandings, vocabulary is developed in context, teacher asks probing questions, and formative assessment is conducted.
- 4) *Application/Further Questions*: Students apply understanding to a new but similar situation, students and/or teacher asks new questions.

The Public Lands Institute set the schedule for working group meetings and facilitated each session. The core curriculum was fully completed in Year 2 of the task agreement, and all materials are provided in a Curricular Development final product that is included with this report.

## DAILY SCHEDULES

Another important consideration for the design and operation of the desert learning center was to ascertain whether the curriculum could reasonably be accommodated in a four-day/three-night schedule, as originally envisioned. The university thought it was equally important to see how the curriculum might translate into schedules of varying lengths, in order to provide a potential

operator with maximum scheduling flexibility. In Year One, the university completed extensive outlines for the following potential daily schedules:

- 4 days/3 nights
- 3 days/2 nights
- 2 days/1 night
- Single-day excursions

While these schedules were not intended to force a particular scheduling philosophy on the future school operator, they served as an important guidepost in assisting the agency and the Core Group to determine if adequate plans had been made for circulation of students around the site, safety and security, recreation, and other concerns. The additional scheduling options also proved useful in discussions with the Clark County School District, because it had a strong interest in having greater numbers of fifth-grade students experience the center than would be possible with solely a 4-day/3-night option. A description of the daily schedules is provided with the final curriculum product that accompanies this report.

### **CURRICULUM REVIEW**

Because of the number of education programs the Public Lands Institute had underway across several SNPLMA Conservation Initiatives, we formed a Curriculum Advisory Team of local teachers and agency personnel to review and advise us on the curriculum. Institute staff was writing for various SNPLMA projects – including Oliver Ranch Science School, Forever Earth, Discover Mojave Outdoor World, and others. UNLV's Curriculum Advisory Team was comprised of representatives from key educational groups that were not represented on the Core Group and included home-school teachers, charter school teachers, private school teachers, and local museums – all of whom were important constituents for SNPLMA place-based education initiatives.

As curriculum products were developed, the Public Lands Institute asked the Curriculum Advisory Team to provide feedback along with the Educational Programs Committee. This further ensured a broad spectrum of community input and buy-in into the school's curriculum.

### **INTEGRATION OF AMERICAN INDIAN TRADITIONS**

In Fall 2005 a meeting was held with agency personnel and Southern Paiute tribal leaders to discuss a strategy of how to best integrate American Indian perspectives within the core curriculum. Based on that meeting, in Spring 2006 Curriculum Coordinator Jeanne Klockow formed a work group comprised of local American Indian schoolteachers to correlate and integrate the Native American perspective throughout the core curriculum by editing and revising lesson plans in each of the five core topic areas. This work, completed in April 2006, was fully incorporated into all final lesson plans/strands and is reflected in the contents of the final curriculum product that accompanies this report.

### **INTEGRATION OF BLM MISSION**

At the request of the agency, the university ensured that the core curriculum was correlated to appropriate aspects of the Bureau of Land Management's overall mission. The intent was to ensure that the school operator would be provided with tools to address the agency's mission. This work, which was conducted in collaboration with local BLM personnel, was completed for

appropriate segments of the core curriculum in Year 2 of the task agreement and is reflected in the contents of the final curriculum product that accompanies this report.

### **TEACHER PILOT WORKSHOPS & CURRICULUM ASSESSMENT**

In Year 2 of the task agreement, the Education Curriculum Coordinator assembled a team of local schoolteachers and university personnel to create and conduct piloting workshops for both pre-service UNLV students and novice Clark County School District teachers. Five pilot workshops were conducted at Spring Mountain Ranch State Park and the Oliver Ranch site to a total of 68 local teachers on the following dates:

- February 23, 2006 – Wild Horse & Burro curriculum
- March 18, 2006 – Science I curriculum
- March 25, 2006 – Historical Figures curriculum
- April 1, 2006 – Science and Historical Figures curriculum
- May 6, 2006 – Science II curriculum

The workshops were provided as a graduate-level course (CIG 600) for in-service. At these workshops, local schoolteachers modeled the lesson plans and provided valuable feedback. The purpose of the curriculum piloting was to ascertain if the tested curriculum strands were valid and useful to teachers and could be implemented as intended. To assess the effectiveness of the piloted curriculum, UNLV's Center for Assessment and Evaluation – under the direction of Dr. Gregory Schraw and Dr. Lori Olafson of the College of Education – developed an assessment instrument to measure the validity of the curriculum and the teachers' response to it. The complete findings and analysis of the teacher pilot sessions are provided in the appendix to the final curriculum product that accompanies this report.

In summary, we found through this assessment exercise that (1) teachers' knowledge increased, indicating that the piloted sessions brought significant instructional benefit; (2) each of the tested curricula strands received high ratings; (3) teachers' attitudes toward the curriculum was very favorable; and (4) only 23 percent of the participants had previous formal or informal experiences with environmental education, which may affect their ability to implement the curriculum successfully.

### **Task 3: Operational Analysis**

*Provide coordination for the business model with curriculum development to elucidate the potential operations and maintenance cost and projected revenues for the School as the design evolves and potential funding sources are more predictable. The activities will be conducted at least in part by university faculty, staff and students as part of the university's research, teaching, and service mission.*

### **June 2004 – December 2006**

As work on the Oliver Ranch Science School task agreement got underway, the Public Lands Institute sought further clarification from Project Coordinator Michael Reiland about what the agency wanted completed under Subtask 3. The Institute offered to develop a framework of basic structural elements for a business plan that could be included with the proposed statement of work for an operator, but the project coordinator directed the university to take no action in this area until an operator was hired. At that time, he viewed the university's role as coordinating the



operator's business plan with the school curriculum and ensuring that each supported the other as the project moved forward.

Unfortunately, delays in soliciting and hiring an operator became an ongoing problem. As this issue became clearer during Year 2 of the task agreement, the Institute and the agency began discussions about modifying the task agreement to shift all Task 3 funds to Task 2, for the purpose of conducting the curriculum pilot workshops and assessment. The appropriate paperwork to formally modify the task agreement's scope of work was signed by the BLM in June 2006. As a result, the university undertook no activities related to Operational Analysis during the term of the task agreement.

#### **Task 4: Community Coordination**

*Provide community outreach coordination to the public and facilitate collaborative processes with the Oliver Ranch committees including but not limited to the core committee and its designated subcommittees as outlined in the current BLM Oliver Ranch minutes. This role will include the calling of meetings, development of meeting agenda, recording and distribution of minutes, meeting facilitation, and other communication and coordination as needed for the smooth functioning of the Oliver Ranch committees. This service will be provided at least in part by university faculty, staff and students as part of the university's research and service mission.*

**June 2004 – December 2006**

#### **PROJECT WEBSITE**

The university began work on an Oliver Ranch Science School website in June 2004, soon after commencement of the task agreement. The initial steps we took were to research federal regulations related to websites and where the project site could be legally housed. Ideally, we had hoped the site could be housed on the university's secure national supercomputer and have its own domain name, to make public access more assured. However, the Institute learned that the BLM required the website to be contained within the Las Vegas Field Office website.

As to website content, as noted under the discussion of Task 1, the university began developing historical and factual documents for the planned website and discussed the design and functionality of the site with the BLM's Project Coordinator. The university's web specialist then devised a sitemap and, between June and October 2004, completed the graphic design, navigation tools, and content for the project website.

Following agency approval of our work, the site went live in October 2004. Unfortunately, because of legal challenges to the federal BLM website, public access to the Las Vegas Field Office site – and, therefore to the Oliver Ranch web pages – was curtailed for most of the two years of the task agreement. As a result, there was not an accessible site for the Core Group or the public to visit for information about the project.

In August 2005, the Core Group suggested that the university develop an interim site through its own server to allow some form of ongoing public information about the project. The university was cautioned that only publicly released or university-authored documents could be loaded onto the site. As a result of that meeting, the university created a Discover Mojave domain name on the university's supercomputer, which already has the highest level federal security clearance, and under that domain posted project information that was updated periodically. The website was

not intended to replace the official BLM website but to provide the public with access to information on an interim basis. In fact, the university website provided a mechanism for immediately uploading current information to the BLM site once public access was restored. Screen shots of the website pages are included in the Community Outreach final product that accompanies this report.

## **COMMUNITY OUTREACH PLAN AND ACTIVITIES**

Over the two years of the task agreement, the university took a number of steps toward implementing community outreach. In Year 1, informational flyers about the desert learning center project were prepared and distributed at the Clark County Farm Festival in September 2004 and at the Summerlin Earth Faire in April 2005.

Beginning in September 2004, the BLM Project Coordinator and the university jointly and individually began a series of general presentations about the project to various community groups and organizations in Southern Nevada, including the Local Partners Group (comprised of numerous stakeholders from local, state, and federal government who are working on various SNPLMA projects); the Southern Nevada Environmental Education Committee; the UNLV Environmental Law Society; the Outside Las Vegas Foundation; the River Mountain Trail Partnership; Friends of Red Rock Canyon; and the BLM Mojave South Resource Advisory Council.

In November 2004, BLM Project Coordinator Michael Reiland was interviewed about the project for an article in *Architectural Digest*, and that same month Principal Investigator Dr. Margaret Rees and Institute Director Nancy Flagg were interviewed for a taped segment on the UNLV-TV show *Academic Café*, which aired in the Southern Nevada metropolitan area on Cox Cable channel 70.

In January 2005, at the direction of the agency, UNLV began work on a written plan to better define Task 4 outreach efforts. The agency instructed the university not to produce any further communication products until the plan was approved by the agency's public affairs officer. Unfortunately, between January and May 2005 the plan went through numerous drafts before it finally met with acceptance by the public affairs officer. A copy of the approved community outreach plan is included with this report.

In Year 2 of the task agreement, the university had hoped to begin executing some of the priorities in the outreach plan. Unfortunately, most of the outreach efforts the university proposed were put on hold by the agency, primarily due to the continuing uncertainties about the viability of the project and concerns about when to go public with it on a broader scale.

The proposed development of a project newsletter/brochure offers a pertinent example of the difficulties we faced in executing Task 4. The publication was envisioned as a general information piece for Las Vegas residents, to familiarize parents of school-age children with the general plans for the desert learning center and get them excited about this new educational opportunity in their community. To this point in the history of the project, there had been no formal information published about the desert learning center, except for the one-page flyer distributed at two community events. Yet it is difficult (if not impossible) to garner community enthusiasm and fund-raising support in the absence of such information. Despite the university's best efforts to keep this one outreach piece moving forward, it took more than 9 months for the content to be reviewed and approved by local and state BLM personnel, after which the agency directed that it not be distributed.

The lack of outreach products created somewhat of a vicious circle with respect to the desert learning center project as a whole. For example, when Las Vegas Field Office Manager Juan Palma spoke at the final Core Group meeting in March 2006, he noted a problem with lack of formal buy-in to the project – both from local residents as well as the Clark County School District. However, the community was never sufficiently informed about the project to elicit the grass-roots support that would assist the agency in its efforts to see the project to fruition.

Other than the specific examples noted above, the university's desires to move forward with community outreach efforts were effectively stalled by the agency due to its continuing uncertainties about the viability of the project.

## **FUND-RAISING ACTIVITIES**

In Year 1 of the project, the Red Rock Interpretive Association was designated as the 501-c-3 organization of record to accept donations for the Oliver Ranch Science School project. To date, unsolicited cash donations of \$25,100 and an in-kind gift of a greenhouse were received. In June 2004, the university began researching potential fund-raising contacts with well-connected individuals in the non-profit fund-raising field. Although a great deal of information, surveys, and data were compiled by the university, the Fund-Raising and Partnership Subcommittee elected not to take any initial actions toward a fund-raising plan, and the agency did not advocate the development of a plan, in the belief that fund-raising should wait until the project was farther along and after critical issues – such as water source, operator, and environmental analysis – were settled satisfactorily. The university did not agree with this approach – given its considerable expertise in the fund-raising arena – but we were not granted authority by the Project Coordinator to pursue any activity in this area.

One example illustrates how the lack of a fund-raising plan negatively affected other components of the project. In January 2006 the BLM solicited feedback from potential operators through a Request for Information (RFI), which was issued in advance of what was hoped to be a subsequent Request for Qualifications (RFQ). The RFI made clear that any potential operator of the desert learning center would be responsible for raising substantial private funds for basic operations. Given this serious fiscal obligation, it was difficult to make the project attractive to potential operators when no groundwork had been laid for private fund-raising within the local community. If, however, a potential operator had submitted a bid knowing that one or more major corporations were behind the project with pledges of cash and/or equipment, it would undoubtedly have changed the desirability of the project from an operator's viewpoint. Tellingly, the agency received no responses to the RFI from established environmental education center operators.

As with the community outreach component, the agency's hesitancy to move forward on fund-raising and solicitations to the business/corporate community, in our view, did not help the project overall. We believe the failure to generate grass-roots support has (directly or indirectly) led to the current suspension of the project. Both the Core Group members and the university were in a unique position to have led these efforts, particularly where the agency is prevented from doing so, yet this opportunity was not seized.

## SUMMARY

Despite the difficulties the university experienced in attempting to assist the Bureau of Land Management with the goals of Task 1, Task 3, and Task 4, we believe these experiences ultimately will serve as an instructive lesson (and cautionary tale) for other entities that may be interested in establishing an outdoor learning center. We have assembled our final products to provide the agency with a complete historical record of the project, should the Oliver Ranch Science School ultimately move forward to construction. In addition, we tailored these products to be useful to other organizations that might contemplate a similar project in another community.

Our greatest success – and lasting legacy – was manifested in the creation of the core curriculum for the desert learning center. Despite the current uncertainties about the viability of the specific Oliver Ranch Science School project, we consciously chose to develop a curriculum that could be delivered at any outdoor or indoor venue, whether in Nevada or elsewhere. Our belief is that the curricular content and activities will have value to other organizations that might contemplate providing hands-on content about the Mojave Desert.

### **FINAL PRODUCTS PROVIDED WITH THIS REPORT:**

Project Coordination for a Desert Learning Center  
Curricular Development for a Desert Learning Center  
Community Outreach for a Desert Learning Center

Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_ December 31, 2006

Margaret Rees, Ph.D.  
Principal Investigator