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Executive Summary

- The Cultural Site Stewardship Program has now enrolled 376 site stewards
- One training class was held this quarter that adding 12 new volunteers.
- The stewardship had an annual growth of 17.5% during the fiscal year 2008.
- Site Stewards reported 83 significant site impacts in 2008 compared with 63 during the same period last year.

Summary of Attachments

- Team meeting agendas
- Team meeting minutes
- Stewardship Questionnaire

Collaboration with Interagency Team

The Interagency Cultural Site Stewardship Team met once this quarter on August 19, 2008 (see attached agenda and minutes). The Team meets every other month and continues to provide direction and guidance for both specific stewardship issues and strategic planning.

Project 1 – Recruitment, Training, and Retention of Volunteer Site Stewards

TASK 1 – Site Stewardship Database

The Cultural Site Stewardship Program (CSSP) relational database is a complete operational system that assimilates data into a secure system. The secured database is housed on UNLV's supercomputer, with operations overseen by team members from the five federal agencies. This system is a strategic addition to effective site stewardship. It contributes a more highly organized information system and eliminates
variables for management decisions. As responsibility for decisions becomes more complex and difficult, the role of the individual steward remains the same and data analysis becomes more relevant.

The system is accessed only by the Project Manager and authorized federal members of the Interagency Cultural Site Stewardship Team (ICSST). Volunteer steward information is now integrated with agency and cultural site information. With our newer system, data retrieval is more fluid and provides several benefits:

- Site identification either by number, name or location. Archived site monitoring results
- Long-term site visitation trends
- Names of site stewards assignments by site and agency
- Photographs from baseline visits by site stewards accessible over a long period
- Record of accumulated monitoring, training and supervisory hours
- Timely agency reports compiling numbers of volunteer hours and stewardship visits
- Administrative documentation such as evidence of current Volunteer Agreements and Ethics Statements

**Task 2 – Recruit additional volunteer cultural site stewards.**

During the 2008 fiscal year, 56 volunteers have been recruited representing a 17.5% annual growth. This number exceeds the 10% required stewardship increase outlined in the CSSP task agreement. The CSSP Stewardship growth is shown in Figure 1 below:

![Annual Stewardship Growth](image)

**Fig. 1 shows growth in the number of stewards in June of each year.**
**Task 3 – Deliver, evaluate, and refine basic training classes for volunteer cultural site stewards.**

During each basic training class, new information and local requirements create changes in the manual and procedures as advised by the team. The curriculum is consistently modified to accommodate personal strengths of the ICSST archaeologist assisting with training.

**Task 4 – Deliver, evaluate, and refine optional educational training for volunteer cultural site stewards.**

Optional education classes continue to be an effective motivation for stewardship. Eva Jensen, Curator for the Lost City Museum and member of ICCST, offered stewards a class on pottery on December 29, 2007. The class successfully drew 18 stewards.

CSSP arranged an instructional tour of St. Thomas by request of Clark County stewards on April 28, 2008. Steve Daron, Archaeologist for the Lake Mead National Park Service and ICCST member, led 23 stewards on a half-day tour of the previously submerged town on April 28, 2008. Steve explained the history of its creation and its connection to Gold Butte, Overton and the Lost City.

New stewards consistently request instruction for GPS navigation. In response, CSSP brought in Sara Cox Hill, a Ph.D archaeology candidate from UNLV who instructed 28 stewards for 3 ½ hours on the fundamentals of GPS use and technology.

**Task 5 – Obtain and evaluate feedback from volunteer cultural site stewards about the program and incorporate into program improvements.**

On August 1, Program Manager, George Phillips, asked each of the five regional coordinators to contact their stewards to answer specific questions about their site assignments, the effect of increased transportation costs for site monitoring and suggestions for program improvements. To date, 118 responses were received (See attached questionnaire). Eight stewards were traveling in excess of 180 miles are being reassigned sites closer to their homes due to increased cost of gasoline. Two stewards are receiving new (additional) partners to reinforce those whose schedules are not flexible enough to participate on a convenient basis. Five stewards said they would like additional sites and in each case they were easily accommodated. Two stewards who retired also withdrew from the program because of travel costs.

**Task 6 – Plan and implement volunteer recognition initiatives and events.**

As reported in the previous Quarterly Progress Report, plans were approved by the Interagency Cultural Site Steward Team to integrate the annual Recognition Event with the Interagency Volunteer Program (IVP). Details are being addressed by the CSSP Regional Coordinators, and Manager George Phillips will coordinate activities with the IVP team scheduled for November 1, 2008.

**Project 2: Monitoring of Cultural Resource Sites and Reporting Results**

**Task 1 – Assign, monitor, supervise, and evaluate volunteer site stewards to protect cultural sites on public lands.**

Stewardship is divided into five regions within Clark County, each posing its own monitoring challenges.
1. **Gold Butte.** Summer heat provides relief from OHV activity and visitation pressures. After four years’ monitoring, eight of the forty-six stewards monitoring visits are becoming inactive, due to age-related issues. Eight other stewards are being reassigned because of increased transportation expenses. A winter stewardship class is planned to focus on Gold Butte.

2. **Moapa.** Monitoring and visitations are steady. A new Regional Coordinator is becoming acquainted with his stewards and their monitoring assignments.

3. **Las Vegas.** Regional Coordinators are active and stewards are responding well.

4. **Sloan.** Six new stewards were assigned to Sloan. Visitations and monitoring activity have both slowed for the summer.

5. **South – Laughlin.** New sites are being assigned stewards. Family illness may bring about the need for a new Regional Coordinator in fall or winter. Activity is slow due to the heat.

General slowdown from June through September is normal. A need for replacement stewards is slightly higher this year over the same period last year due to the economy, and an increase in new sites for monitoring requested by ICSST.

**Task 2 – Report incidents to appropriate agencies.**

All incident reports have been submitted to the appropriate agencies. As shown below in Figure, reported impacts are up 20 totaling 83 reports, which is a 37% increase in 2008 over those in 2007.

**Significant Site Impacts**

![Graph showing significant site impacts](image)

**Fig. 2 shows recorded impacts to cultural sites annually**
Reported impacts for FYE 2008 are compared with those reported for FYE 2007 below:

### Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9/30/07</th>
<th>9/30/08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digging / Potting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullet holes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire pits in shelters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive trash</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human waste</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHV related</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector’s Piles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs destroyed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural destruction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*OHV related damage reports increased 85%, while reports of excessive trash on sites were down significantly.

**Task 3 – Collect, maintain, and provide longitudinal statistics to federal land managing agencies and create and maintain a central database containing site steward and cultural site monitoring information and statistics from all five agencies.**

Impacts of cultural sites are graded to observe trends. They are arranged according to severity. Priority 1 is most severe and may include potting or graffiti on a petroglyph panel. Priority 3 indicates minimal damage, which affects the overall quality of a site such as OHV damage to biotic soil in the immediate area. Approximately 77% of all sites monitored are on lands managed by the BLM. Early in the year, the archaeologist for USF&W transferred to the BLM, and the introduction of new stewards was put on hold. Annual agency reports will be completed after September 30, containing the number of site volunteers hours donated, number of sites monitored, number of units (sites) monitored, number of visits per steward and the number of visits each site received. The number and types of impacts are contained within each report.

As shown below, four years of graded impacts are reported to each agency affected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>BLM</th>
<th>NPS</th>
<th>BOR</th>
<th>USFS</th>
<th>USFW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project 3: Community Outreach and Education**

*Task 1 – Inform the community about the Cultural Site Stewardship Program and their opportunity to get personally involved in protecting public lands.*

CSSP Manager Phillips attended all monthly or quarterly meetings for the following:

- Friends of Sloan
- Friends of Gold Butte
- Southern Nevada Rock Art Association
- Archaeo-Nevada Society
- Nevada Archaeological Association

Phillips reported on the status of CSSP to the quarterly meeting of the board of Nevada Archaeological Association in Austin, Nevada on July 18, 2008. He delivered an update on impact data gathered at Gold Butte from site stewards to the Friends of Gold Butte on September 16, 2008.
Task 2 – Educate the public about the need to protect cultural sites, increase public awareness of the significance and value of heritage resources, and educate the public about proper site etiquette in accordance with existing state and federal laws enacted for historical preservation.

At a meeting on August 1, 2008, Phillips talked to the Friends of Nevada Wilderness regarding OHV data gathered at Gold Butte by CSSP stewards. Photos taken in one week intervals of the rapid evolution of off-road damage, showed how quickly a single track in the desert expands to a major illegal thoroughfare. Copies of the photos were given to the group for further dissemination.
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