

**NOTE:** This is the feedback from ARMS Staff on the above report. There are a number of suggestions which I will include in future reports. --gh--

Hi Gary,

In response to your request for detailed constructive criticism on your submittal, NMCRIS 113736, I asked the staff archaeologist who does the validation on the research/academic reports, Steve Townsend, if he would put yours at the top of the queue and provide critical feedback. Below is his compiled feedback.

Overall, everyone's pretty elated by the high quality of your report.

Thank you!

Anna

=====

I'd say that Gary has done a much better job than most in terms of making this recording one that has increased archaeological value. I think his use of a typology, and his definition of terms is a particularly valuable thing, and I hope that nomenclature makes its way through more of the rock art literature. I know ASNM does this. But if all our rock art researchers did recordings the same way, the results might be qualitatively improved. I also see that he has documented some structural features that are associated with the rock art. This is very valuable. One of the biggest complaints folks have about rock art recording is that it is highly thematic, and does not address anything but rock art. Knowing there are structural features around is a good thing. I noticed he used a report number. If ASNM imposed a report numbering series on everything I think it would help to track their overall output.

Site boundaries are hard to determine for rock art sites, since they consist of groupings of panels and elements. It might be good if they took a series of GPS readings around the boundaries of the sites, as they define them, and include them as a table in the LA Site Record. That would help future recorders, as well. Along those lines, why this is important with rock art is because in complex locations, where there are thousands of elements, sites might be arbitrarily bounded, for ease of management. So a boundary coordinate table would then be of increased importance to the next person to come along. I am not faulting Gary on this either, since the idea has not caught on across the board very well.

All in all this seems to be a very well done volunteer effort. Kudos to Gary for the effort.

Some cultural context would be of use. I know the area he's working in has everything from Archaic through possibly post-contact Plains Nomads contributing to the array of

elements. So a context would help to anchor the elements he is documenting within a cultural/temporal framework.

#### Cultural Context Statement:

As to context, in CRM literature (which is somewhat of a different beast), it is required that positive findings include a section that discusses the local cultural/temporal situation from which the findings likely originated. In Gary's case that would mean a discussion of aboriginal groups that might have contributed elements to the rock art he is recording. (In regulation it was meant to help evaluate the findings and to demonstrate the recorder knows what they should be looking for.) It doesn't have to be a lengthy discussion.

#### Site Location Maps:

**NOTE:** A comment was removed that applied to another report which was not prepared before the Archive-Ready Rock Art Report format was available. This report did not include any site location map. --gh--

[Updating the map in the NMCRIS map server too helps protect the site.]

[Thank you for filling out the site form online! Please also print out a copy and include that with the submitted report.]

All in all this is a very good set of documentation.