Stewards of a Public Trust

TPWD Outlines Procedures for Cultural Resource Studies on Public Lands
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The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) oversees the state’s expansive park system and protects and manages fish and wildlife populations, but its role is far more complex. The agency’s stated mission is “to manage and conserve the natural and cultural resources of Texas and to provide hunting, fishing and outdoor recreation opportunities for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.” As the state agency’s land has increased over the years, the resource management responsibilities have multiplied.

Broadly speaking, lands owned by TPWD are managed for the public trust and are acquired to conserve cultural resources, natural plant habitats, and animal communities. More specifically, as a state agency with a land and resource management assignment, the area of cultural resource protection is an important component of this job.

Introducing TPWD’s Structure and Organization

TPWD’s main landholding divisions are the State Parks, Wildlife, Inland Fisheries, and Coastal Fisheries divisions. Of these, the State Parks Division (SPD) and Wildlife Division (WD) are the two primary land-managing entities. The two divisions have
different funding sources, public use objectives, missions, and extent of development rules, and as such, the two divisions implement third-party land-access agreements in slightly different ways.

SPD is responsible for managing 94 properties that total 916.4 square miles and include 74 state parks, 10 state historic sites, three state parks/state historic sites, and seven state natural areas (Figure 1, Table 1). For the purposes of this discussion, this whole group is called state parks (SPs). WD manages 51 Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs), totaling about 1,117.5 square miles (Figure 1, Table 2).

In both divisions, some TPWD properties are lands transferred from other agencies by the legislature, purchased by state-issued bonds, or acquired by private land donations or probated estates. Other lands are simply managed by TPWD under programmatic agreements on behalf of various other state agencies or subdivisions (e.g., Texas Department of Transportation mitigation land bank; various river, electric, or utility authorities; and city- or county-owned properties). Still other lands are managed by TPWD under long-term leases and are owned by federal agencies; these agreements include partnerships with the Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and U.S. Forest Service.

At full capacity, TPWD has 15 full-time staff archeologists and a few temporary or hourly cultural resource employees. The SPD has a program director, full-time regional archeologists stationed at each of the state’s eight regions, four full-time staff assigned to the Archeology Survey Team, and one staff member directing several part-time workers at the Archeology Laboratory. The WD has one archeologist managing resources and conducting projects on the WMAs. The agency also relies on the expertise of in-house historians and architectural historians to supplement the prehistoric and historic archeological staff, as well as several material conservators who maintain various collections of furniture, period artifacts, and documents that support the historic sites. TPWD also maintains a state-certified curation facility at the Archeology Laboratory that exclusively manages the artifacts, records, and photographs from projects on TPWD properties.

Cultural Resource Studies by Private Consultants on TPWD Lands
The Antiquities Code of Texas requires TPWD to obtain an annual Antiquities Permit when TPWD staff conduct small-scale projects on TPWD properties. All cultural resource consulting firms (CR firms) working on TPWD lands and TPWD staff working on some larger agency projects are required to obtain separate permits, regardless of whether the entire, or just a small percentage, of the proposed project area crosses TPWD land.

Sometimes, TPWD will solicit bids for cultural resource services for proposed projects on SPs and WMAs. Most contract CR firms are familiar with the process of bidding on cultural resource projects and the standard activities needed to fulfill the usual terms of the TPWD contract. However, CR firms must take a number of additional steps in order to obtain permission to access TPWD lands when conducting cultural resource studies for third party clients. Third party clients usually include groups in the energy (oil/gas, seismic, etc.) or transmission (power line, pipeline, gas lines, etc.), or utility industries, whose activities occasionally occur on or cross TPWD-managed lands. Even companies with legal rights to extract subsurface minerals from under TPWD property have to comply with conditions stipulated in TPWD Surface Use Agreements (SUAs).

SUAs may include a range of instruments, such as easements and geophysical permits, depending upon the nature of the third-party request. They also cover such conditions as facility placement, points of entry, and access timing to ensure that activities related to the study do not adversely affect (1) breeding, nesting, and migratory activity and locales for migratory and native species, including endangered species; (2) TPWD’s schedule, as well as its ability to manage wildlife and habitats and to operate properties; or (3) public use areas in SPs by inflicting unsightly project scars or intrusive noise.

Ultimately, TPWD’s mission and goal is to avoid cultural resource disturbances when alternate options are available. Some SUAs may also require avoidance, maintenance or restoration of roads, levees, fences, and natural features that might be damaged by direct and indirect adverse project effects during surveys or third-party project implementation. Essentially, any firm working on TPWD lands must meet the agency’s stated mission for properly managing resources within its properties.

The cultural resource permits and consultation processes needed to work on TPWD-managed lands depends upon the requirements and authority of the landowner. Projects conducted on federally-owned lands, or those developed under federal permit or with federal funds managed by TPWD, require compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. In contrast, projects conducted on properties owned by the State of Texas or its subdivisions and managed by TPWD need to comply with the Antiquities Code of Texas as well as TPWD rules and guidelines for operations conducted on TPWD lands. Invariably, projects conducted on federal lands, using federal funds, or under federal permit will require coordination with the appropriate lead federal agency and possible consultation with other interested parties. It is important to note that different staff members within the Archeology Division of the Texas
Historical Commission (THC) review federal undertakings and state projects on TPWD-administered lands.

The TPWD staff will assist CR firms through the THC consultation process. As soon as the consulting archeologists become aware that one of their client’s proposed projects may occur on TPWD administered lands, they should advise their client to begin the process of obtaining an SUA, if this has not already been done. The conditions of this agreement hold the firm’s client to certain entry and access requirements, specify the allowed range of activities by construction workers and the client’s consultants, and provide post-project restoration commitments to reduce the impact on the habitat.

Slight procedural differences exist in the ways SPD and WD implement the necessary agreements to begin cultural resource projects. The SPD allows CR firms to begin the Antiquities Permit application process after their clients have agreed to begin negotiations for the SUA. Cultural resource activities are allowed to proceed within a state park following an issuance of a TPWD “Right-to-Enter-Premises” letter with conditions (or similar legal instrument) stipulating restrictions in addition to those outlined in the Antiquities Permit. In contrast, the WD often requires a separate access SUA be negotiated with the CR firm while the client is discussing the project SUA. The SUA with the consulting CR firm is a more formal process, but it is similar to the “Right-to-Enter-Premises” letter used by SPD. It also spells out conditions the CR firm must follow to enter and work on the WMAs. Both TPWD divisions encourage resources investigation well in advance of granting the client’s project SUA so that the results of archeological and/or other environmental studies are integrated into the conditions of the SUA that will cover project construction. TPWD would prefer to know where cultural resources are relative to the proposed project location before the negotiations for the construction phase of the project SUA are completed. As stated earlier, avoiding impact to resources is TPWD’s preferred management tool.

Regardless of who owns the property, TPWD staff will help facilitate the permit application process. Indeed, TPWD would like the CR firms to submit to the agency their Antiquities Permit application with their client’s signature for TPWD review of methods and procedures. This will facilitate TPWD authorization on the landowner’s signature space on the Antiquities Permit application. The TPWD cultural resource staff will review the permit applications and maps (including access roads, staging areas, stock piles area, turnarounds, etc.) to be certain that all primary and secondary impact project areas are identified and addressed in the permit application.

TPWD cultural resource staff also will review the CR firm’s proposed methods to ensure that the firm abides by the Council of Texas Archeologists’ field guidelines, which is the standard recommended by the TPWD and THC for this work. TPWD may require strict adherence to the field guideline methods to ensure that the proposed field practices meet the agency’s needs for identifying resources. This means that TPWD cultural resource staff may not accept landscape classifications identifying “low site probability areas” that the consulting firm archeologists recommend only need superficial field inspections. As the responsible managing agency, TPWD is committed to ensuring that the resource has a fair chance of being identified and managed. When the Antiquities Permit proposal is acceptable and complete, the authorized TPWD staff will sign the landowner’s certification line on the permit application and TPWD will forward the Antiquities Permit application to the THC for permit issuance on behalf of the CR firm. Do not send the Antiquities Permit applications directly to the THC.

Typical SUA Conditions Related to Cultural Resources

Cultural resource projects for third parties on SPs or WMAs begin with the CR firm’s client initiating negotiations with TPWD about the proposed project. TPWD will grant the consulting CR firm either a “Right-to-Enter-Premises” letter with conditions (for SPs) or an SUA with conditions (for WMAs) to conduct fieldwork.

To negotiate access agreements, contact David Riskind at the SPD and Dennis Gissell at the WD (see contact list below). These individuals act as clearinghouses for their respective divisions by coordinating with area managers and TPWD Legal and Land Conservation Programs staff to address concerns about resources, park, or wildlife operations in the development of the SUAs. In addition, natural resource concerns are factored into the SUA, and cultural resource, operational, public use, and aesthetic issues are integrated to assure minimum adverse impact of the third-party project on TPWD-managed properties. Thus, the SUA covers a wide range of concerns. Some provisions may relate to cultural resources and the consulting CR firm. Noncompliance with terms of the “Right-to-Enter-Premises” or SUA conditions may jeopardize the CR firm’s client’s activities on TPWD property; this would not be in the best interest of the CR firm.

Common SUA conditions and stipulations for cultural resources include the following:

1. The client must agree on suitable location and configuration of facilities and access routes. Sometimes, initial designs for proposed facilities and access routes can adversely affect the visual integrity and operations of historic and natural landscapes on SPs and WMAs. TPWD is concerned with avoiding, minimizing, or mitigating adverse affects caused by poorly planned facilities placement.

To negotiate access agreements, contact David Riskind at the SPD and Dennis Gissell at the WD (see contact list below). These individuals act as clearinghouses for their respective divisions by coordinating with area managers and TPWD Legal and Land Conservation Programs staff to address concerns about resources, park, or wildlife operations in the development of the SUAs. In addition, natural resource concerns are factored into the SUA, and cultural resource, operational, public use, and aesthetic issues are integrated to assure minimum adverse impact of the third-party project on TPWD-managed properties. Thus, the SUA covers a wide range of concerns. Some provisions may relate to cultural resources and the consulting CR firm. Noncompliance with terms of the “Right-to-Enter-Premises” or SUA conditions may jeopardize the CR firm’s client’s activities on TPWD property; this would not be in the best interest of the CR firm.

2. The client must agree on suitable routes and timing of access to proposed locations. For example, in marshy public
lands, TPWD wants to ensure that wheeled or tracked vehicles do not jeopardize the integrity of levees or damage sensitive wetland or bottomland habitat. Occasionally wood-plank roads are required to disperse vehicle weight on marshy ground, and access routes might have to skirt rare plant communities or other sensitive features. Furthermore, conditions may require the client to restore levees and roads to preexisting conditions.

3. The client must have his or her cultural resource principal investigator or project archeologist meet with the SP or WMA manager to arrange dates of access, points of entry, and proposed means of entry that will inflict the least disturbance to the habitat or species of management concern and/or damage to the property. In some cases, special modes of transportation, such as air boats, might be the only appropriate field vehicles on marshy ground. Firms should be aware of the potential for these kinds of conditions, and they should build in appropriate time and costs into budgets and/or advise clients before the beginning of fieldwork about these kinds of stipulations.

4. The client’s CR firm must submit a proposed scope of work for the Antiquities Permit application to TPWD cultural resource staff for review and modification. This will ensure that the methods comply with TPWD’s field standards, methods of coverage, and recording procedures.

5. Unless otherwise stipulated, TPWD will require that the CR firm conduct its own background research at the TPWD Archeology Lab and curation facility in Austin prior to conducting field research.

6. The client’s CR firm’s field crews must carry a signed Antiquities Permit and the “Right-to-Enter-Premises” or SUA agreements while in the field and present the Antiquities Permit to SP and WMA managers upon request. If the CR firm’s field crews arrive at TPWD property without a signed Antiquities Permit, they might not be granted access to the property.

7. The field crews will abide by all existing SP and/or WMA rules and regulations while they are conducting fieldwork.

8. The client’s CR firm will submit one copy of the draft cultural resource report to the TPWD cultural resource staff for review to ensure that the report project adequately addresses TPWD interests as outlined in the Council of Texas Archeologists guidelines. TPWD staff review shall be conducted and the CR firm will address agency comments before the CR firm submits draft review copies along with a TPWD cover letter to the THC for that agency’s permit review. TPWD staff is most familiar with the SP/WMA resources and issues, and will focus on the adequacy of background research, field methods, documentation of cultural resources and recommendations and justifications developed by the CR firm’s staff.

9. Staff at the client’s CR firm shall prepare all project field notes, pictures, and artifacts from TPWD property according to the standard of cleanliness, packaging, and labeling as outlined in the TPWD Archeology Laboratory and curation manual available at the agency’s curation facility. (These curation procedures and standards are obtained by contacting Aina Dodge; see contact list below.)

10. The client’s CR firm shall submit all artifacts, records, and photographs from TPWD property and managed lands to the TPWD Archeology Laboratory curation facility in Austin. The curation facility staff will issue a letter of material receipt upon delivery. The staff will check the contents of the records and materials and then issue the curation completion form that will be sent to the THC indicating satisfactory submittal of project materials for curation. Currently, and in the foreseeable future, curation collections from TPWD property will be received and curated at no charge to the CR firm or the client.

11. The client’s CR firm shall submit to TPWD five final printed paper reports for our regional and headquarters files. These hard copies shall be submitted to TPWD above and beyond any report stipulations on the number and/or formats of final reports required to satisfy the Antiquities Permit. Historically, the final reports submitted to the THC were distributed to libraries or university contract firms; none were sent back to the land-managing agencies. TPWD requires these final report copies to manage the resources effectively on behalf of the citizens of Texas.

**Assistance Provided by TPWD**

TPWD staff offers the following forms of assistance:

1. Review and guidance on proposed survey methodologies for particular TPWD-owned or managed properties.

2. Access to up-to-date historical records and reports on specific TPWD properties at the agency’s Archeology Laboratory, located at 1340 Airport Commerce Dr. in Austin.

3. Review comments on draft reports to enhance the CR firm’s reporting quality and verify information about TPWD’s resources.

4. Gratis curation for records, photographs, and collected materials from TPWD project areas.

**Summary**

We urge private consulting firms to start with a phone call to the TPWD cultural resource staff when a client proposes a project on TPWD lands. Be sure that the firm’s client is aware of the need for initiating SUA negotiations with the appropriate Natural Resources Program coordinator before the project time clock begins. Some “Right-to-Enter-Premises” and SUA conditions, such as modes of transportation or scheduling constraints during nesting seasons, etc., might have cost or schedule implications firms should be aware of when bidding and scoping a job. Discussions with the TPWD
staff should occur before the firm considers developing an Antiquities Permit application. Do not submit the Antiquities Permit directly to the THC; instead, TPWD will forward the permit application to the THC after approving and signing off on the proposed procedures. TPWD cultural resource staff members are most familiar with the resources and issues on their SPs and WMAs and can steer you through the process with the least amount of trouble. Don’t forget to send one digital or hard copy of the draft report for review and at least five paper copies of the final report to TPWD. The bound, paper final reports sent to TPWD are in addition to the format and/or numbers of final copies needed to satisfy Antiquities Permit requirements.

Compliance with the TPWD procedures, as outlined above, should reduce problems that may arise with the THC reviewers. The ultimate goal is to forge a partnership with companies working on TPWD lands and improve the quality of cultural resource studies so that TPWD can meet its stated mission. Appropriately managing public lands in Texas will preserve rare sanctuaries, conserve our irreplaceable cultural and natural resources, and ensure that future generations will be able to enjoy the treasures found at the diverse SPs and WMAs scattered around the state.

**Contacts**
For further information, please contact the following individuals.

**Cultural Resources Staff**
- Michael Strutt, Cultural Resource Program Director, Parks Division, TPWD, 4200 Smith School Rd., Austin, TX 78744, 512.389.4736
- Christopher Lintz, Cultural Resource Specialist, Wildlife Division, TPWD, 4200 Smith School Rd., Austin, TX 78744, 512.389.4427
- Aina Dodge, Archeology Laboratory Supervisor, TPWD, 1340 Airport Commerce Dr., Building 6, Austin, TX 78741, 512.389.4876

**Natural Resources Program Coordinator Staff**
- David Riskind, Natural Resources Program Director, Parks Division, TPWD, 4200 Smith School Rd., Austin, TX 78744, 512.389.4897
- Dennis Gissell, Environmental Resources Coordinator, Wildlife Division, TPWD, 4200 Smith School Rd., Austin, TX 78744, 512.389.4407

---

*Christopher Lintz is a cultural resource specialist in the TPWD’s Wildlife Division. Michael Strutt is the Cultural Resource Program director in the TPWD’s Parks Division.*

---

### Table 1

**State Parks Division Facilities: Ownership, County, and Approximate Acreage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choke Canyon</td>
<td>Bureau of Reclamation</td>
<td>Live Oak/McMullen</td>
<td>3,766.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Texana</td>
<td>Bureau of Reclamation &amp; Lavaca-Navidad River Authority</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>575.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth</td>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>1,475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Hill</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>1,810.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper Lake</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth</td>
<td>Delta/Hopkins</td>
<td>3,026.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>423.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Somerville</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth</td>
<td>Burleson/Lee</td>
<td>5,520.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Whitney</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>1,315.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Dies, Jr.</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth</td>
<td>Jasper/Tyler</td>
<td>705.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Roberts Lake</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth</td>
<td>Cooke/Denton/Grayson</td>
<td>5,538.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Angelo</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth</td>
<td>Tom Green</td>
<td>7,063.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State Parks Owned by State Entities or Subdivisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Corpus Christi</td>
<td>City of Corpus Christi</td>
<td>San Patricio</td>
<td>14,155.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Facility Name</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Acreage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luminant Energy (formerly Texas Utilities Company)</td>
<td>Martin Creek Lake</td>
<td>Rusk</td>
<td>286.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luminant Energy (formerly Texas Utilities Company)</td>
<td>Fairfield Lake</td>
<td>Freestone</td>
<td>1,460.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabine River Authority</td>
<td>Lake Tawakoni</td>
<td>Hunt</td>
<td>376.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Electric Service Company</td>
<td>Lake Colorado City</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb County</td>
<td>Lake Casa Blanca</td>
<td>Webb</td>
<td>371.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Abilene</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>529.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Balmorhea</td>
<td>Reeves</td>
<td>45.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Bastrop</td>
<td>Bastrop</td>
<td>6,176.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Bentsen-Rio Grande Valley/ WBC</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>763.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Big Bend Ranch</td>
<td>Brewster/Presidio</td>
<td>301,318.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Big Spring</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>381.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Blanco</td>
<td>Blanco</td>
<td>104.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Bonham</td>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>261.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Brazos Bend</td>
<td>Fort Bend</td>
<td>4,975.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Buescher</td>
<td>Bastrop</td>
<td>1,016.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Caddo Lake</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>484.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Caprock Canyons and Trailways</td>
<td>Bomois/Floyd/Hall</td>
<td>15,279.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Cleburne</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>528.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Colorado Bend</td>
<td>Lampasas/San Saba</td>
<td>5,328.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Copper Breaks</td>
<td>Hardeman</td>
<td>1,886.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Daingerfield</td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>506.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Davis Hill*</td>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>1,737.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Davis Mountains</td>
<td>Jeff Davis</td>
<td>2,708.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Dinosaur Valley</td>
<td>Somervell</td>
<td>1,587.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Falcon</td>
<td>Starr</td>
<td>572.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Fort Boggy</td>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>1,847.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Fort Parker</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>1,448.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Franklin Mountains</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>24,150.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Galveston Island</td>
<td>Galveston</td>
<td>2,006.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Garner</td>
<td>Uvalde</td>
<td>2,029.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Goliad</td>
<td>Goliad</td>
<td>188.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Goose Island</td>
<td>Aransas</td>
<td>321.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Guadalupe River/Honey Creek</td>
<td>Comal/Kendall</td>
<td>4,232.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Huntsville</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>2,083.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Inks Lake</td>
<td>Burnet</td>
<td>1,201.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Kickapoo Cavern</td>
<td>Edwards/Kinney</td>
<td>6,368.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Lake Arrowhead</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>524.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Lake Bob Sandlin</td>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>639.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Lake Brownwood</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>537.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Lake Livingston</td>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>635.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Lake Mineral Wells and Trailway</td>
<td>Parker/Palo Pinto</td>
<td>3,282.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Lockhart</td>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>263.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Longhorn Caverns</td>
<td>Burnet</td>
<td>652.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>McKinney Falls</td>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>725.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>Bosque</td>
<td>505.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Mission Tejas</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>659.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Monahans Sandhills</td>
<td>Ward/Winkler</td>
<td>3,840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Mother Neff</td>
<td>Coryell</td>
<td>259.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Mustang Island</td>
<td>Nueces</td>
<td>4,093.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1—continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Palmetto</td>
<td>Gonzales</td>
<td>276.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Palo Duro Canyon</td>
<td>Armstrong/Randall</td>
<td>26,275.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Pedernales Falls</td>
<td>Blanco</td>
<td>5,211.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Possum Kingdom</td>
<td>Palo Pinto</td>
<td>1,528.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Putris Creek</td>
<td>Henderson/Van Zandt</td>
<td>1,582.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Sea Rim</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>4,141.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Sheldon Lake</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>2,605.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>South Llano River</td>
<td>Kimble</td>
<td>524.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Stephen F. Austin</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>487.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>985.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Village Creek</td>
<td>Hardin</td>
<td>1,090.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>World Birding Center—Resaca de la Palma*</td>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>World Birding Center—Vesliaco</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>153.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*State Parks Total Number* 74
*State Parks Total Acres* 503,149.57

State Historic Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Fanthorp Inn</td>
<td>Grimes</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Fort Leaton</td>
<td>Presidio</td>
<td>23.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Hueco Tanks</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>860.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Lipantitian</td>
<td>Nueces</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Monument Hill/Kreische Brewery</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>40.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Port Isabel Lighthouse</td>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Battleship Texas</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>San Jacinto Monument and Battleground</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>1,215.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Sebastopol House</td>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Washington-on-the-Brazos</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>292.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*State Historic Sites Total Number* 10
*State Historic Sites Total Acres* 2,442.30

State Parks/Historic Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Fort Richardson</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>477.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Lyndon B. Johnson</td>
<td>Gillespie</td>
<td>717.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Seminole Canyon</td>
<td>Val Verde</td>
<td>2,172.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*State Parks/Historic Sites Total Number* 3
*State Parks/Historic Sites Total Acres* 3,367.66

State Natural Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Chinati Mountains*</td>
<td>Presidio</td>
<td>37,885.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Devil's River</td>
<td>Val Verde</td>
<td>19,988.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Devil's Sinkhole</td>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>1,859.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Enchanted Rock</td>
<td>Gillespie</td>
<td>1,643.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Government Canyon</td>
<td>Bexar</td>
<td>8,620.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Hill Country</td>
<td>Bandera/Medina</td>
<td>5,369.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Lost Maples</td>
<td>Bandera/Real</td>
<td>2,174.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*State Natural Areas Total Number* 7
*State Natural Areas Total Acres* 77,541.73

Parks Division Total Acres 586,501.26
Parks Division Total Square Miles 916.41

*Not currently open to public.*
Table 2  
Wildlife Division Facilities: Ownership, County, and Approximate Acreage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Wildlife Management Areas &amp; Units</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wildlife Management Areas on Federally Owned Land</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Reclamation</td>
<td>James Daughtry</td>
<td>Live Oak/McMullen</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth</td>
<td>Ray Roberts Culp Branch Prairie</td>
<td>Cooke/Denton/Grayson</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth</td>
<td>Angelina-Neches/Dam B</td>
<td>Jasper/Tyler</td>
<td>16,136.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth</td>
<td>Cooper Lake</td>
<td>Delta/Hopkins</td>
<td>14,180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth</td>
<td>Granger</td>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>11,116.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth</td>
<td>Lake Somerville</td>
<td>Lee/Burleson</td>
<td>3,180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth</td>
<td>White Oak Creek</td>
<td>Cass/Morrison/Red River</td>
<td>25,775.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Tulsa</td>
<td>Pat Mayes</td>
<td>Lamar</td>
<td>8,925.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and General Land Office</td>
<td>Matagorda Island</td>
<td>Calhoun</td>
<td>43,893.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Forest Service</td>
<td>Alabama Creek</td>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>14,561.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Forest Service</td>
<td>Caddo Grasslands (two areas—Northern and Southern Units)</td>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>16,174.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Forest Service</td>
<td>Sam Houston National Forest</td>
<td>San Jacinto/Montgomery</td>
<td>161,154.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Forest Service and Campbell Group</td>
<td>Bannister</td>
<td>San Augustine</td>
<td>28,307.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Forest Service and Campbell Group</td>
<td>Moore Plantation</td>
<td>Sabine</td>
<td>27,034.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wildlife Management Areas Owned by State Agencies or Subdivisions**

| General Land Office | Welder flats | Calhoun | 1,480.00 |
| Sabine River Authority | Lake Tawakoni | Hunt/Rains | 1,562.00 |
| Sabine River Authority | North Toledo Bend | Shelby | 3,650.00 |
| Texas Department of Transportation | Nanny M. Stringfellow | Brazoria | 3,553.30 |
| Trinity River Water Authority | Cedar Creek Islands | Henderson/Kaufman | 159.00 |
| TPWD | Alazan Bayou | Nacogdoches | 2,063.00 |
| TPWD | Atkinson Island | Harris | 151.96 |
| TPWD | Big Lake Bottom | Anderson | 4,339.14 |
| TPWD and General Land Office | Black Gap | Brewster | 109,345.62 |
| TPWD | Caddo Lake | Marion/Harrison | 7,804.77 |
| TPWD | Candy Abshier | Chambers | 208.77 |
| TPWD | Chaparral | Dimmitt/LaSalle | 15,200.00 |
| TPWD | D.R. Winterman | Wharton | 246.00 |
| TPWD | Elephant Mountain | Brewster | 23,146.70 |
| TPWD | Gene Howe (two areas—Gene Howe Proper and W.A. Pat Murphy Units) | Hemphill/Lipscomb | 8,775.80 |
| TPWD | Guadalupe Delta (four areas—Hynes Bay, San Antonio River, River, and Mission Lake Units) | Calhoun/Refugio/Victoria | 7,239.77 |
| TPWD | Gus Engeling | Anderson | 10,960.00 |
| TPWD | J.D. Murphree (three areas—Big Hill, Hildebrandt, and Salt Bayou Units) | Jefferson | 24,516.00 |
| TPWD | Keechi Creek | Leon | 1,500.00 |
| TPWD | Kerr | Kerr | 6,459.88 |
| TPWD | Las Palomas (ten areas—Anacua, Arroyo Colorado, Baird, Carricitas, Chapote, Ebony, Fredrick, Longoria, Taormina, and Tucker-Deshazo Units) | Cameron/Hidalgo/Willacy | 2,820.00 |
As a marine archeologist for the past 30 years, I’ve heard many tales of lost treasure. I’ve even worked on a real treasure wreck or two. But it all pales in comparison to the latest twist on an old myth from the Texas swamplands.

Following a clue he found in 2006 in a book on lost treasures, Nathan Smith from California is seeking access to a site near Refugio where he hopes to eventually make his fortune. To do this, he has not only traveled more than 1,200 miles from home, but his odyssey has involved a slew of other players—property owners near the site, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Texas Historical Commission (THC), lawyers on both sides of a legal case, the U.S. District Court in Houston, and members of the news media.

Myth or Historical Fact?
Most myths are based on some small bit of history, and this one is no different. Anyone searching for Burgentine Creek in the Handbook on Texas Online (Huson undated), will find the familiar story of a ship in distress seeking shelter from a tremendous storm and blown ashore. The vessel was washed far up a creek, where it was abandoned and later discovered and salvaged by locals in need of timber and metal. Burgentine Creek—which was dammed by the Civilian Conservation Corps to form Burgentine Lake on the lower part of the creek in 1939—was apparently named after the stranded vessel, said to be a barkentine or brigantine. Of course, any good shipwreck story must have treasure.

---

Table 2—continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Wildlife Management Areas &amp; Units</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPWD (leased to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)</td>
<td>Las Palomas (eight areas—McManus, Champion, Kelley, Kiskadee, Penitas, Prieta, La Grulla, and Vorshell Units)</td>
<td>Starr/Hidalgo/Cameron</td>
<td>606.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Lower Neches (three areas—Adams Bayou, Nelda Stark, and Old River* Units)</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>8,372.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>M.O. Neasley</td>
<td>Gonzales</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Mad Island</td>
<td>Matagorda</td>
<td>7,281.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Mason Mountain</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>5,300.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Matador</td>
<td>Cotile</td>
<td>28,184.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>McGillvray and Leona McKie Muse</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>1,972.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Old Sabine Bottom</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>5,727.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Old Tunnel</td>
<td>Kendall</td>
<td>16.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Peach Point</td>
<td>Brazoria</td>
<td>17,826.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Playa Lakes (three areas—Dimmitt, Armstrong,** and Taylor Lakes Units)</td>
<td>Castro/Donley</td>
<td>1,592.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Redhead Pond</td>
<td>Nueces</td>
<td>36.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Richland Creek</td>
<td>Freestone/Navarro</td>
<td>13,796.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Sierra Diablo</td>
<td>Culberson</td>
<td>10,231.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Tony Houseman</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>3,896.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Tyler Nature Center</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>82.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Walter Buck</td>
<td>Kimble</td>
<td>2,133.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wildlife Management Areas Total Number 51
Wildlife Division Total Acres 715,171.37
Wildlife Division Total Square Miles 1,117.46

*Lower Neches Wildlife Management Area—Old River Unit (ca. 4,525 acres) is leased by TPWD from Entergy, Inc.
**Playa Lakes Wildlife Management Area—Armstrong Unit (ca. 160 acres) is leased by TPWD from private landowner; land also has a conservation easement.

---

A Texas Swampland Tale
(or How I Became a Highway Robber)

Steven D. Hoyt

As a marine archeologist for the past 30 years, I’ve heard many tales of lost treasure. I’ve even worked on a real treasure wreck or two. But it all pales in comparison to the latest twist on an old myth from the Texas swamplands.

Following a clue he found in 2006 in a book on lost treasures, Nathan Smith from California is seeking access to a site near Refugio where he hopes to eventually make his fortune. To do this, he has not only traveled more than 1,200 miles from home, but his odyssey has involved a slew of other players—property owners near the site, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Texas Historical Commission (THC), lawyers on both sides of a legal case, the U.S. District Court in Houston, and members of the news media.
In this account, the lost treasure is in the form of a pay chest for Mexican garrisons.

This particular story has been recounted many times with various interpretations. Henry Wolff, Jr., provides an elaborate version of the tale as told to him by a local resident (Victoria Advocate 1999). In this version, a Spanish ship sailed from Veracruz in 1822 laden with gold and silver. When the storm struck, Captain Diego Soto took his ship into the bay and traveled several miles up a wide river before turning into the mouth of a creek. When the storm waters receded, the ship became stranded. The crew was never heard from again. The ship, with the treasure still inside, was found 18 years later by Comanches, who were attacked by Karankawas as the Comanches were carrying off the treasure. After a fierce battle, during which the Comanche warriors killed many of their horses to use as a barricade, the Karankawas retreated. The Comanches buried the treasure on the knoll where they had made their stand since they no longer had enough horses to carry the load. The story goes on to say that a Mr. Fagan found the wreck after the Civil War in a creek locally known as Barkentine Creek and used salvaged parts to build a house. He apparently did not find the remaining gold and silver on the wreck, and the treasure has never been located.

Another version of the story was reported by Pat Hathcock in the Victoria Advocate (undated). Lucile Snider, then living on the Fagan ranch, related her family legend about her great-grandfather Nicholas Fagan, who allegedly found the Spanish shipwreck. Mrs. Snider claimed to own two hand-wrought hinges that were part of the material collected from the wreck by Mr. Fagan and used in construction of his house. In this version of the story, the wreck occurred in 1818, and the ship was carrying money for Mexican soldiers rather than Spanish gold and silver on its way to the king.

The final printed version of this story I will mention at this point claims that a Comanche war party found the wreck, removed eight jars of gold coins, and buried them in the prairie while being chased. The coins were never recovered, but it is reported that during the last half of the 1800s, many people came to see the wreck on the prairie (Townsend 1979:6).

The Treasure Hunt Begins

In December 2006, the THC received some telephone calls about buried treasure. The caller claimed to have found a 17th century Spanish shipwreck on private property at the edge of a lake in South Texas by using satellite imagery (Google Earth”). He also said he had visited the wreck site, found the ship in perfect condition, and claimed it still contained “billions of dollars in gold.” By the second call, which came on the same day, the wreck was worth a trillion dollars.

The caller, Nathan Smith, was informed that if he had located a wreck on private property, the wreck belonged to the property owners. In this case, the THC would have no jurisdiction. On the other hand, if the wreck were on public property, it and all of its contents belonged to the state of Texas. He declined to give any specific information that might help determine if the wreck was on private or public property. In a third call that same day, the caller said he had worked out a deal with the property owner, and he was going to file a salvage claim on the wreck in federal court under admiralty law. He wanted the THC to be involved so it would be a legitimate archeological investigation. Mr. Smith informed the THC would only be involved with the full agreement of the landowner and that the landowner needed to contact the agency directly.

In yet a fourth call that day, Mr. Smith reported filing a suit in federal court in California. He wanted the THC to help him find an archeologist, and he expected to become famous.

“X” Marks the Spot

About a month after his initial contact, in early January 2007, Mr. Smith called again. This time, he reported visiting the site and using a metal detector that indicated the presence of lots of gold and silver. He again maintained that he had a deal with the landowner, who remained unidentified. According to Mr. Smith, the entire wreck was buried, with the bow elevating a dirt mound slightly higher than the surrounding terrain. He reported recovering a couple of small fragments of wood, one of which appeared to be treated with creosote, indicating to him it was from a shipwreck. Further, there was an “X” on the ground where nothing was growing.

During this conversation, the caller shared an even more fabulous version of the shipwreck story. Sixteen Spanish ships were carrying gold from Mexico to Galveston in 1822. One ship was left behind, and the other 15 were destroyed in a storm in the Gulf. The last vessel got a late start and was caught in a separate storm. In searching for shelter, the ship entered a bay and continued into a river, then into a tributary of the river the captain thought might lead back to the Gulf. The vessel eventually came to rest on a muddy prairie where the crew was slaughtered and eaten by native cannibals. Twenty years later, the Comanche found the wreck and tried to use the gold for trade, but they also were killed and eaten. Eventually, the land was bought, and the owner, hearing the tale of the immense treasure on the wreck, found it after only two or three days of searching. According to Mr. Smith’s story, others have found the wreck since but were unaware of the
Some Relevant Facts
A few observations might be appropriate at this point.
• At the time of this writing, gold is selling for about $946 per ounce. Two thousand tons of gold would currently be worth $60,544,000,000.
• By far, the greatest percentage of treasure carried out of the New World by Spain was silver, not gold (Walton 1994:44).
• By 1892, “downeasters” were being built in New England. Known for exceptional cargo capacity, they were capable of carrying around 1,400–1,500 tons. Two thousands tons of cargo capacity would be a truly exceptional ship for 1822.
• The Spanish treasure fleets, the flota system, ceased operation around 1790 after Spain opened up the New World markets for free trade.
• Spanish treasure fleets never stopped in Galveston. Even in 1822, well past the end of the flota system, Galveston was not a developed port, having been inhabited primarily by the pirates Aury and Lafitte between 1817 and 1821.
• Throughout my long career, I have never seen a legitimate reference to a lost Spanish treasure fleet of 1822. Sixteen ships lost with the king’s treasure would certainly have been noted in the official records.

The Story Continues
As the case continued to unfold, additional information about the wreck emerged. On January 24, 2007, Mr. Smith sent aerial photographs of the shipwreck location. The images show a giant shoe-shaped print in the low prairie’s brush and grass. To pinpoint the location of the shape and find out if it is on public or private land, I visited the Google Earth™ web site where Mr. Smith originally found this image. Searching the area around Burgentine Creek proved fruitless.

Several months later, when visiting this issue once again, I finally located the “shoe print.” I was astounded. First of all, it seems the Burgentine Creek wreck has migrated to a completely different ranch and a completely different creek several miles away. (Perhaps another great storm picked it up and moved it across the prairie?) Second, the print is more than 1,400 feet long. The world’s first nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, the USS Enterprise, which launched in 1960, is only 1,123 feet long. This brings to mind a conversation with Mr. Smith in which he asked if a ship in soft soil could wallow out a basin larger than the hull itself. At the time, I assured him it could, and that it was quite common. He also asked if the basin could be a thousand feet long, and I assured him it could not, not for a ship of that period.

To fill in other gaps in the story, I offer the following notes:

August 2007—A representative of the family who owns the property where the shipwreck supposedly lies calls. According to her, Mr. Smith is trying to get access to the family property, saying he has an admiralty salvage claim, and they are required to grant him access. She asks about the THC’s involvement since Mr. Smith has indicated he has had discussions with the agency. I inform her that the state has no jurisdiction over historic resources on private property, that I am very skeptical of the claims made, and that the THC has no agreement with Mr. Smith. She indicates the property owner is not inclined to give him access to the property. It is apparent from this conversation that the previous assertion by Mr. Smith (that a deal had been made with the property owner, wherein the property owner would get six percent of the treasure’s value) is not correct.

Late September 2007—Mr. Smith now claims the wreck is underwater but on private land. Despite having previously been told that the THC has no authority over artifacts on private property, he expresses surprise, saying he had heard the “Texas Antiquity” would take away anything he found. I tell him I am skeptical of his claims, that he has presented no credible evidence of having found a wreck, and that even if a wreck did exist, the possibility of finding vast treasure is minimal.

August 2008—The Galveston District of the Corps of Engineers contacts me about a permit request they received from Mr. Smith to excavate the site of a shipwreck on privately owned wetlands. The Corps of Engineers requires Mr. Smith to hire an archeologist and complete an archeological survey of the site to determine if a vessel eligible for the National Register would be impacted by the activity. Shortly after that, I am contacted by several professional archeologists inquiring about the project and Mr. Smith’s claims.

December 2008—Houston news media report on a trial in a Houston federal court in which Mr. Smith claims salvage rights under admiralty law. Until this point, all previous conversations with Mr. Smith had only mentioned a California court. It is apparent Mr. Smith is attempting to prove the wreck is in navigable waters, a prerequisite for filing an admiralty salvage claim. Researching the case, I find the
judge previously instructed the property owners’ representa-
tives and the claimant to visit the site and videotape the
location. Experts on defining navigable waters are called in
for both sides in the case. The trial (Nathan Smith v. The
Abandoned Vessel, U.S. District Court for the Southern
District of Texas) is held over two days, December 29–30.
Unfortunately, the THC is unaware of the situation until
the story appears in the media. Acting quickly, a request to
intervene in the case is filed by the THC in order to protect
the state’s interest if the wreck proves to be on public
property; however, the request is denied.

April 2009—After the trial but before the ruling, Skip
Hollandsworth, executive editor of Texas Monthly, requests
an interview with me for a “light-hearted” article about
Mr. Smith’s quest. I spend about an hour on the phone with
Mr. Hollandsworth, discussing the background to the case
as far as I know it and the laws that might impact Mr.
Smith’s claim in Texas. I also learn much about the trial,
Mr. Smith, and his claim, since Hollandsworth has already
interviewed the major characters, including Mr. Smith and
the lawyers on both sides.

The federal judge involved in the case rules that the
body of water, a shallow lake normally only inches deep
but occasionally subject to flooding, is navigable, as is the
small creek that provides access to the lake. He also rules
that Mr. Smith has provided no evidence to support his
claim that a shipwreck is located on the property and
dismisses his salvage claim. No decision is made about
ownership of the site, which is now under navigable waters.
And, apparently, the issue that the wreck had migrated from
the “shoe print” on land and into the lake is not addressed.

After the ruling, I had an opportunity to speak directly
with a lawyer representing the land owners. From this
conversation and the previous discussion with Mr. Hol-
landsworth, I learn that:

• Mr. Smith never had a map, aerial photo, or GPS when
he visited the site.

• He never visited the “shoe print,” apparently because he
didn’t have a map, aerial photo, or GPS, but instead went
to a spot well away from the “shoe print” on the shore of
the lake.

• He claimed in court he did not use a GPS because the
government was intentionally degrading the signal to make
the data worthless for his purpose.

• Mr. Smith’s photographs and the piece of wood he
recovered could not be introduced as evidence in court
because they were lost, either through computer failure
or other mishap.

• Another reason Mr. Smith decided that this “shoe print”
was the location of the wreck, besides the vaguely ship-shaped
impression, was that the nearby creek suddenly turned 90
degrees just before it reached the “shoe print.” (To this, I
would note the same creek turns a quick 180 degrees just a
bit upstream. It’s a typical meandering coastal stream, going
wherever it pleases.)

• Mr. Smith found out about this shipwreck in one of many
popular and fanciful books about lost treasures. I have not
read the book Mr. Smith cites, but I assume the version of
the story he related to me comes from that book.

Antiquities Code of Texas and Other Laws
As stated earlier, if a historic site is on private property,
the state has no jurisdiction over that site. The Antiquities
Code of Texas, which was developed as a direct result of
treasure hunters looting a wreck in Texas waters in the late 1960s, states:

Sunken or abandoned pre-twentieth century ships
and wrecks of the sea, and any part or the contents
of them, and all treasure imbedded in the earth,
located in, on, or under the surface of land
belonging to the State of Texas, including its
tidelands, submerged land, and the beds of its
rivers and the sea within jurisdiction of the State
of Texas, are declared to be state archeological
landmarks and are eligible for designation (65th
Texas Legislature 1977a).

Additionally, “No person, firm, or corporation may conduct
an operation on any landmark without first obtaining a
permit . . . (65th Texas Legislature 1977b).” By regulation,
permits are issued only to qualified archeologists.

In his ruling on this case, the judge carefully considered
the Law of Salvage and the Law of Finds, which are the
basis for salvage claims under admiralty law. Because the
state was not a party to the trial and the possibility of the
wreck being on public property was not discussed, one
important statute—the Abandoned Shipwreck Act of
1987—was never brought up. This federal legislation
asserts title to all abandoned shipwrecks in state waters,
transfers title of those shipwrecks to the states in which
they lie, and specifically states that the Law of Finds and
the Law of Salvage do not apply to these shipwrecks.
The intent of this law is to specifically remove historic
shipwrecks from admiralty salvage law so they can be
protected under cultural resource legislation enacted by
each state. The question remains: if the water is navigable,
might the bottoms be public?

Where Are We Now?
In the July 2009 Texas Monthly article, Mr. Smith says
the court ruling leaves the door open for him to return
and locate the wreck. His return schedule is uncertain as
he is off chasing other lost treasures at the moment. I have
maintained that Mr. Smith is sincere in his belief that he has
found a shipwreck, and he has demonstrated that he has
some interest in appropriate archeological investigations. I have called him a dreamer, believing it is all right to dream big. Unfortunately, Mr. Smith’s dream has cost other people a lot of time and money based on conclusions that any critical thinker would say seem to defy logic.

In a *Texas Monthly* (2009) article quote, Mr. Smith refers to me as a highway robber. I’m not sure how explaining the laws of Texas to Mr. Smith could make me a highway robber; in only 30 years I have gone from underappreciated, underpaid archeologist to highway robber, and all it took was one more treasure-hunting squabble to get me there. At least I got a few chuckles out of this one; it has truly had its entertaining moments. I will be astounded if a historic shipwreck is ever found at or near Mr. Smith’s “shoe print.”

---

*Steven D. Hoyt has served as THC state marine archeologist since 1998. He has answered many calls from would-be treasure hunters wanting to work Texas waters and has had to disappoint them all. Since December 2006, he has served as Nathan Smith’s contact at the THC, and he has devoted many hours to this case.*

---
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Mark Wolfe Begins Tenure as THC Executive Director

In June 2008, in preparation for the August 2009 retirement of Texas Historical Commission (THC) Executive Director Larry Oaks, the agency welcomed Mark Wolfe of Denver, Colo., as the incoming chief deputy executive director and deputy state historic preservation officer. This September, Wolfe assumed the title of THC executive director and all duties and responsibilities associated with the position.

“The THC conducted a nationwide search for someone who could assist in leading what many believe to be some of the best historic preservation and heritage tourism programs in the nation,” said John L. Nau, III, who was chairman of the THC at the time of Wolfe’s initial appointment. “Mark will be responsible for articulating the agency’s long-term strategy while assisting in the management of current operations. We are very pleased to have someone with his experience and expertise joining our team.”

Wolfe, who served as deputy state historic preservation officer in Colorado, directed one of the nation’s largest historic preservation grants programs before coming to Texas. He has 20 years of experience in historic preservation, the last 10 in Colorado where he was engaged in all aspects of program administration, preservation strategy, public policy, and heritage tourism oversight. Previously, he served as the historic preservation officer in Deadwood, S.D., for six years and for four years as its city planner and assistant city planner. He also has been a lawyer in private practice.

“Clearly Texans take pride in their history,” said Wolfe. “Public and legislative support for the commission’s activities proves this to be true. I have always loved my work, and I believe I can bring both skill and enthusiasm to this new position.”

Oaks, who had been THC executive director for 10 years, said his successor would “add his unique insight to our team of experts in the field of historic preservation,” and that he would bring “a fresh perspective to our award-winning, nationally-recognized programs.”

Wolfe’s educational background includes a master’s degree in historic preservation from the University of Vermont, a law degree from the University of Oregon School of Law, and a bachelor’s degree in English from the University of Oregon.

Governor Signs New Law to Protect Cemeteries

Sept. 1, 2009, was the 40th anniversary of the creation of the Antiquities Code of Texas, and this date also represents a new milestone, the implementation of changes to the Texas Health and Safety Code that provide a new level of protection for unmarked and abandoned cemeteries across the entire state of Texas.

After 24 years of working with the state legislature as well as cemetery preservationists, the Texas Funeral Service Commission, perpetual care cemeteries, and many other interested parties, the Texas Historical Commission (THC) has helped craft new protections for all individuals buried beneath the lands of Texas. Even isolated single interments are covered under the changes to Chapter 711 of the Health and Safety Code, and thus those interments are at last afforded the respect they so justly deserve.

Both the THC and the Texas Funeral Service Commission are currently working on new rules to help administer the changes to the law and the first drafts of these rules should be coming out for the public to review in the next two months. The THC’s Archeology Division is primarily responsible for crafting rules associated with “Method of Removal of Remains” (Section 711.0105 of the Health and Safety Code) and its effect on archeological investigations that may require exhumation of human remains. The THC should have rules providing guidance on these issues by February 2010.

Mark Denton
State and Federal Review Section Coordinator
THC Archeology Division
La Salle’s wrecked ship, the *Belle*, was found in Matagorda Bay by the Texas Historical Commission (THC) in 1995. It was subsequently excavated by the THC from fall 1996 until spring 1997.

The single most important artifact recovered was the bottom 40 percent of the hull. It was disassembled timber by timber and shipped to Texas A&M’s Conservation Research Laboratory for conservation, where it has been reassembled and placed into a large concrete vat and immersed in water. Polyethylene glycol (PEG), a synthetic wax, has been added to the vat to conserve the hull. The original plan was to begin soaking the timbers in a mixture of PEG 200, later changing to PEG 3350, a denser molecular weight preservative. Unfortunately, the costs for undertaking this work have steadily increased as oil prices have climbed, and in late 2008 the need for additional funds to complete the PEG conservation treatment reached a crisis point.

As a result, an alternative approach to complete the *Belle’s* conservation was examined. The new approach would minimize future PEG immersion, instead using freeze-drying as the final means of preserving the wooden hull. Freeze-drying is a commonly used method of wood conservation and utilizes the process of sublimation; that is, water in waterlogged timbers is frozen and evaporated directly into a gas. This treatment can produce well-preserved and visually attractive wood objects.

This freeze-drying plan would provide three benefits. First, the cost would be somewhat lower than pursuing a pure PEG solution. Second, the process would produce timbers that ultimately look better and will not have the waxy appearance that PEG often generates. And finally, the freeze-drying solution would provide completed timbers for display one to three years sooner than the PEG option would allow.

The THC commissioners approved the freeze-drying option for the *Belle* conservation at their quarterly meeting on April 15, but to move forward with this change, another party had to be consulted. According to an international agreement with the Republic of France, which holds official title to the hull and all other artifacts found with the ship, the THC must consult with French officials about major changes on the care and treatment of the *Belle*.

To accomplish this, Archeology Division Director Jim Bruseth traveled to Paris in June to consult with members of the Musée National de la Marine, the organization that has the authority to represent the French government in matters related to the *Belle*. A meeting was held on June 11 with Museum Director Admiral Noel Gard, Museum Conservator Hélène Tromparent, and Henri Bernard-Maugiron, a representative from ARC-Nucleart, the French national laboratory that conducts research into the preservation of waterlogged wooden artifacts. All present agreed that a freeze-dry option for the *Belle* was superior to a PEG-only option.

Because a number of detailed and technical questions came up during the June 11 meeting, Peter Fix, the chief conservator for the *Belle* at Texas A&M University, traveled to Grenoble, France, a couple of weeks later to meet with scientists at ARC-Nuclet. As a result, Fix was able to develop the final plan for the conservation of the *Belle’s* hull in a manner that takes advantage of the latest French research and that will offer the best possible museum display. Two to three years from now, timbers from the *Belle* will begin arriving at the Bob Bullock Texas State History Museum for assembly. This work will take about a year, and during this time the reassembly of the *Belle* will become a major exhibition in the museum.

The *Belle* hull undergoes preservation in polyethylene glycol at Texas A&M University’s Conservation Research Laboratory.
In April, the Texas Historical Commission (THC) presented its Curtis D. Tunnell Lifetime Achievement Award in Archeology to Dr. Dee Ann Story of Wimberley. Named in honor of Texas' first state archeologist and former THC executive director, the award is presented at the THC's Annual Historic Preservation Conference and recognizes an individual for outstanding lifetime accomplishments in archeological research and/or preservation.

When she chose to pursue a career in archeology, Dr. Story—known fondly as “Dee Ann” by friends and colleagues—was one of a few women in the United States to undertake graduate studies and to be active in the field. She plunged into what was then a male-dominated profession and served as a role model for both women and men entering the field. Her academic credentials include a bachelor of arts (1953) and master of arts in anthropology (1956) from the University of Texas (UT) at Austin and a doctorate (1963) from the University of California at Los Angeles.

While a student at UT Austin, Dee Ann wrote a term paper that sought to systematically describe prehistoric artifact types together with chronological and geographical distribution information. With contributions made by Alex D. Krieger and Edward B. Jelks of the UT Anthropology Department, the Texas Archeological Society published this paper as the *Handbook of Texas Archeology* in 1954. This was a benchmark publication that provided a much-needed framework for ongoing discussion and debate in Texas archeology.

Dee Ann has a seemingly insatiable thirst for knowledge about the past and published widely on a range of research topics relating to Texas archeology. She served as an active member and officer of numerous state and national professional associations. During her career, Dee Ann directed archeological investigations at various locales in Texas, with Caddo archeology in East Texas receiving much of her attention. She cofounded and directed the UT Austin Texas Archeological Research Laboratory, a major archeological repository that now holds the widest range of archeological collections and records in the state. Dee Ann also distinguished herself as a much sought-after instructor at UT. Several prominent professional archeologists received their early training at her archeological field schools and consider her to be an important, positive influence on their careers.

Following her retirement from academia, Dee Ann undertook archeological outreach efforts in Hays County and granted a conservation easement to The Archaeological Conservancy in order to protect a prehistoric, burned-rock midden site on her property in Hays County.

A short video clip of Dee Ann’s accomplishments may be viewed on the THC web site at www.thc.state.tx.us/awards/awdwln09.shtml.
Regional Archeologist Jeff Durst presented two Texas Historic Lands plaques to two landowners in June. One of these plaques went to the owners of the Colonel and Mrs. Robert Parker Andrews Pocket Park site (41NA303), located in downtown Nacogdoches. In 2007, Texas Historical Commission steward Tom Middlebrook recorded the site, which is one of the early military plazas in the downtown district. Subsequent excavations yielded a vast array of artifacts covering the first five decades (1779–1830) of Nacogdoches history.

The second plaque went to the owners of the John Wingate Truitt Log Cabin site (41MX142), which is the location of one of the earliest log cabins still standing in Morris County. The archeological site that surrounds the cabin offers an incredibly pristine location for the study of early pioneer life in Texas.

Both sites were recently designated as State Archeological Landmarks, which qualified them to receive Texas Historic Lands plaques.

The number of curatorial facilities certified by the Texas Historical Commission (THC) through its Curatorial Facility Certification Program (CFCP) continues to grow. Since 2005, when the CFCP was established, the THC has certified 12 facilities to act as stewards for the millions of artifacts found on nonfederal public lands over the years.

The program, which is open to any Texas museum or repository wishing to acquire additional state held-in-trust archeological collections, ensures that facilities housing these collections meet current museum standards pertinent to the care and management of these holdings.

During the past year, two facilities were certified by the CFCP. These are the Museum of the Coastal Bend in Victoria and the Stephen F. Austin State University Anthropology and Archaeology Laboratory in Nacogdoches.

For more information about the program, including a complete list of certified facilities, visit the THC web site at www.thc.state.tx.us/archeology/aacfcp.shtml.
Marie Archambeault joined the Archeology Division on September 14 as an archeological project reviewer in the State and Federal Review Section.

“We are pleased to announce that Marie Archambeault of Austin has joined the Texas Historical Commission,” said Mark Denton, State and Federal Review Section coordinator.

“Ms. Archambeault has been hired to work as an archeological project reviewer, and she also will be assisting the staff with GIS project mapping and Atlas editing.”

Most recently, Archambeault worked for the Center for Archeological Research at the University of Texas at San Antonio on contract with Texas Military Forces. As an archeologist and tribal coordinator, she monitored archeological sites, consulted with tribes concerning cultural resources issues, developed and taught cultural sensitivity training courses, and performed other related duties, including organizing public outreach events in coordination with military activities.

Statewide, Archambeault also has worked as a project archeologist for Horizon Environmental Services, Inc., and TRC Environmental Corporation. Other positions she has held include field technician for Hicks & Co. in Uvalde and laboratory technician/research assistant for Panamerican Consultants, Inc., in Tampa, Fla.

Her project experience encompasses a wide range of activities—cultural resource management, public outreach, archeological site inventories, archeological test excavations, and archeological data recovery excavations.

Currently, she serves as treasurer for the Council of Texas Archeologists and as a member of the Texas Archeological Society Multicultural Subcommittee.

Archambeault obtained a master of arts from the University of South Florida’s Public Archaeology Program and a bachelor of arts in archeology and anthropology from Baylor University.

**Archeologists Investigate Three Sites Related to San Xavier Mission Complex**

A site that could be the location of either a military camp or presidio associated with the San Xavier Mission complex in Milam County was revisited by the Texas Historical Commission (THC) in May. The missions, which included San Francisco Xavier de Horcasitas, San Ildefonso, and Nuestra Señora de la Candelaria, were in operation from approximately 1746 to 1755.

As part of the work, THC staff members Dan Potter and Bill Pierson, assisted by local volunteer David Kaufman, laid out a magnetometer block at 41MM18. The site had originally been investigated by archeologist Kathleen Gilmore many years ago as part of the Texas Archeological Society Field School at Rowe Valley.

Surfer-based magnetometry imagery from the block (100 m x 50 m) exhibits subtle features that could indicate presidio features, as well as robust clusters of metal objects that likely include modern materials and Spanish Colonial artifacts (Figure 1).

Archeology Division Director Jim Bruseth and archeologist Dee Dee Green headed up a small testing program at nearby associated sites (41MM16 and 41MM17) that included a number of shovel tests and resulted in some small recovery of artifacts such as ceramics and animal bones. Bruseth’s team confirmed the location of 41MM17 as the likely location for the Candelaria Mission, but investigations at 41MM16 proved more difficult. While modern and 19th century materials were observed...
Hurricane Ike threw thousands of objects into the waters of the Texas Gulf coast and bays. These items ranged from household appliances, such as refrigerators, to the houses themselves. Cars, SUVs, and sunken boats littered waterways.

Shortly after Ike passed, the Texas General Land Office (GLO) launched a massive campaign to locate and remove this debris. The equipment used to locate the debris—most of which was submerged in murky, brown water—was a side-scan sonar. This sonar uses sound to compile a detailed picture of items lying on the bottom of bays. The sensor is towed behind a boat and takes images of the bottom on both sides of the sensor as the boat travels along survey lines guided by GPS positioning. Exact locations of the items found below the surface can be calculated by the sonar software.

The sonar survey found not only general debris, but archeological sites as well. The first phase of the survey located three wrecks off the coast, between Galveston and Freeport. Sonar operators contracted by the GLO recognized San Xavier Mission—continued

at 41MM16, there was no solid confirmation that the site represents the location of the San Ildefonso Mission.

It is expected that further work will be conducted at all three sites in the coming year in order to conclusively confirm relevant site locations.

The THC staff member Bill Pierson explains the use of magnetometry to reporters at a San Xavier missions site (41MM18).
A mental picture of the boiler/engine room space was possible only after gathering a lot of data and comparing notes from several dives. Everything on the wreck is fragmentary: no single boiler is complete, the engines are missing, the paddlewheel shaft is separated in the middle, and the paddle wheels were not found. Still, working with excellent divers and stewards who have shipwreck experience made it possible to decipher the evidence and paint a basic picture of the type of ship.

“As often happens with archeological investigations, more questions have arisen,” said Hoyt. “The construction details of this ship are exactly what we would expect for the Will-o-the-Wisp, for which we have considerable information from historic records. We have been unable to locate such detail for the Caroline.”

Looking back in Will-o-the-Wisp records from the 1980s when the wreck was discovered and investigated by a volunteer group in Galveston, it appears that no information was ever gathered on any recorded features of the wreck. Two permits were issued for the investigations, but no work was ever done and no reports turned in. The wreck may have been misidentified.

“It now appears that the wreck most recently discovered could be the Will-o-the-Wisp and the older wreck, 41GV90, may be something else—perhaps the Caroline,” said Hoyt. “Only additional research, both archival and diving, will sort this out.”

Marine steward Andy Hall (left) and marine archeologist Amy Borgens prepare to descend on the unidentified wreck.

Texas Archeology Month Offers Peek into Past

Our fascination with past human activity and our curiosity about our antecedents lead us to probe the earth and go below the waters of the sea to find relics and artifacts that offer clues to the past. This year, Texas Archeology Month (TAM) featured events that shared secrets of the past as revealed by site excavations, by above-ground archeological investigations (cemetry tours), by examination of aerial photography that captured the imprints left on the landscape by previous cultures, and by other techniques.

Celebrating its 20th anniversary, TAM took place in October and included tours of rarely seen sites where the public viewed rock art, village ruins, open quarry pits left by previous inhabitants, and even areas of a historic battleship that are only open to the public during TAM.

Topics were diverse, ranging from pioneer traditions to the use of native plants, from battlefield archeology to maritime accidents, and from Ice Age animals and mammoth hunters to the Spanish Colonial era. Activities included archeological fairs, frontier festivals, a father of Texas celebration, talks and presentations, simulated archeological digs, historical reenactments, exhibits, Native American crafts, park interpretations, conferences, artifact viewing and identification, a brewery tour, and many others.

The printed version of the 2009 TAM Calendar listed 102 events in 67 cities, and events were added to the online version through the end of October. Among this year’s unique events was an above-ground archeology activity at the Brownsville Historic City Cemetery; an exhibit of aerial photography by Adriel Heisey called “From Above: Images of a Storied Land,” which will show through January 15 at the Centennial Museum of the University of Texas at El Paso; and lectures on Chinese archeology at the Houston Museum of Natural Science.
A Special Thanks to Texas Archeology Month Donors

Many thanks to the following donors for their support of Texas Archeology Month 2009, as well as to those individuals who wish to remain anonymous.

The members of the THC Texas Archeological Stewardship Network deserve special recognition. Many events listed in this year’s calendar of events would not be possible without the talents, generosity, and hard work of archeological stewards throughout the state.
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Books about 1554 Shipwrecks Posted on THC Web Site

Three out-of-print publications related to the investigation of three 1554 Spanish shipwrecks off Padre Island have been posted on the Texas Historical Commission (THC) web site at www.thc.state.tx.us/archeology/aresource.shtml. The publications are Texas Antiquities Committee (TAC) Publications 2, 4, and 8 and are titled Texas Legacy from the Gulf: A Report on Sixteenth Century Shipwreck Materials Recovered from the Texas Tidelands; Treasure, People, Ships, and Dreams: A Spanish Shipwreck on the Texas Coast; and Documentary Sources for the Wreck of the New Spain Fleet of 1554.

Posted in PDF format, the books discuss historic documents and recovered artifacts and will be of particular interest to nautical students and enthusiasts.

According to historical accounts, three ships laden with New World treasure were returning to Spain in 1554 when they sank in a storm near Padre Island. About 400 years later, the state of Texas challenged treasure hunters for ownership of artifacts looted from one of the three shipwrecks, the Espíritu Santo, an action that ultimately led to the development of the Antiquities Code of Texas and the establishment of the TAC marine archeology program. The TAC was abolished in 1995; its duties were absorbed by the THC and today are carried out through its Archeology Division.

Texas Legacy from the Gulf
Copublished by the TAC and Texas Memorial Museum at the University of Texas (UT) at Austin in 1976, this 210-page book was written by Dorris L. Olds. The book examines the artifacts recovered by the treasure hunters who located the first of the 1554 wrecks and removed all of the artifacts to Indiana before Texas filed suit and recovered the collection.

Chapters discuss the history of recovery and collection delivery to UT Austin’s Texas Archeological Research Laboratory; inventory and preservation; archeological evidence for dating the wreckage; navigational apparatus; ship’s gear, fittings, and equipment; armament and weapons; cargo; and shipboard living.

The book contains 76 figures and seven tables.

Treasure, People, Ships, and Dreams
A joint publication of the TAC and UT San Antonio’s Institute of Texan Cultures, this book was written by John L. Davis and published in 1977. This publication was created to accompany a traveling exhibit of artifacts from the 1554 fleet. That traveling exhibit has long since been incorporated into the permanent collection now housed at the Corpus Christi Museum of Science and History.

The book contains 82 pages and is filled with colorful illustrations. It is divided into four parts—“The Tale,” “The Search,” “The Find,” and an addendum with figures.

Documentary Sources for the Wreck of the New Spain Fleet of 1554
This 1979 publication was prepared by David McDonald, who served as translator, and then-State Marine Archeologist J. Barto Arnold III. The 338-page book was compiled over a five-year period and used archives and other resources found in libraries, museums, and similar institutions in Spain, Portugal, France, Mexico, and the United States.

The book is divided into three parts. Part I, called “1554 Wreck Sources,” includes letters, registry records, reports, notes, and quotations and extracts from various accounts dating to the mid 1500s. Part II contains translations of secondary sources and related materials. Part III includes correspondence, records, and discussions of maritime topics (for example, sailing directions for the coasts of Mexico and one translation called “Description of Seven Salvage Techniques by Pedro de Ledesma ca. 1623”).

Referring to the latter translation, the authors write, “In the following document several salvage techniques are described by Pedro de Ledesma. Some are on the fanciful side, such as the diving suit with the 16-fathom-long snorkel of leather, but the technique of dragging a chain or weighted rope along the bottom between two search vessels actually was used to locate two of the Padre Island wrecks by the Spanish salvagers.”
Regional Archeologists’ Reports

Mountain/Pecos & Plains
Spring and summer were busy periods for stewards in the Mountain/Pecos and Plains regions. The Courson family once again hosted a successful Texas Archeological Society (TAS) summer Field School in the Panhandle near Perryton, and seven stewards from Regions 1 and 2 attended for one or more days. This included Teddy Lou Stickney, whose visit was cut short due to an injury on the first day. Three other intrepid stewards—Doug Wilkens at the Archie King Area 1 site and Rolla Shaller and Alvin Lynn at the 1868 Evans Depot military site—assumed leadership roles at the Field School. Their expertise, organization, and hard work were appreciated by everyone involved in this year’s event. Although not in attendance at the Texas Archeological Stewardship Network (TASN) annual workshop held in Austin in July, Lynn, Shaller, and Wilkens were recognized...
for their work. (See related story, page 27.) The three were among 12 stewards who received the Norman G. Flaigg Certificate of Outstanding Performance award this year.

All of the stewards in Regions 1 and 2 worked diligently on a variety of activities—conducting archeological surveys and research, monitoring sites, and handling public outreach. Combined, they contributed more than 2,196 volunteer hours toward stewardship activities during this period and drove more than 12,120 miles across the region. The stewards reporting during this cycle included six who conducted public outreach presentations and/or workshops that reached a total of 232 people in the region. While these presentations reached a great number of people, TASN, along with the Archeology Division of the Texas Historical Commission (THC), will continue to work to bring archeology to even more people in the Mountain/Pecos and Plains regions during the coming year. All TASN members are encouraged to contact fellow stewards in their regions and Regional Archeologist Tiffany Osburn to coordinate presentations and workshops. A greater level of awareness in Regions 1 and 2 should lead to more private land surveys and increase the number of sites recorded and State Archeological Landmarks (SALs) nominated throughout the state.

The stewardship network in Regions 1 and 2 succeeded in assisting 17 landowners; 21 agencies, organizations, or institutions; and 84 individuals. Five new sites were recorded since February, and these were all done by Evans Turpin. (Thanks to Turpin for this substantial contribution.) In the meantime, stewards monitored 42 sites and conducted or participated in 17 site investigations. This busy group of stewards also spent a significant amount of time documenting, analyzing, and conserving seven artifact collections. As days get cooler, we are all looking forward to getting out and recording new sites recording and revisiting old ones.

Since February, Alvin Lynn monitored two sites and investigated five others. He also works continuously on Colonel Kit Carson-related research and field work. Lynn served as co-principal investigator at the TAS Field School investigations of Evans’ 1868 military supply depot, along with Osburn and Shaller. He and Shaller work nearly every week at the Panhandle-Plains Historical Museum on the conservation, cleaning, and analysis of the Evans Depot artifact collection. Lynn assisted two landowners and four organizations or agencies during this reporting period, and he also has conducted numerous outreach programs for students, senior citizens, and Lions clubs. As an on-call steward, his spring and summer activities also have included assistance to Matthew Taylor, the assistant curator of archeology at the Panhandle-Plains Historical Museum, to resolve two separate burial discoveries near Lefors and Memphis.

Reeda Peel kept busy with site documentation on weekends and worked to complete a report for one nonprofit organization. She spent time monitoring two sites during the spring and summer months. In addition, she traveled to Iraan to conduct a PowerPoint presentation for the Iraan Archeological Society, and she has spent time assisting homeschoolers.

Cindy Smyers, who attended the TASN annual workshop in Austin in July, monitored 12 sites and investigated seven others since February. She has distributed outreach materials to local groups and driven an incredible 1,250 miles for steward-related activities.

Rolla Shaller monitored two sites and investigated four others since our last reporting period. He worked with Lynn and Osburn to conduct excavations during the TAS summer Field School at Evans’ 1868 supply depot (41RB111). Over the last six months, he has been working to clean, catalogue, and conserve artifacts from these investigations. Shaller also provided assistance to Panhandle-Plains Historical Museum staff member Matthew Taylor, who is resolving two prehistoric burial discoveries near Lefors and Memphis.

Jack Skiles has spent a great deal of time monitoring eight significant sites and assisting 52 individuals and five agencies and institutions. Recently, he assisted the Institute of Texan Cultures with a videotaping project at Bonfire Shelter for an exhibit that opened September 2009.

Teddy Lou Stickney remains busy with the TAS Rock Art Recording Task Force, a group that is recording rock art sites across the state, and she will continue this work near Big Bend National Park between December 27 and January 2. The site the group is working on is located on private land adjacent to the national park. The rock art panel is approximately 20 m x 4 m and 90 percent of the art is red pictographs. An interesting site with lots of overprinting, it will be a challenge to record.

S. Evans Turpin recorded five new archeological sites during this reporting period. This is a great accomplishment, especially considering his other work—monitoring nine other sites and giving a presentation. Turpin also assisted in the recording of rock art in Val Verde county (41VV1994) and is now preparing a PowerPoint presentation for a Texas Archeology Month (TAM) meeting and events in his area. Turpin attended the TASN annual workshop session on projectile point typology.

Doug Wilkens monitored five previously recorded sites and participated in one major site investigation. Wilkens played a major role in the 2009 TAS Field School, working as a site principal investigator at the Archie King Area 1 site where he had a great crew and top-notch crew chiefs. He worked closely with TAS members Bill and Jean Parnell to provide leadership and was able to answer many questions regarding the architecture of this village period structure. An article by Wilkens on the Archie King ruins appears in
the current issue of the Steward, which was distributed this summer. The Steward (see related story, page 27) is published by the THC to highlight the work done by TASN members.

REGIONS 3 & 4 • DAN POTTER

Forts/Hill Country & Lakes/Brazos
It has been a busy six months for stewards in Central and North Texas.

Tom Adams reports from Brownwood that he has responded to a THC request and recorded the site of a historic water cistern located near the Brown County Courthouse. The cistern was more than 3 m tall, plastered, and made of coursed sandstone.

Frank Binetti recorded two new sites and investigated (mapped, tested, or surface collected) four others. Binetti also helped with an upcoming SAL designation. (Thanks for all the sweat and hard work this year.)

Jay Blaine reports 124 hours of TASN work and over 1,300 miles driven. As usual, Blaine remains in high demand among archeologists from inside and outside Texas for consultation on all metal-related matters, including conservation.

Kay Clarke recorded one new site and investigated two others. Seven presentations were given at local schools on archeological topics. Most recently, she directed a single 1-m test unit and multiple shovel tests at a newly recorded site in Williamson County.

José Contreras reports a newly recorded site and analysis of a private artifact collection. He also assisted several landowners in the Boerne area.

Karen and Mike Fulghum remain active in the Southern Texas Archaeological Association and the Hill Country Archeological Association. Most recently, they assisted a landowner in the Pipe Creek area.

Bryan Jameson investigated 16 sites over the past half year. Ever the consummate field archeologist, Jameson is always sought out for participation in projects all over Texas. (Thanks for the work done at Black Angus Ranch and Tenoxtitlán, both in Central Texas.)

Rick Jarnigan has a long-standing interest in preservation of historic cemeteries, and this year was no exception—he conducted monitoring and inventory work at several important historic cemeteries in the Austin-Round Rock area.

Tammy Kubecka, our new steward in Burleson County, recorded four new sites and was primarily responsible for supporting THC research at Tenoxtitlán in May. Informally, she writes “Metal detection hits were GPSed, many photographed and identified. More ceramics were observed scattered on the ground. Many questions remain, but a few more puzzle pieces started to fit.” (We’re delighted to have Kubecka as a new TASN member and look forward to much more work in Burleson County.)

Glynn Osburn spent about 30 hours on TASN volunteer work, with eight sites newly recorded. We believe this is a new personal high for Osburn, at least since becoming a steward. (Congratulations, and thank you.)

Ona B. Reed logged an impressive 2,500 miles as a steward over the past half year. She recounted an interesting tale of a trip taken with a group of friends/archeologists to evaluate “cupules.” Controversy broke out when the group began to interpret what cupules are. (Imagine that—archeologists disagreeing with each other about an archeological feature . . .) In addition, Reed was one of 12 stewards who received the Norman G. Flagg Certificate of Outstanding Performance during the TASN annual workshop held in Austin in July. (See related story, page 27.)

Larry Riemenschneider reports on his work on the October 10 Archeology Fair in San Angelo and adds that lots of archeological work has been going forward as well. He continues to work at Fort Chadbourne, finished work at Clark Ranch, and is making progress on the Dove Creek Ranch, where he believes the Dove Creek Battle site has been located.

Jim and May Schmidt logged quite a bit of work over the past six months, sometimes as a team and sometimes separately. There has been strong activity from both in TAM-related work, a number of group programs and talks, and strong support for TAS programs. In March, Jim testified before a Texas Senate committee on the importance of protecting archeological sites.

Frank Sprague led a workshop and hosted archeological research by the Baylor University Field School and the Tarrant County Archeological Society.

Alice Stultz continues with laboratory work at the Gault site. She also is involved in Texas Archeological Research Laboratory collections and has been organizing learning activities for adults and children in and around Austin.

Art Tawater has done archeological work in Pantola, Hamilton, Comal, Burleson, Palo Pinto, McLennan, and Tarrant counties—all in the last six months. (Tawater has been invaluable—thanks for all the hard work and sweat so far this year.)

Buddy Whitley from San Saba County provided assistance to a local landowner with several sites and helped Lower Colorado River Authority archeologists with recent work near San Saba. Whitley also recently helped THC archeologists at the Hale site in Mills County.

The indomitable couple, Kay and Woody Woodward, have recorded new sites, given major presentations and...
programs, and are writing about the testing work they’ve been doing with the Hill Country Archeological Association. (These two just don’t quit. They are always there to help, and they’re invaluable.)

**REGIONS 5 & 6 • JEFF DURST**

**Forest & Independence/Tropical**

The past few months have been extremely active for stewards in Regions 5 and 6, with several interesting projects that have involved numerous stewards working together to make an outstanding contribution to preservation efforts in their regions. In appreciation for their exceptional service during the past year, seven stewards from Regions 5 and 6 were recognized in July during the TASN annual workshop (see related story, page 27) with the Norman G. Flaigg Certificate of Outstanding Performance. Additionally, three stewards from Regions 5 and 6 were recognized for 25 years of participation in the stewardship network, and two stewards received the Jim Word Award for Archeological Stewardship to honor their 10 years of service.

**Pat Braun** was presented with the Norman G. Flaigg Certificate of Outstanding Performance at the TASN annual workshop in Austin. Braun is one of the most active stewards in Region 6, always making outstanding contributions of time and effort.

**Jimmy Bluhm** is a longtime TASN member who has recently donated his well-documented artifact collection to the Museum of the Coastal Bend. Bluhm’s large and impressive collection is the result of a lifetime of monitoring two eroding sites along the Gulf Coast where he grew up. His collection joins several other impressive collections that have recently been donated to the Museum of the Coastal Bend.

**Frank Condron** is a first-year steward who was recognized at the TASN annual workshop with the Norman G. Flaigg Certificate of Outstanding Performance. Condron has gotten off to a strong start with the help of his compatriots at the Museum of the Coastal Bend in Victoria, and we expect great things from him in the future.

**Richard Gregg** was recognized during the TASN annual workshop in Austin for 25 years of service to the stewardship network. Gregg has been with the TASN since its inception and continues to be one of the most active members. Most recently, he assisted the THC in two survey projects, one conducted in Houston County in search of the Mexican period site of Trinidad de Salcedo and another at the location of Groce’s Plantation in Waller County. The latter site is believed to be the first plantation in what was later to become the state of Texas.

**Patti Haskins** received the Norman G. Flaigg Certificate of Outstanding Performance during the TASN annual workshop. Haskins remains busy working on various public outreach projects. One of these is the Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act inventory of the Buddy Calvin Jones collection held by the Gregg County History Museum.

**Sheldon Kindall** was recognized at the TASN annual workshop for 25 years of stewardship service. Kindall also has been very active with the Groce’s Plantation survey in Waller County that began in mid August 2009, and he also participated in the THC’s search for Trinidad de Salcedo.

**Ben McReynolds** is another first-year steward who was recognized with the Norman G. Flaigg Certificate of Outstanding Performance at the TASN annual workshop. He also has been working with the cadre of TASN members who work at the Museum of the Coastal Bend in Victoria. Apparently, their inspirational dedication has worn off on him.

**Beverly Mendenhall** was recently recognized with the Jim Word Award for Archeological Stewardship for 10 years of service. Mendenhall has been an active member of the TASN during her tenure and has participated in numerous survey and excavation projects throughout the state.

**Sandra Rogers** was recognized at the annual TASN workshop with the Norman G. Flaigg Certificate of Outstanding Performance. Rogers also participated in the Trinidad de Salcedo survey and the Groce’s Plantation survey.

**Neal Stilley** is a first-year steward who has hit the ground running and was awarded the Norman G. Flaigg Certificate of Outstanding Performance at the TASN annual workshop in Austin. Stilley is extremely active with public outreach across much of the state.

**Robert Turner** was recognized at the TASN annual workshop for his 25 years of service. Turner is working with an individual who is donating an amazing collection of artifacts to the Northeast Texas Rural Heritage Museum in Pittsburg, where Turner is the curatorial director. (See related story, page 30.)

**Mark Walters** was recognized with the Norman G. Flaigg Certificate of Outstanding Performance at the TASN annual workshop. Walters continues to be one of the most active stewards in TASN, traveling near and far to pursue his interests in archeology.
2009 TASN Workshop Participants Learn and Celebrate

What do projectile point typology, blackwater diving, and a 25th anniversary have in common? They all relate to the Texas Archeological Stewardship Network (TASN) annual workshop held on July 25–26 in Austin.

During the workshop (see photos on following pages), participants were treated to in-depth presentations on projectile point typology and documentation procedures by respected archeologist Elton Prewitt and his assistant, Stephanie Mueller. A new training component specifically designed for marine stewards was among the workshop offerings this year. This involved a presentation by professional underwater archeologist Amy Borgens entitled “Diving under Duress: The Archeological Investigation of Shipwrecks in Blackwater Environments.” Archeology Division (AD) staff also conducted an orientation session for the newest members of the TASN.

The significance of this year’s workshop was heightened by the fact that 2009 is the 25th anniversary year of the TASN program. Thanks to the generous donations received from TASN advisor and member Tom Middlebrook and the Lower Colorado River Authority Employees’ United Charities, the 2009 workshop was an unparalleled success. Throughout the years, this type of support has enabled the AD to bring in outside experts to train stewards on a variety of subjects designed to enhance program capacity.

Member recognition is an important aspect of the TASN workshop each year. The meeting provides a venue for publicly acknowledging the many accomplishments by members of the TASN. Stewards reported astonishing contributions from February 2008 to January 2009 that add up to 18,881 volunteer hours, 140,157 miles traveled, 12,668 educational materials distributed, 93 sites recorded, and 1,088 individuals assisted. The hours contributed during this time period is roughly equivalent to 10 full-time staff members, and the monetary worth of these volunteer hours is a whopping $382,340.25, calculated at $20.25 per volunteer hour (source: Independent Sector, www.independentsector.org).

The workshop luncheon at Scholz Garten was designed to be a time for celebration as well as good Texas barbecue. The top 10 percent performers in the TASN program during the past year received the Norman G. Flaigg Certificate of Outstanding Performance (see list on page 28). The Jim Word Award for Archeological Stewardship was also presented to five stewards to honor their 10 years of service in the TASN program. Honorees were Dan Brown (Christoval), Bob Everett (Seguin), Bev Mendenhall (Houston), Reeda Peel (Alpine), and Alice Stultz (Austin). In addition, 63 special certificates of appreciation were presented to stewards for their volunteer efforts (see list on page 28).

The celebration was capped by a special 25th anniversary cake and official cutting by founding members Dick Gregg (Houston), Sheldon Kindall (Houston), and Bob Turner (Pittsburg).

New Issue of the Steward Available Now

Released last spring, Volume 7 of the Steward contains five papers that focus on archeological excavations and one paper that provides a comprehensive look at the use of plants by Native Americans in Texas. Established in 1993, the publication series highlights work done by members of the Texas Archeological Stewardship Network (TASN) and their associates.


The Steward can be purchased for $5 plus shipping and handling ($1 for one copy and $.75 for each additional copy). Please send your request and payment to Archeology Division, Texas Historical Commission, P.O. Box 12276, Austin, TX 78711-2276. Checks or money orders should be made out to the Texas Historical Commission, with “Archeology Division” designated on the notes. If you wish to pay by credit card, include the type, number, and expiration date. For more information, contact the Archeology Division at 512.463.6096 or archeology@thc.state.tx.us.

The TASN was established in 1984 and currently includes 125 members located across the state. This all-volunteer army supplements and enhances the work done by the Texas Historical Commission in preserving and interpreting the vast archeological landscape of Texas.
Norman G. Flaigg Certificate of Outstanding Performance
Plains & Mountain/Pecos Regions
Alvin Lynn
Rolla Shaller
Doug Wilkens
Lakes/Brazos Region
Ona B. Reed
Forest Region
Patti Haskins
Sandy Rogers
Neal Stilley
Mark Walters
Independence/Tropical Region
Pat Braun
Frank Condon
Ben McReynolds
Marine
Calvin “Jack” Jackson
Certificates of Appreciation
Tom Adams
Beth Aucoin
Pat Aucoin
Jerry Bauman
Frank A. Binetti
Bill Birmingham
Jay Blaine
Jimmy Bluhm
Charlie Bollich
Pat Braun
David Calame, Sr.
Wayne Clampitt
Kay E. Clarke
Frank Condon
José Contreras
Robert Crosser
Rick Day
Robert Everett
Richard Gregg
Patti Haskins
Jay Hornsby
Doris Howard
Claude Hudspeth
Don G. Hyett
Calvin “Jack” Jackson
Bryan Jameson
H. “Don” Keyes
Sheldon Kindall
Doug Kubicek
Emery Lehner
John N. Luce
Alvin Lynn
Nelson Marek
Clint McKenzie
Ben McReynolds
Nick Morgan
Doug Nowell
Glynn Osburn
Sandra Pollan
Marisue Potts Powell
John Preston
Ona B. Reed
Larry Riemenschneider
Louis “Pinky” Robertson
Joe D. Rogers
Sandra E. Rogers
Linda Satter
Jim Schmidt
May Schmidt
Rolla Shaller
Jack Skiles
Frank Sprague
Teddy Lou Stickney
Neal Stilley
Alice Stultz
Robert L. Turner
S. Evans Turpin
Mark Walters
Buddy Whitley
Doug Wilkens
Kay Woodward
Woody Woodward
Bill Young
Previous page, left photo: TASN founding members (left to right) Sheldon Kindall, Bob Turner, and Dick Gregg prepare for a fun dig into the 25th anniversary cake.

Previous page, right photo: TASN stewards Morris Jackson (right) and Robert Crosser (left) line up for barbecue during the workshop luncheon, celebrated at nearby Scholz Garten.

Top left: Neal Stilley (second from right) was one of 12 stewards who were honored with the Norman G. Flagg Certificate of Outstanding Performance. He is shown with (left to right) AD Director Jim Bruseth, State Archeologist Pat Mercado-Allinger, and Regional Archeologist Jeff Durst.

Top right: State Marine Archeologist Steve Hoyt chats with TASN member Doris Howard.

Above left: The annual workshop allows stewards to catch up with each others’ work and other happenings. José Contreras (standing) and his guest, John Forister (right), join Woody Woodward (with cap), Dorothy Grayson (second from right), and others.

Bottom left: After a presentation on projectile point typology and procedures by Elton Prewitt (standing), TASN members (seated, left to right) Mark Walters, Bob Turner, and Glynn Osburn practice documenting projectile points.
Rural Heritage Museum Honors Turners

Camp County resident Robert L. Turner, a 25-year member of the Texas Archeological Stewardship Network, and his wife Gloria were honored by the Northeast Texas Rural Heritage Museum with its John M. Holman Museum Service Award.

Named after John Holman, who played a pivotal role in the establishment of the museum and was the first recipient of the award, the award recognizes unpaid service of those who go above and beyond the call of duty to the museum. The Turners’ names have been engraved on a bench situated in front of the Depot, one of two museum venues in Pittsburg.

The award was presented in April by Glen Gatlin, chairman of the museum’s board of trustees.

Looking Ahead

If you would like to get involved in a regional archeological society, visit the Texas Archeological Society (TAS) web site at www.txarch.org/Contacts/regions.php to locate one near you.

NOVEMBER 20–22
Civil War and Living History Weekend—The 11th Texas Cavalry, a 501(c) organization, has coordinated this event for 10 years at Liendo Plantation in Hempstead. Activities include living history demonstrations and battle reenactments. Information: www.thc.state.tx.us (go to Calendar); or 936.931.2811, wil_gibson@yahoo.com.

DECEMBER 27–JANUARY 2
Rock Art at Study Butte—The TAS Rock Art Recording Task Force will work at Study Butte near Big Bend National Park. Information: Teddy Stickney, 432.682.9384, stick711@sbcglobal.net.

JANUARY 31
Call for Papers—Deadline for abstracts of papers to be presented at the 52nd Annual Caddo Conference and 17th Annual East Texas Archeological Conference (see March 18-20, below). Papers are invited on the archeology, history, and culture of the Caddo Indians. Please send paper titles and abstracts to Dr. Timothy K. Purttula, tkp4747@aol.com.

MARCH 18–20
52nd Annual Caddo Conference/17th Annual East Texas Archeological Conference—The 52nd Annual Caddo Conference will be held in conjunction with the 17th Annual East Texas Archeological Conference, Ornelas Activity Center, 3402 Old Omen Road (across Spur 248 from the University of Texas at Tyler). Information: www.52ndcaddo-17thetac.com.

MARCH 26-29
American Rock Art Research Association Annual Conference—The meeting will be held in Del Rio, with help from the Shumla School. The Lower Pecos archeological area contains a distinctive and significant archeological record and is home to some of the finest examples of prehistoric rock art in North America. Information: www.arara.org.

APRIL 14–18
75th Anniversary Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology (SAA)—This meeting celebrates SAA’s past successes and allows participants to shape 21st century perspectives on archeology in the next quarter century. Information: www.saa.org.

APRIL 22–24
Annual Historic Preservation Conference—This event is hosted by the Texas Historical Commission (THC) in association with Preservation Texas. Sessions, workshops, tours, and panels on important preservation issues and case studies are conducted by experts in architecture, archeology, economic development, heritage tourism, and marketing. Information: THC Marketing Communications Division, 512.463.6255.
TEXAS ARCHEOLOGICAL STEWARDSHIP NETWORK
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