

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Chaco Culture

**1.2 - World Heritage Property Details
State(s) Party(ies)**

- United States of America

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

353rev

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987




1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Chaco Culture National Historical Park , New Mexico , United States of America	36.064 / -107.971	0	0	0	1987
Kin Bineola , New Mexico , United States of America	35.992 / -108.142	0	0	0	1987
Kin Ya'a , New Mexico , United States of America	35.674 / -108.112	0	0	0	1987
Pueblo Pintado , New Mexico , United States of America	35.975 / -107.675	0	0	0	1987
Aztec Ruins National Monument, Aztec , New Mexico , United States of America	36.834 / -108.003	0	0	0	1987
Casamero , New Mexico , United States of America	35.425 / -108.055	65	0	65	1987
Kin Nizhoni , New Mexico , United States of America	35.369 / -107.778	259	0	259	1987
Pierre's site , New Mexico , United States of America	36.244 / -107.947	162	0	162	1987
Twin Angels , New Mexico , United States of America	36.6 / -106.938	16	0	16	1987
Halfway House , New Mexico , United States of America	36.387 / -107.939	16	0	16	1987
Total (ha)		518	0	518	

Comment

CCNHP -- 13,036 ha Kin Bineola -- 554 ha Kin Ya'a -- 105 ha Pueblo Pintado -- 65 ha Aztec ruins -- 129 ha Note that these figures do not represent additional Hectares, they replace the '0' and reflect more accurate property size descriptions.

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Chaco Culture - Map showing Chaco Culture National Historical Park, Kin Bineola, Kin Ya'a and Pueblo Pintado	01/03/2006	
Chaco Culture - Map showing Aztec Ruins	01/03/2006	
Chaco Culture - Map showing Casamero	01/03/2006	

Chaco Culture - Map showing Kin Nizhoni	01/03/2006	
Chaco Culture - Map showing Halfway House	01/03/2006	
Chaco Culture - Data sheet on Twin Angels	01/03/2006	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Jonathan Putnam
US National Park Service Office of International Affairs
World Heritage Program Officer

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Dabney Ford
National Park Service
Archaeologist
Chaco Culture National Historical Park

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

1. [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
2. [Chaco Culture National Historical Park \(U.S. World Heritage\)](#)
3. [Chaco Culture National Historical Park \(U.S. National Park Service\)](#)
4. [Aztec Ruins National Monument \(U.S. National Park Service\)](#)
5. [World Heritage in the United States](#)

Comment

The web link listed in #2 above does not exist and should be deleted.

1.8 - Other designations / Conventions under which the property is protected (if applicable)

Comment

Property is included in 2 units of the National Park Service, and in 4 "Areas of Critical Environmental Concern" within the Bureau of Land Management . Additionally, the property is listed on the National Register of Historic Places

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Statement of Significance

The Chaco Culture National Historical Park, the associated sites at Aztec Ruins National Monument and five Chaco Culture Archeological Protection Sites are outstanding elements of a vast pre-Columbian cultural complex that dominated much of the south-western United States in the mid-9th to early 13th centuries. Chaco Canyon, a major center of ancestral Pueblo culture between 850 and 1250, was a focus for ceremonies, trade and political activity. Chaco is remarkable for its monumental public and ceremonial buildings and its distinctive multi-storey "greathouses" which demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of astronomical phenomena. They are linked by an elaborate system of carefully engineered and constructed roads. The achievements of the Chaco Anasazi people are exceptional, given the harsh environmental conditions and resource limitations of the region.

Criterion (iii) The Chaco Canyon sites graphically illustrate the architectural and engineering achievements of the Chaco Anasazi people, who overcame the harshness of the environment of the south-western United States to found a culture that dominated the area for more than four centuries.

2.2 - The criteria (2005 revised version) under which the property was inscribed

(iii)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

2.4 - If needed, please provide details of why the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be revised

2.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

3. Factors Affecting the Property

3.14. Other factor(s)

3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact						Origin
3.1	Buildings and Development							
3.1.3	Industrial areas							
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities							
3.3	Services Infrastructures							
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities							
3.3.3	Non-renewable energy facilities							
3.3.5	Major linear utilities							
3.4	Pollution							
3.4.4	Air pollution							
3.6	Physical resource extraction							
3.6.1	Mining							
3.6.3	Oil and gas							
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage							
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses							
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage							
3.9	Other human activities							
3.9.1	Illegal activities							
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage							
3.13	Management and institutional factors							
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities							
3.13.2	High impact research / monitoring activities							
3.13.3	Management activities							
Legend	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside	Outside		

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend	
3.4	Pollution					
3.4.4	Air pollution	widespread	on-going	minor	low capacity	increasing
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.9	Other human activities					
3.9.1	Illegal activities	localised	frequent	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	increasing

3.17. Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to factors affecting the property

3.17.1 - Comments

Energy exploration and extraction, specifically oil and gas production currently threatens viewshed and the associated cultural landscape. Uncontrolled homesite lease development and associated infrastructure on adjoining lands also impacts the cultural landscape and viewshed. The property is currently protected by its remote setting and lack of roads but these developments expose the boundaries to unauthorized access and increased vandalism.

4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is no buffer zone, and it is not needed

4.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are **adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.1.3 - Are the buffer zone(s) of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The property had no buffer zone at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List

4.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

4.1.5 - Are the buffer zones of the World Heritage property known?

The property had **no buffer zone** at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List

4.1.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to boundaries and buffer zones of the World Heritage property

Park staff are working with adjoining land owners and agencies that control subsurface mineral leasing, in an attempt to manage these developments so that their impacts to visitor and resource values are negligible. These discussions are ongoing and some progress is possible in the upcoming 5 years.

4.2. Protective Measures

4.2.1 - Protective designation (legal, regulatory, contractual, planning, institutional and / or traditional)

The area currently known as Chaco Culture National Historical Park was originally established as a national monument in 1907

by proclamation of President Theodore Roosevelt for the purpose of reserving for the public's benefit lands containing prehistoric remains of extraordinary interest because of their number, their great size, and their value. In 1980 the 96th Congress of the United States of America enacted Public Law 96-550 that: 1) redefined Chaco Canyon National Monument as Chaco Culture National Historical Park; 2) recognized a more representative area that depicts the unique cultural remains of the prehistoric Chacoans; and 3) provided for continued preservation, protection, research, and interpretation of the Chacoan culture.

The park is comprised of the main canyon area and three detached units: Kin Bineola, Kin Ya'a and Pueblo Pintado. Relative ownerships by specific entities are the United States Government (68%), Navajo Tribe (23%), State of New Mexico (5%), Indian allotment (3%), and other private (1%).

Regulation:

PL 96-550 – Establishment of Chaco Culture NHP 1980 and designation of the

Chaco Culture Archeological Protection Sites.

Presidential Proclamation 1650 - Establishment of Aztec Ruins NM 1923

PL 104-11 – Chaco Outliers Protection Act of 1995

PL 100-559 – Boundary Expansion of Aztec Ruins NM

PL 59-209 – Antiquities Act of 1906

PL 89-665 – National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended

PL 91-190 - National Environmental Policy Act of 1969

PL 95-341 – American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978

PL 96-95 – Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, as amended

PL 96-515 – World Heritage Convention, 1980

Executive Order 11593 – Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural

Environment, 1971

PL 101-601 – Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990

Executive Order 13007 – Indian Sacred Sites, 1996

General Authorities Act of 1976 (withhold disclosure of site locations)

Historic Sites Act of 1935

Management of Museum Properties Act of 1955

Mining in the Parks Act of 1976

National Park Service Act of 1916 'Organic Act'

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and amendments

Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976

Regulations:

36 CFR 18 (National Historic Preservation Act of 1966)

36 CFR 61 (NHPA, "State and Local Government Historic Preservation Programs")

36 CFR 68 (NHPA, Secretary for the Interior's standards for historic preservation)

36 CFR 79 (NHPA and ARPA, Curation of Federally owned collections)

36 CFR 800 (NHPA, Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties)

43 CFR 3 (Antiquities Act, procedures for permitting excavation or collection)

43 CFR 7, Subparts A & B (Archaeological Resources Protection Act, Uniform Regulations)

43 CFR 10 (NAGPRA, rights of affiliated lineal descendants to human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and object of cultural patrimony)

4.2.2 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate for maintaining the Outstanding

Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection

4.2.3 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The property had **no buffer zone at the time of inscription** on the World Heritage List

4.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection of the property, contributing to the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity

4.2.5 - Can the legislative framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) be enforced?

There is **acceptable** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property but some deficiencies remain

4.2.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to protective measures

The legal framework is adequate for maintaining the integrity and authenticity of the property at present. If energy exploration and extraction, uncontrolled infrastructure development or other external threats increase, adjacent landowners and managers may recommend a buffer zone that surrounds the property as a method for addressing cumulative impacts. Discussions are ongoing to determine the most effective means for managing the resource.

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

The Resource Management Plan for the Chaco unit has been updated to reflect current surface ownership and the General Management Plan is under development at the Aztec unit. General Management and Resource Management Plans, reviewed by the public, provide both broad overviews and detailed descriptions of the resources themselves and the goals to conserve, protect, and understand their values.

The other significant management regime change -- although not a change in ownership -- is that the park now directly manages the Chaco Archaeological Collection which contains some 2 million objects and records. At the time of inscription, the federally owned collection was scattered among several NPS repositories and University Museums. This collection is now reassembled under the management of the park superintendent's staff and housed in an off-site facility on the University of New Mexico campus in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Bureau of Land Management: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) designations have been established to

provide a higher level of protection and Resource Management Plans define and direct appropriate non-detrimental uses of the Chaco Protection sites. Both Chaco Culture National Historical Park and Aztec Ruins National Monument have General Management Plans, required under law. Chaco's General Management Plan was completed in 1984; it is somewhat out-of date and needs major revision to reflect current issues, resource management improvements, and recent legal mandates. The main portion of the plan presents general proposals for how management will acquire and use lands within the boundaries (through exchanges, donations, and purchases) and how these lands will be protected, such as by installing fencing, restricting visitor access, and routine patrolling. The plan defines sustainable levels of visitor use based on 19-year-old visitation records, and some guidance on the need for or expansion of developments that will be proposed or maintained in support of visitor and operational needs. The plan provides some sense of how these management goals can be accomplished, and environmental consequences of these actions. One major goal of the General Management Plan was to clearly delineate the development zone which contains the visitor center, housing, campground, utilities, and other infrastructure. This design has enabled the park to upgrade and add needed visitor facility improvements while limiting the footprint and visual impacts of these modern intrusions. Implemented in 1995, another important resource protection strategy outlined in the plan was to redesign the park entrance road to enable the park to control unauthorized access to fragile resources. The state highway that once traversed the park, and was open day and night, was abandoned and replaced with a one-way interpretive loop road that can be closed at sunset. This road allows easy visitor access to all major interpreted sites and back country trails, but enables the park to secure the area at night and during emergencies. This road redesign has significantly cut down on vandalism to resources, poaching, and other types of unauthorized activities that were damaging resources. Further, once carrying capacities are defined, the park will be able to maintain visitor uses at sustainable levels. At about the same time the General Management Plan was completed, Chaco developed a Land Protection Plan (1985) that summarized similar topics, but focused more on the purpose and methods for acquisition of inholdings. This is a more comprehensive plan that included the charter for the multi-agency Chaco Protection Sites Program. A more detailed inventory of cultural and natural resources was included, as well as effects of land status on the condition and integrity of the resources. Recommendations to acquire management authority on non-federal portions of the park were made, and objectives defined, once acquisition was complete.

The most current and comprehensive management plan available for Chaco Culture National Historical Park is the Resource Management Plan (2003) which contains detailed information about the cultural and natural resources in the park. Resource needs, such as protection, conservation treatment, assessments, inventory, monitoring, and other evaluations, are identified. The bulk of this plan is the development of project proposals that outline detailed resource actions, such as mapping or documentation projects, research needs, and preservation treatment plans. These proposals identify how the project work can be accomplished through government funding sources, partnerships with universities and other institutions, contracting, collaborative and multi-park efforts, and other innovative solutions. Aztec Ruins' General Management Plan was signed in 1989. The park has initiated a three-year effort to generate a new plan which will address management of the expanded park boundaries and additional cultural resources. Until then, the

park continues to work under the old plan. The 1989 plan called for backfilling, or reburial of certain portions of the standing architecture to promote long term preservation. Backfilling was initiated in 1998 and has progressed on the major standing ruin, the West Ruin. The plan also called for expanded visitor services to include new exhibits and walking trails to the additional lands and cultural sites. The trails and exhibits have not yet been constructed. The Land Protection Plan, which is part of the General Management Plan, prescribes acquisition of interest in parcels within the expanded boundaries through easements or outright purchase. To date, 230 acres have been purchased outright. Per the Land Protection Plan, the National Park Service will purchase interests in the remaining 61 acres with a combination of easements and outright purchase. The management plans for each of the Chaco Protection Sites under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management have been prepared and are being implemented. Some of the actions completed since inscription include: improved fencing, cultural inventories, preservation treatments, mineral closures, and improved visitor facilities at one of the units. All units have been designated as Off- Highway Vehicle areas. All have been designated Visual Resource Management areas to protect visual integrity.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Comment

The newest management document is the 2012 amendment to the General Management Plan that outlines visitor use and resource management values. It and other planning documents are available here: <http://www.nps.gov/chcu/parkmgmt/planning.htm>

4.3.3 - How well do the various levels of administration (i.e. national / federal; regional / provincial / state; local / municipal etc.) coordinate in the management of the World Heritage Property ?

There is **excellent coordination** between all bodies / levels involved in the management of the property

4.3.4 - Is the management system / plan adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value ?

The management system / plan is **fully adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?

The management system is being **fully** implemented and monitored

4.3.6 - Is there an annual work / action plan and is it being implemented?

An annual work / action plan exists and **many activities** are being implemented

4.3.7 - Please rate the cooperation / relationship with World Heritage property managers / coordinators / staff of the following

Local communities / residents	Fair
Local / Municipal authorities	Fair
Indigenous peoples	Good
Landowners	Fair
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Good

Industry	Fair
----------	------

4.3.8 - If present, do local communities resident in or near the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

Local communities have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management

4.3.9 - If present, do indigenous peoples resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

Indigenous peoples directly contribute to **some decisions** relating to management but their involvement could be improved

4.3.10 - Is there cooperation with industry (i.e. forestry, mining, agriculture, etc.) regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone?

There is **little or no contact** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

4.3.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

The property is in a remote location with few local residents and distant from population centers, so communications and cooperative relationships with these communities and residents is limited. Efforts are underway to increase and improve these interactions. Local industry, primarily related to oil/gas exploration, is also headquartered in distant communities with field operations near the property, and continuing efforts to improve communications are underway.

4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective measures and management arrangements for the World Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report

4.4. Financial and Human Resources

4.4.1 - Costs related to conservation, based on the average of last five years (relative percentage of the funding sources)

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	
Governmental (National / Federal)	90%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	10%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	
Other grants	

4.4.2 - International Assistance received from the World Heritage Fund (USD)

Comment

No international assistance is received from the World Heritage Fund. Not applicable

4.4.3 - Is the current budget sufficient to manage the World Heritage property effectively?

The available budget is **acceptable** but could be further improved to fully meet the management needs

4.4.4 - Are the existing sources of funding secure and likely to remain so?

The existing sources of funding **are secure** in the medium-term and planning is underway to secure funding in the long-term

4.4.5 - Does the World Heritage property provide economic benefits to local communities (e.g. income, employment)?

There is a **major flow** of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the World Heritage property

4.4.6 - Are available resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure sufficient to meet management needs?

There are **some** adequate equipment and facilities, but deficiencies in at least one key area **constrain** management at the World Heritage property

4.4.7 - Are resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure adequately maintained?

There is **basic** maintenance of equipment and facilities

4.4.8 - Comments, conclusion, and / or recommendations related to finance and infrastructure

4.4.9 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Full-time	50%
Part-time	50%

4.4.10 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Permanent	50%
Seasonal	50%

4.4.11 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Paid	70%
Volunteer	30%

4.4.12 - Are available human resources adequate to manage the World Heritage property?

A range of human resources exist, but these are **below optimum** to manage the World Heritage Property.

4.4.13 - Considering the management needs of the World Heritage property, please rate the availability of professionals in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	Fair
-------------------------	------

Promotion	Fair
Community outreach	Fair
Interpretation	Good
Education	Good
Visitor management	Fair
Conservation	Good
Administration	Good
Risk preparedness	Fair
Tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Fair

4.4.14 - Please rate the availability of training opportunities for the management of the World Heritage property in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	High
Promotion	High
Community outreach	High
Interpretation	High
Education	High
Visitor management	High
Conservation	Medium
Administration	High
Risk preparedness	High
Tourism	High
Enforcement (custodians, police)	High

4.4.15 - Do the management and conservation programmes at the World Heritage property help develop local expertise?

A capacity development plan or programme is **in place and fully implemented**; all technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally, who are assuming leadership in management

4.4.16 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

The remote location, and limited staff managing the property affect the availability of professionals engaged in some of the disciplines. Professional capabilities are present within the National Park Service and Bureau of Land Management at regional and national levels.

4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

4.5.1 - Is there adequate knowledge (scientific or traditional) about the values of the World Heritage property to support planning, management and decision-making to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient**

4.5.2 - Is there a planned programme of research at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is a **comprehensive, integrated programme of research**, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

Research results are **shared widely** with the local, national and international audiences

4.5.4 - Please provide details (i.e. authors, title, and web link) of papers published about the World Heritage property since the last Periodic Report

Much of the recent research is available at WWW.chacoarchive.org, and in the Chaco archives. Titles of the most current synthetic research publications are: Lekson, Steve: 2005 - Archaeology of Chaco Canyon, SAR Press, Lekson, Steve: 2006 - The architecture of Chaco Canyon, University of Utah Press, Mathien, Joan: 2005 -- Culture and Ecology of Chaco Canyon, Publications in Archaeology 18H.

4.5.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to scientific studies and research projects

Specific language in the property's enabling legislation mandates promoting research to better understand the archaeological resources. Managers actively encourage and permit research on a broad range of multi-disciplinary topics. More focus could be directed to studies that directly address current management needs.

4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

4.6.1 - At how many locations is the World Heritage emblem displayed at the property?

In **many locations and easily visible** to visitors

4.6.2 - Please rate the awareness and understanding of the existence and justification for inscription of the World Heritage property amongst the following groups

Local communities / residents	Average
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Poor
Local Indigenous peoples	Average
Local landowners	Poor
Visitors	Excellent
Tourism industry	Excellent
Local businesses and industries	Poor

4.6.3 - Is there a planned education and awareness programme linked to the values and management of the World Heritage property?

There is a planned education and awareness programme but it only **partly meets the needs** and could be improved

4.6.4 - What role, if any, has designation as a World Heritage property played with respect to education, information and awareness building activities?

World Heritage status has influenced education, information and awareness building activities, **but it could be improved**

4.6.5 - How well is the information on Outstanding Universal Value of the property presented and interpreted?

The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is adequately presented and interpreted **but improvements could be made**

4.6.6 - Please rate the adequacy for education, information and awareness building of the following visitor facilities and services at the World Heritage property

Visitor centre	Adequate
Site museum	Not provided but needed
Information booths	Not provided but needed
Guided tours	Adequate
Trails / routes	Excellent
Information materials	Excellent
Transportation facilities	Excellent
Other	8 -
	array
	1 3
	2 1
	3 1
	4 3
	5 4
	6 4
	7 4
	array
	1 Rating on a 4 point scale on adequacy
	2 Not needed
	3 Not provided but needed
	4 Poor
	5 Adequate
	6 Excellent

4.6.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to education, information and awareness building

The property's remote, isolated location and lack of a 'gateway' community makes it difficult to connect with the more distant communities and residents. The Aztec Ruins unit of the property has made recent progress in contacting and educating the local community and that, along with educational outreach will improve awareness. New museum exhibits are in progress at several locations.

4.7. Visitor Management

4.7.1 - Please provide the trend in annual visitation for the last five years

Last year	Minor Increase
Two years ago	Minor Increase
Three years ago	Minor Increase
Four years ago	Minor Increase
Five years ago	Minor Increase

4.7.2 - What information sources are used to collect trend data on visitor statistics?

Entry tickets and registries
Visitor surveys

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

The 2012 GMP amendment was based on a visitor values/use survey and other visitor statistics used to develop the plan. That document will fill some of the visitor management records lacking in the previous report. In addition, visitor counting methods in the past were not consistent or accurate, but in the past few years, these methods have been improved and will provide more accurate information. The 2013 GMP amendment is available on the NPS website

4.7.4 - Is there an appropriate visitor use management plan (e.g. specific plan) for the World Heritage property which ensures that its Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is managed but **improvements could be made**

4.7.5 - Does the tourism industry contribute to improving visitor experiences and maintaining the values of the World Heritage property?

There is **limited co-operation** between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry to present the Outstanding Universal Value and increase appreciation

4.7.6 - If fees (i.e. entry charges, permits) are collected, do they contribute to the management of the World Heritage property?

The fee is collected and makes a **substantial contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

4.7.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to visitor use of the World Heritage property

The tourism industry in the state of New Mexico is reaching out to Chaco Culture to more effectively coordinate tourism and cooperate on mutual goals. Managers at the property are updating planning documents to address some of the current and future needs for improving site protection with respect to visitor use.

4.8. Monitoring

4.8.1 - Is there a monitoring programme at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is a **comprehensive, integrated programme** of monitoring, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.8.2 - Are key indicators for measuring the state of conservation used to monitor how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained?

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient** for defining and monitoring key indicators for measuring its state of conservation

4.8.3 - Please rate the level of involvement in monitoring of the following groups

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Average
Local communities	Average

Researchers	Excellent
NGOs	Excellent
Industry	Average
Local indigenous peoples	Excellent

4.8.4 - Has the State Party implemented relevant recommendations arising from the World Heritage Committee?

No relevant Committee recommendations to implement

4.8.5 - Please provide comments relevant to the implementation of recommendations from the World Heritage Committee

4.8.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to monitoring

The National Park Service Office of International Affairs keeps property managers fully aware of World Heritage issues and requirements, and assists in understanding and meeting reporting and management requirements.

4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs

4.9.1 - Please select the top 6 managements needs for the property (if more than 6 are listed below)

Please refer to question 5.2

5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

	World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment	
3.4	Pollution						
3.4.4	Air pollution	Primarily caused by coal-fired power plants upwind and within 50-100 miles of the property. Decreased air quality prevents visitors from viewing significant elements of the cultural landscape and understanding the vast extent of the Chaco property.	Open communications with industry to understand how they could affect air quality in the region.	Contact industry and ask for their monitoring data.	These actions could begin immediately.	National Park Service could be lead in beginning the discussions.	N/A

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.3 Management System / Management Plan						
	Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		
4.3.10	There is little or no contact with industry regarding management	Make a greater effort to contact industry leaders who are currently working in adjoining areas to educate them on protection measures and recruit them as partners in protecting the resources.	Ongoing.	National Park Service.	N/A	

5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity

The authenticity of the World Heritage property has been **preserved**

5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

The integrity of the World Heritage property is **intact**

5.3.3 - Current state of the World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **maintained**.

5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values

Other important cultural and / or natural values and the state of conservation of the World Heritage property are **predominantly intact**

5.4. Additional comments on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.4.1 - Comments

Increases in development outside of the property will always pose threats to fragile resources. Managers will need to continue and accelerate their efforts to educate the public and industry about ways to protect and preserve the resources.

6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

6.1 - Please rate the impacts of World Heritage status of the property in relation to the following areas

Conservation	Very positive
Research and monitoring	Very positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	Not applicable
Funding for the property	No impact
International cooperation	Very positive
Political support for conservation	No impact
Legal / Policy framework	No impact
Lobbying	No impact
Institutional coordination	No impact
Security	No impact
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

6.2 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to World Heritage status

The World Heritage status has no impact on how NPS distributes limited funds and assistance, however the visiting public recognizes the importance of the listing. Among other World Heritage sites there are ongoing important collaborations on conservation and preservation methods and techniques. The general public greatly appreciates and understands the values that accompany World Heritage listing

and they are becoming important advocates in the protection of these resources.

6.3 - Entities involved in the preparation of this Section of the Periodic Report

Governmental institution responsible for the property
Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff

6.4 - Was the Periodic Reporting questionnaire easy to use and clearly understandable?

yes

6.5 - Please provide suggestions for improvement of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire

6.6 - Please rate the level of support for completing the Periodic Report questionnaire from the following entities

UNESCO	Good
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Fair

6.7 - How accessible was the information required to complete the Periodic Report?

Most of the required information was accessible

6.8 - The Periodic Reporting process has improved the understanding of the following

The World Heritage Convention
The concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Integrity and / or Authenticity
Managing the property to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting
Management effectiveness

6.9 - Please rate the follow-up to conclusions and recommendations from previous Periodic Reporting exercise by the following entities

UNESCO	None
State Party	Satisfactory
Site Managers	None
Advisory Bodies	None

6.10 - Summary of actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee

- Geographic Information Table**
Reason for update: CCNHP -- 13,036 ha Kin Bineola -- 554 ha Kin Ya'a -- 105 ha Pueblo Pintado -- 65 ha Aztec ruins -- 129 ha Note that these figures do not represent additional Hectares, they replace the '0' and reflect more accurate property size descriptions.

6.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting exercise