

1144
41/52

An archaeological component to the geological field investigation conducted by US Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station (WES) was designed to assure that cultural remains encountered during the field investigation would not be damaged, destroyed or overlooked. Given the occurrence of artifacts, and ecofacts previously recorded at site 45 BN 52, it would seem very likely that cultural material would be encountered during the geological field and analytical investigation. During the series of meetings and telephone conversations between principal project participants, that preceded the field work, it was decided that an archaeologist team member would be included in the WES project. The WES scope of work reflects this decision.

In anticipation of encountering cultural material during the geological investigation, a field and laboratory procedure was developed by Dr. Andrew Warne and Dr. Frederick Briuer to combine a geological and archaeological perspective. In this way the geological research goals would be met without adversely impacting archaeological contexts. This procedure, including copies of the field recording sheets were coordinated with all participants at a prework conference held Friday 12 December 1997.

PRE WORK CONFERENCE: ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

A meeting of all interested participating parties (See Dr. Wakeley's attendance list) was conducted Friday afternoon after an initial on-site meeting Friday morning 12 December 1997. During this meeting it became apparent that there was considerable misunderstanding about the WES scope of work and two ARPA permits. The WES scope of work stipulated that the research goals would necessitate the removal of artifacts encountered. The WES scope of work called for an analysis and description of artifacts at the Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg Mississippi, before returning them to the Walla Walla District. The WES team was not anticipating a problem concerning artifact removal and assumed that the research goal of dating the site could not be achieved without a consideration of the chronological significance of artifacts. Mr. Van Pelt, the spokesman for the Umatilla tribe voiced strong objections to this provision. Mr. Van Pelt took the position that artifacts could not be removed from the site and that the provisions of the ARPA permits for the non-federal teams led by Dr. Gary Huckelberry and Dr. Manfred Jaehnig applied to the WES team as well, even though WES as a Federal Agency does not require an ARPA permit and the WES scope of work had been previously coordinated with all interested parties. The WES team had not anticipated a policy of no-removal of artifacts.

The perceived need to collect artifacts and the demand by the Umatilla spokesman to not remove artifacts seemed to be at an impasse when Dr. Paul Nickens, a professional archaeologist representing the Department of Justice at this meeting, suggested a compromise solution. Dr. Nickens suggested that the number of artifacts encountered during field work, would probably be small and that there were enough archaeologists on hand to perform artifact cataloging, photography and description on site. He offered to take responsibility to assist the WES team with the task of cataloging, describing and photographing any artifacts that may be encountered before returning them to their place of discovery. Since this compromise would assure that

2

5925

EXHIBIT E

1147
42/52

critical informational context of artifacts would be saved and would not increase the level of effort and unanticipated work for the WES team, a compromise agreement was reached that all artifacts would be returned to the site once Dr. Nickens completed his description.

Dr. Briuer then raised the issue of the need to recover other materials to accomplish the research goals. In particular, Dr. Briuer asked for clarification about non-artifactual remains such as bone or shell (ecofacts) critically needed to answer the project research questions agreed to in the WES scope of work. The consensus of opinion was that ecofacts could be removed. An example of which would be unmodified shell (ecofact) as opposed to an obviously human modified shell bead with drilled and polished modifications which would be considered an artifact. Dr. Briuer also raised the issue of the possibility of encountering small artifacts in the core samples that would be removed from the site for analysis at the Waterways Experiment Station. Again Mr. Van Pelt had no objection to the removal of core samples even if there was a possibility that these samples might contain small artifacts. There were no objections voiced by meeting participants to this clarification about the need to perform analysis of cores at WES.

FIELD WORK (ARCHAEOLOGICAL COMPONENT) DECEMBER 13-16

Profiling commenced Saturday 13 December. A total of twelve profiles was completed at points along a base line of three hundred and thirty four meters in length. The base line ran approximately parallel to the river bank. Profiles were selected at roughly twenty five meter intervals in areas where new surfaces could be cleaned off with a minimum of excavation. Profiles were designated CPP 005 through 334 (Columbia Park Profiles with meter designation along the surveyed base line). The upper left corner, as the viewer faces each profile, was marked by a three foot section of one half inch steel rebar driven into the ground at a diagonal. This corner was surveyed in by a team of professional surveyors from the surveying section of the Walla Walla District Corps of Engineers. The survey team set out the base line and supported the field work by surveying in all profiles, a one meter geophysical grid system, the original site datum point and various points throughout the site for topographic mapping.

Sections of the cut bank that were obviously damaged or disturbed by recent natural processes such as erosion, slump or mass wasting, were avoided. A conscious effort was made to select those profiles with the greatest potential for stratigraphic integrity. An effort was also made to minimize excavation to only that which would be needed to produce a clean vertical face. An effort was made to expedite the profiling process so that other cooperating investigators could have access to the profiles for their research purposes as soon as possible. Profiles were stepped back as an alternative to digging long continuous faces requiring the removal of large quantities of sediment. An effort was made to minimize the amount of excavation so that the removed sediment could be screened as quickly as possible and not hold up other investigators with a need to examine the profiles.

Each of the profiles was set into the bank (framed) with one inch wide PVC pipe set vertically and one half inch, three foot long sections of steel rebar driven diagonally into all four corners of each profile. Each profiles was framed with the PVC pipe fifty centimeters wide but varied in