

1 exit inventory, Dr. Owsley confirmed and identified that some of the remains in these two  
2 collections were consistent with the remains of collection CENWW.97.KENNEWICK. Other  
3 bones in collections CENWW.97A.KENNEWICK and CENWW.97B.KENNEWICK were  
4 identified during our examination of the remains in November 1997 and again during the exit  
5 inventory by Dr. Owsley. However, the remains from collections CENWW.97A.KENNEWICK  
6 and CENWW.97B.KENNEWICK that were identified as belonging with the main  
7 CENWW.97.KENNEWICK collection will still retain separate catalog numbers since they were  
8 not found with the initial discovery.

9  
10 7. The femurs have been in an incomplete and fragmented condition since my involvement with  
11 this case. Therefore, I can not comment on their condition prior to November 1997.

12  
13 8. When my staff and I cataloged the collection in November 1997, unique numbers were  
14 assigned to every bone and fragment present. Dr. Owsley verified with me the presence of the  
15 entire collection at the exit inventory. We both filled out a checklist of the catalog numbers  
16 when the remains were unpacked on the morning of October 28, 1998, and again after the  
17 remains had been inventoried and their condition assessed by the conservators. In the nine hours  
18 that Dr. James Chatters was present and conducting his own inspection of the remains, I did not  
19 hear him ask to sign or review the catalog or the inventory. The catalog forms that were signed  
20 are as Dr. Owsley and I agreed upon. Dr. Chatters had the opportunity during the nine hours  
21 they were present in the same room during the inventory to confer with Dr. Owsley. However,  
22 Dr. Chatters performed his own evaluation of the remains. Pursuant to the Revised Joint  
23 Memorandum of Agreement dated September 30, 1998 and the Court Order of October 20, 1998,  
24 Dr. Owsley had the authority to use Dr. Chatters as his assistant, but he specifically asked me if  
25 the government would let Ms. Lueck assist him. I concurred and shifted her responsibilities to  
26 Ms. Militello of my staff and myself. I understood that Dr. Owsley did not wish Dr. Chatters in  
27 the room until after 4:00 p.m. Dr. Chatters arrived at 5:03 p.m.; over 2 hours after the inventory  
28 began.

29  
30 9. Plaintiffs' Supplemental Report on Transfer of the Skeleton states, "Although not as  
31 significant as the missing pieces of femurs, the bones that were taken from the collection in April  
32 1998 also could have aided in reconstructing the skeleton." (See Exhibit 1, page 7). To the  
33 contrary, these fragments were never identified as being part of the collection, nor were they

1 even confirmed as being human. They were never catalogued and were not considered as part of  
2 the collection since no accurate recordation of their provenience was taken.

3  
4 10. Although paragraph 6 of plaintiff's filing states that the signed inventory forms do not  
5 represent an itemized list of every bone, Dr. Owsley's report appears to imply otherwise. The  
6 Report of Dr. Owsley states: "These forms [the completed inventory forms signed by both Dr.  
7 Trimble and Dr. Owsley] list all of the elements in the collection" and "We have an accurate,  
8 high-level inventory of the anatomical elements in the collection. The standardized inventory  
9 data forms attached as Appendix A identify the presence (complete or partial) or absence of all  
10 anatomical elements of the Kennewick skeleton. ... As a result, we now have a unified record  
11 that integrates all of the elements belonging to the Kennewick skeleton." (See Plaintiffs'  
12 Supplemental Report on Transfer of the Skeleton, Exhibit 1, at p. 5). Although the signed  
13 inventory forms do not represent an item-by-item list of every bone and fragment in the  
14 collection, the catalog does contain such a listing. As explained below, the catalog will be  
15 updated upon review of Dr. Owsley's notes and when the collection is rehoused.

16  
17 11. During the skeletal inventory, Ms. Lueck made notations of needed catalog changes as well  
18 as new or corrected identifications made by Dr. Owsley on the master catalog list and catalog  
19 tags. (See Enclosure M, Ms. Lueck's Typed Notes from Transfer). When the collection is  
20 rehoused we will reconcile and update the catalog and identifications made during the inventory  
21 using the information provided in Dr. Owsley's Report that was filed on December 10, 1998, and  
22 the notes prepared by Ms. Lueck. During the exit inventory, I decided to update the catalog after  
23 the transfer because to do so during the transfer would delay Dr. Owsley's work. The  
24 reconciliation should be made at the time the collection is rehoused to reduce the number of  
25 times the remains are handled. Thus, a reinspection of the skeleton to reconcile catalog and  
26 identification inconsistencies, as claimed by Plaintiffs, is not necessary.

27  
28 12. Dr. Owsley originally proposed the time he needed to conduct the inventory (See letter from  
29 Dr. Owsley to Ms. Michael and Dr. Trimble dated 17 September 1998). He stated that "...with a  
30 recorder it [the examination] can be completed in approximately four to five hours." Thus, the  
31 work schedule I coordinated with Dr. Owsley called for four hours for Dr. Owsley to complete  
32 the inventory of the skeleton. I never understood Dr. Owsley or the plaintiffs to object to this  
33 timeframe. In fact, Defendants made every accommodation to Dr. Owsley by increasing his