Conclusion:

No DNA suitable for PCR amplification remains in the Kennewick samples studied. Thus, no conclusion regarding its ethnic ancestry based on DNA can be made. The source of all DNA that could be amplified in our studies was hypothesized to be one of two persons (FAK and JAE) who participated in the DNA analysis. Since this particular sample from the Kennewick remains is likely to be the most optimal for extraction of DNA for analysis, it is unlikely that further analysis of other elements (e.g. teeth or a much larger portion of bone) would be successful. While this outcome is somewhat surprising since the collagen content of the samples analyzed was relatively high ,given their great age, there is ,in fact, very little data suggesting that the presence of protein in a given sample of bone is closely correlated with its DNA content and the consensus of opinion of scientists attending the June,2000 (biannual) Ancient DNA Conference in Manchester ,England, was that such a correlation is ,at best, low. It is significant that samples analyzed during the 1999 analysis were fare less contaminated (e.g. figure 2a) than those analyzed during 1996 (e.g. figure 1a). This is probably due to changes in methodology during the interim designed to reduce opportunities for contamination of ancient DNA with modern DNA.