

~~Kirts, Linda R NWW~~
From: Leier, John P NWW
Sent: Thursday, January 08, 1998 9:35 AM
To: Briuer, Frederick L WES01
Cc: Kirts, Linda R NWW; Rubenstein, Paul D HQ01; Wakeley, Lillian D WES01
Subject: Comments on 2nd Draft of Ancient Remains Site Report

Fred:

Some comments for your consideration on the ancient remains site report.

1. On the title page and at several other places in the report, you refer to the site as 45BN52. While originally folks may have included the ancient remains location as part of 45BN52, my present understanding is that this no longer is the case. (I'm not aware that this was ever done officially in terms of amending the present 45BN52 site form to include the ancient remains location.) When I was out at the site on December 13, I talked with Dr. Manfred Jaehnig about this situation. He told me that he had been directed by Jeff Van Pelt to not record the ancient remains site as part of 45BN52. The same day, I also talked to Ray Tracy about anything he may have done regarding recordation of the site. He said he had not submitted anything to the state office recording it as part of 45BN52. Lastly, I talked with the state archaeologist yesterday. In the course of our discussions, he mentioned that he did not recall a specific site number being assigned to the ancient remains location. I don't know what information you were provided on this matter, but for the present, this may be something to not include in the report to avoid any misunderstandings.
2. Page 5, acknowledgments on last paragraph - Dr. Harvey "Pete" Rice, Dr. Gordon Lothson (Yakama Tribe - "a" instead of "j"), Mr. Jason Lyon and Mr. Brett Lenz (neither have a Ph.D.), Ray Tracy, and Linda Carter.
3. Pages 7 and 8, discussion on the 3 articulated bones - My understanding is that the District will start the actual site protection work on 12 January with an estimated completion time of 10 days. Obviously, bank protection will be done long before the final WES report is completed. Further, I've not heard that any additional site work (e.g. removal of the 3 articulated bones to clarify the Bison question) will be done prior to the protection work. Given this situation, your recommendation for removal and comparison of the bones will be "after the fact" and I assume very unlikely to happen at that point. Would suggest this part be rewritten to retain the question of Bison or cow but also reflect the fact that the area is already protected.

Please call if you have any questions regarding the above.

John

S-552