

From: Leier NWW01, John P
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 1997 6:51 AM
To: Kirts NWW01, Linda R; Tracy NWW01, Ray L
Subject: FW: protection options

privileged: NP

Linda:

The only comment I would add to Ray's description is that for the temporary protection option, it should be noted that this approach will not protect against high flows/spring floods. The site will still be very susceptible to erosion under these conditions.

John

From: Tracy NWW01, Ray L
Sent: Monday, September 22, 1997 2:44PM
To: Leier NWW01, John P
Subject: protection options

John

Please send to Linda with your comments.



REMPROT.DOC

Ray

115-886

We are currently considering two protection options for the Columbia Park site.

1. Temporary protection.

This would consist of the placement of natural logs along the foot of the eroded area for about 150 feet. Fiber mats would be placed to cover the cut-bank to protect it from the impact of winter rains. the logs and the mats would be staked in place to secure them against movement by flowing water or wind.

This option would provide adequate protection from winter rains and would also serve to discourage artifact hunters from digging or beach combing along the shore area of the site. The cut-bank would still be accessible for site evaluations by the removal of a small portion of fiber matting. When permanent protection is deemed to be appropriate, the staked logs will act as the footing for backfilling to the top of the cut-bank. The fiber mats can be reused to cover the back-fill and will assist in the establishment of plant cover.

The measures would be highly visible and would necessitate increased monitoring to prevent possible vandalism.

2. Permanent protection.

This would include the placement of staked logs along the shoreline with backfill behind the logs to the top of the cut-bank. Fiber mats would be staked in place on top of the backfill and plant cover would be established.

This option would provide immediate protection from winter rains, as well as, protection against erosion by spring floods. Considerable protection against vandalism would result. The protection would become more robust with the establishment of plant cover. Appropriate thorny plants might be established to discourage vandalism.

Permanent protection would complicate additional site evaluation by making it necessary to excavate more to gain access for sediment samples, etc.

Al Sutlick has been contacted to make a cost estimate for the two options.