ROCKY REACH CULTURAL RESOURCES
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS
FROM PREVIOUS STUDIES

06/01/00

The following summary of recommendations has been prepared in response to a request form the Cultural Resources Working Group on March 20, 2000.

Two major studies have been completed in the last 20 years in conjunction with the preparation of an application to amend the Rocky Reach license to allow a three-foot increase in headwater elevation. The FERC denied the application in an Order issued on November 18, 1996. A comprehensive overview of the study area that included a field component of site inventory was completed in 1981 (Schalk and Mierendorf 1983) and was complemented by survey of recreation sites within the Rocky Reach reservoir. Approximately 10 years later, additional survey was undertaken (Galm 1990) followed by test excavations at several sites (Boreson 1992). Recommendations resulting from these studies are summarized below.

Five identification procedures were identified in the overview of Rocky Reach (Schalk and Mierendorf 1983:669-675) as important considerations for managing cultural resources within the reservoir:

1. More detailed historic and ethnographic studies need to be conducted:
    a. Ethnographic field research with knowledgeable member of Middle Columbia Salish tribes should be undertaken.
    b. Archival collections of documents, photographs, maps, and other information pertaining to the study area should be examined.

2. Predictive modeling. The existing overview and survey data have not been used to predict the likely location, density, and numbers of existing but as yet undiscovered archaeological sites. This could serve as a useful, long-range planning tool.

3. Project-specific, short-term planning surveys may need to be conducted. Where earth-moving activities are likely to occur, these surveys may need to be intensive.

4. Special survey techniques, such as subsurface auguring or post hole excavations, use of remote sensing should be employed on landforms having less than 1.0 percent ground visibility unless:
    a. The landform is historic in nature;
    b. The landform consists of a bedrock outcrop along a steep valley wall; or
    c. The erosional bank affords an unobstructed view of intact sedimentary deposits and the project boundaries are not more than 20 m inland from the exposed bank.

5. Monitoring. Regular inspections should be made of those portions of the reservoir shoreline that are adjacent to all unconsolidated sedimentary deposits, other than those mentioned in 3.a above and should include the following:
    a. Intensive survey along eroding portions of the reservoir within 12 months following any permanent pool raise.
    b. Intensive survey of eroding landforms between 12 and 24 months, between 24 and 36 months, between 36 and 48 months, and between 48 and 60 months following a pool raise.
    c. After the 5th annual monitoring survey, reservoir erosion of archaeological sites should be monitored every three years until expiration of the FERC license.
    d. Control datum points may be established along a representative sample of the various kinds of eroding landforms along the reservoir to quantify rates of

erosion that may be useful for predicting long-range reservoir effects on cultural properties.

e. The monitoring procedure should include a special provision to account for a catastrophic Columbia River flood. If such were to occur, then an intensive archaeological survey of erosional areas should occur as soon as feasibly possible.

In addition to these recommendations, management planning for the reservoir included considerations of data gaps, high-sensitivity localities, considerations of evaluations of selected site types, Determinations of Effects on National Register properties, treatment of properties, and other ancillary management considerations.

The 1990 resurvey of the Rocky Reach reservoir resulted in the documentation of 11 new archaeological sites and one inundated site recorded from notes, photographs, and recollections (Galm 1990:12). In addition eight sensitive areas (following the recommendations of Schalk and Mierendorf 1983) were identified. Recommendations included testing at two sensitive areas (Sensitive area 1 and 5) (Galm 1990:26-27). Subsequently both sensitive areas and fourteen sites were tested prior to completion of Determinations of Eligibility (Boreson 1992).