

CULTURAL RESOURCE REVIEW
April 2002

ISSUES/OPPORTUNITIES REPORT

HANFORD REACH NATIONAL MONUMENT

Introduction

“This magnificent area contains an irreplaceable natural and cultural legacy...one of the few remaining archaeologically rich areas in the western Columbia Plateau, containing well preserved remnants of human history spanning more than 10,000 years.”

The Hanford Reach National Monument (Monument) established on June 9, 2002, by Presidential Proclamation, identifies the significance of the area based on its natural and cultural landscape. In addition to the sites representing aboriginal inhabitants of the area, historic settlement of the area is also evident in and adjacent to the Monument. These remnants of past human culture and activity are invaluable and irreplaceable keys to former life ways and behavior patterns. Protection of these cultural resources, including tangible portions of sites, such as artifacts, features, structures, natural resources and landscapes (e.g. traditional use and sacred areas) as well as oral and written records is paramount to management of the Monument.

One of the reasons the Monument came into being is that, through an unusual, yet fortuitous, circumstance, many of the natural and cultural resources were preserved as the result of the development of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation during World War II. This buffer zone around the Reservation (now encompassed by the Monument) has been protected from development and human use since 1942. Unfortunately, some of the resources such as the historic town sites, homesteads and other structures, as well as Native American traditional use areas and aboriginal occupation areas, were damaged during establishment and operation of the Hanford site. However, there is little doubt that without the inadvertent protection of the area through its restricted public use many of these resources would have been obliterated or damaged. Inheriting this resource brings an obligation to the FWS not only to manage the Monument for the protection and preservation, and restoration as appropriate, of these heritage resources but to enhance their value through the education of the public.

Also integral to the significance of the Monument is its connection to the regional Native American heritage. Extant native peoples tie traditional and continued use and occupation patterns to this land. Spiritual beliefs link plants, animals and sacred areas within the cultural landscape. Use of their traditional hunting, gathering and collecting territory has continued for generations although somewhat reduced by the Hanford Site restrictions. The FWS has an opportunity to enhance these opportunities for traditional Native American use of the resources through on-going interaction with native peoples.

Cultural Resource Background for the Monument

Pre-Contact, Native American Tradition

The Monument falls within the area known as the Mid-Columbia region of the Plateau physiographic province, so named for its central position along the 1,200 -mile- long Columbia River drainage system. The accessibility and potential density of sites along the river has enticed both archaeologists and collectors to the area for the past 80-100 years. Smithsonian archaeologist Krieger excavated sites in the Wahluke in 1926. The area yields the famous “Columbia River gem points”; so named for the beauty and craftsmanship displayed by their indigenous creators. Consequently, the riverine area known as the Hanford Reach has been studied, or at least explored, for as long or longer than any other area in the Northwest. This opens a fascinating chapter in the oral history and still-unfolding story of the archaeological resources in the Monument

In addition, the extant Native American cultures occupy and utilize parts of what is now the Monument, which represents only a portion of their extensive aboriginal homeland. Nch’i-Wana (the Wanapum People’s word for “Big River”) for thousands of years was the life- blood of Native Americans in the region. Without the river, survival in the harsh desert environs of the Columbia Basin would have been difficult. The archaeological record within the Monument goes back at least 8000 years. A recent find on the Hanford Site of an early projectile point type dating from about 10,000 years ago suggests earlier sites may exist along former shorelines of the Columbia River. Previous archaeological excavations in the surrounding region, such as Lind Coulee, Sunset Creek and Marmes rockshelter and the controversial “Ancient One” find in Kennewick suggest that people occupied the areas during early PaleoIndian periods over 10,000 years ago.

These ancestors of the present day Wanapum People, Yakama, Colville, Umatilla and Nez Perce Tribes fished for salmon; hunted deer, elk, sheep and rabbit; and collected and gathered roots, seeds and berries. Trading networks between tribes allowed a wider exchange of non-local goods and facilitated interaction among people. Being located in the Mid-Columbia provided an advantage for local groups to network with others to obtain desired commodities such as shell from the coast, obsidian from Idaho and Oregon and buffalo from the Plains. Celilio Falls on the Lower Columbia was not only a prominent fishing area but also a major trading location where tribes from as far as the Plains and Great Basin came to trade.

Natural resources, including foods, medicines and material for tools and shelter were gathered in the appropriate season, primarily spring to fall. Thus resource harvesting required mobility and establishment of various camps in both riverine settings for fishing, shellfish gathering, tule and other natural material, to upland root and berry collecting sites and hunting stations. In the winter, villages comprised of oval or circular housepits were established along the river terraces and islands. The 47- mile stretch of the Hanford Reach contains numerous village sites primarily attributed to the Wanapum. In addition, several traditional cultural properties and sacred areas

are known to exist on the Monument. Even today the area is utilized for resource gathering and traditional ceremonies.

Prominent ridges, such as Rattlesnake Mountain and the Saddle Mountains, are known as traditional spring root gathering areas. Rock features, such as cairns, hunting blinds and talus pits, are also found along prominent ridges and overlooks. These may also have significance as traditional cultural properties. Although none of the areas have been officially designated Traditional Cultural Properties, Rattlesnake Mountain (known to the native people as La Liik) is revered by all of the Native Americans in the area as sacred.

This use and occupation of the Monument area for thousands of years has left a cultural historical record with both an extensive and well-preserved diversity of archaeological resources prior to Euro-American contact. The majority of the field work that has been undertaken, primarily along the river, is the result of government projects such as Army Corps of Engineers dam-related studies or the Hanford Site development or clean-up activities. Information is project specific and often remains incomplete or unpublished. In addition, a few scattered university project and field school excavations have been done but again often remain unpublished.

Little field work has been accomplished in the outer reaches of the Monument. The River Corridor Unit is the only one with enough data to even discuss the types of cultural resources, and the data is biased toward the Hanford site side of the river. The ALE unit contains some site information due to selected DOE project work and research but concentrates around the more readily accessible areas such as the springs, homesteads and Hanford site development along the roads and ridges. Some investigation has occurred in the McGee/ Riverlands and Vernita Units, again primarily due to their riverine connection. The Wahluke Unit and Saddle Mountain Units have a mixture of riverine and upland physiography so the coverage is determined by proximity to the river. Virtually none of it has been done systematically or with a specific research design. In essence, knowledge is limited and disconnected.

No synthesis of the Mid-Columbia archaeological record has been developed so the exact numbers of sites within the monument is unknown but an estimate of about 1,000 sites were recorded within DOE lands as of 1996. Additional sites and isolated artifacts noted since then bring the total to at least 1,500 locations recorded. In addition eight Archaeological Districts are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Six of these Districts, including Coyote Rapids, Locke Island, Savage Island, Wooded Island, Ryegrass and Hanford fall within the River Corridor Unit of the Monument. The majority of the total site inventory represents pre-Euro-American site types including pithouse villages, campsites, fishing and root gathering stations, resource processing camps, hunting blinds, rock cairns, talus pits, hearth features, cemeteries, quarries and lithic tool production sites.

Limited archaeological excavation-- less than 20 projects including testing and data recovery excavation-- has occurred within the Hanford Site/Monument area. Most of the major excavations were conducted by an avocational archaeological group, the Mid-Columbia

Archaeological Society in the 1960s and 70's. A few test excavations have been done through DOE contractors and a handful by university projects or field schools. None of the sites dug are located outside of the river corridor so radiocarbon dating of sites tends to cluster in the later periods covering the past 3,000 years. This reflects the more intensive riverine use associated with salmon fishing that was common throughout the region during this time period. It is likely that early sites do exist but have not been located as they are associated with higher elevation spring areas and possibly rock shelters within the ridge systems and older terraces along the ancestral meander channels of the Columbia.

Post-Contact, Euro-American Tradition

The most notable early explorers in the region were Lewis and Clark who passed through the area immediately south of the Monument in 1805. Much of the shrub-steppe landscape noted in their journals is reflected by the present Monument. Fur traders in the 1840's and military posts in the 1840's and 1850's (Walla Walla) created transportation routes on (steamships, paddle-wheelers and ferries) and along (wagons, stagecoaches) the river. Many early transportation systems, especially trails which turned into roads, can be traced through the Monument. In most cases they have been preserved due to the lack of development in the area in contrast to the surrounding region. The White Bluffs Road, which crosses Cental Hanford and the Monument, was likely an aboriginal trail expanded into horse and wagon use by the 1850's and 60's. With the establishment of the ferry at the White Bluffs river crossing in 1859, this location became the major thoroughfare and supply point for gold-rush traffic to and from Canada, Montana and Idaho. After the gold mining burst in the region, Chinese miners continued to rework tailings and placer deposits.

Evidence of Chinese mining, including rock alignments and piles, along the Hanford Reach has been documented by the DOE. Cattle drives also took advantage of the White Bluffs Road corridor as evidenced by regionally renown cattle-king, Ben Snipes, who drove thousands of head of cattle to market via the road. Euro-American settlement followed by the 1890s with scattered homesteads and ranches developing along the river. The earliest structure on the Monument is a log cabin which served as a home and possible blacksmith shop adjacent to the White Bluffs ferry crossing. It is all that remains of the original White Bluffs community established on the east bank of the river.

With water the most precious commodity, dry farming had inherent risks. Towns began to emerge only in conjunction with the development of irrigation systems such as the Hanford Irrigation and Power Company in 1907. Remnants of the system remain in the River Corridor Unit of the Monument with the Allard and Hanford pumping stations. Other water systems within the area consisted more of individual or small groups wells often pumped by wind power. Two known settlements within the Monument, outside of central Hanford, include the Wahluke and McGee communities. The latter was unique in that it is the only area boasting artesian wells. Also within the McGee/Riverlands Unit, was the small community of Midway built to support the Midway substation in conjunction with the Hanford Engineering Works.

The influx of settlers enticed by the hope and even advertisement of irrigated farming possibilities brought an expansion of the railroad to carry goods to markets on both coasts. By 1913 the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railroad established their line through the region with a Priest Rapids to Hanford spur line. Irrigation and transportation provided the impetus for orchards to blossom and led to the area's reputation for the earliest fruit crops in Washington. Fruit sheds and warehouses were constructed on farms along the rail line. The only remaining warehouse is Bruggeman's, a river-rock structure just south of the Monument boundary in the Riverlands Unit. Stumps and second generation offspring apricot, apple and cherry trees remain in abandoned rows throughout the Monument, marking those accomplishments.

The burgeoning development effort was thwarted by a national defense initiative that shaped world history in World War II. The Hanford Engineering Works became the site for the top-secret Manhattan Project which required removal of all property owners within and adjacent to the Hanford Site. Nine plutonium production reactors were constructed between 1943 and 1963 as part of the on-going national defense strategy. Although none of the reactors are administered by FWS as part of the Monument, the boundary bisects portions of some of the reactor complexes. In particular, the B Reactor, which is the most significant in that it is the world's first reactor and produced the plutonium to manufacture the Nagasaki bomb, is near the Monument boundary. An active historical group continues to pursue establishing a museum in this National Register of Historic Places structure.

Other defense-related sites are scattered around the Monument relating primarily to the Cold War era. These include four Nike missile locations including an intact complex on ALE. Anti-Aircraft Artillery sites also flanked the Hanford Site with about half of the 16 sites located in strategic elevations on the Wahluke slope and Saddle Mountains within the Monument.

Current Cultural Resource (CR) Management

The FWS is managing the Monument under a cooperative Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the DOE. The DOE has maintained a CR management program through contractors (PNNL, Bechtel et al) since 1987. A draft CR Management Plan was developed in 1989 and is currently being revised in an effort to publish a final plan. Although the FWS follows the same CR management regulations and similar protocols, the Monument adheres to FWS policy for CR management. FWS will review the DOE plan when it is available and ascertain which portions are applicable, and can be incorporated into Monument management to avoid duplicating effort.

The **FWS Cultural Resource policy (614 FW 1)** describes the agency objectives for managing cultural resources as follows:

- Protect, maintain and plan for the use of FWS-managed cultural resources for the benefit of present and future generations.

- Provide a good example of how to maintain and preserve unique cultural resources while meeting the FWS's on-going natural resource and wildlife responsibilities.
- Identify, evaluate the importance of, and seek the appropriate protective designation of cultural resources in accordance with existing legal requirements, regulations and professional standards.
- Exercise caution that cultural resources are not inadvertently transferred, sold, demolished or substantially altered as a result of FWS sanctioned activities until appropriate.
- Ensure CR identification, evaluation and planning are accomplished.
- Avoid damage and deterioration to cultural resources that would result from erosion, abandonment or benign neglect.
- Encourage and enhance educational, interpretive and research opportunities for cultural resources consistent with the overall management objectives of the FWS.

Tribal Consultation

The FWS Native American Policy stipulates how the agency will coordinate at a policy level with Native American governments. The FWS will work directly with Native American governments to observe legislative mandates, trust responsibilities and respect Native American cultural values.

The Monument recognizes the Treaty Tribes, including the Yakama Nation, Confederated Colville Tribes, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation and the Wanapum People, and strives to conduct business in an appropriate manner with each group. Addressing Native American concerns on the Monument is an on-going process. Protocols are being developed by the Monument staff and the Regional Office Tribal Liaison at the technical discipline level as well as on a policy level. Access to and use of native material in the Monument is acknowledged and supported by the FWS

The Monument Cultural Resource Manager has worked with the DOE Indian Nations Program, the Regional Office Tribal Liaison and the tribal cultural resource programs in establishing working relationships at the technical level. Participation in the CR Issues Meetings, DOE site monitoring program involving the tribes and field investigation involving tribal members has been instrumental in furthering these networks and establishing coordination protocols.

At least one policy level meeting has been held with all Tribes except the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation. Tribal presentations were arranged for the Federal Advisory Committee meeting in August 2002. Each Native American group had an opportunity to provide

information to the FWS and the Committee. The FWS plans to continue meeting with tribal governments to further refine meaningful government to government relationships with consultation meetings anticipated in the near future.

Cultural Resource (CR) Review

In order to determine the status of the CR database to address the planning issues, a cultural resource review meeting was held with cultural resource professionals and Native Americans from the region in April 2002. The meeting was designed to be a pre-planning session to evaluate the state and availability of knowledge, and identify existing gaps. Issues and opportunities for planning and future management of the Monument were also identified.

The **priority issues** (not in any order of priority) to be brought forth in the CCP include:

- *Synthesis of CR data with appropriate data analysis and interpretation*

Much of the existing data is based on cultural resource compliance work for government agencies (DOE, ACOE). The past 15 years of information has been the result of annual surveys and project work undertaken by the DOE through consultants and Tribal Cultural Resource programs. Report detail varies; with some unreported, some incomplete.

- *Fill data gaps by surveying the Wahluke, Saddle Mountain, McGee and ALE areas*

Most of the work undertaken by the DOE was in Central Hanford, not on the buffer lands of the Monument. No systematic survey addressing research questions has been undertaken.

- *Establish protocols with Tribes for compliance with government to government consultation*

Both the FWS and DOE have established Native American policies which affect the management of the Monument and day-to-day activities. Formalizing more specific protocols with individual tribal governments is on-going. Activities include technical level meetings while attempting to arrange policy-level meetings.

- *Establish landscape management not by jurisdictional boundaries*

Similar natural and cultural landscapes exist adjacent to the Monument in areas administered by other agencies such as the BLM in the Saddle Mountains and the Army on Yakima Ridge and the Yakima Training Center. The FWS approach to research and management should be holistic, not done in a vacuum.

- *Establish policies and procedures for artifact collection, inadvertent discovery of human remains and areas at risk for potential damage (erosion, vandalism)*

The Monument has a no collection policy. Research requests may desire collection so parameters/policies need to be stipulated. Certain areas of the Monument are more susceptible to looting and erosional damage so special monitoring of these may need to be undertaken. Expansion of Law Enforcement coverage of looting concerns and a public watch program is necessary.

- *Create appropriate budget for CR Management program*

Preservation and enhancement of the cultural resources is specified in the proclamation. In addition, extensive tribal involvement and consultation is required for management of the Monument.

- *Protect, enhance and restore native species for human food and medicine as applicable*

The emphasis has been on wildlife habitat in keeping with the FWS mission of wildlife first. Restoration of aboriginal native foods and medicinal plants should be incorporated.

- *Evaluate existing and proposed public use and access areas for impacts to CR*

People tend to occupy the same areas over time. Current areas of the Monument which have heavy use (e.g. Vernita and White Bluffs boat launch) are impacting CR sites. FWS does not have title to the land or management authority in some cases. Mitigation of these impacts may be necessary prior to implementation of the CCP in order to protect the resource being damaged.

Opportunities identified to meet CCP and future goals of the Monument include:

- Partnerships with Tribes/universities to synthesize existing survey information and collection data.
- Establish a CR work group of affected agencies and Tribes.
- Provide public education, especially school groups such as Mattawa school District field trip to Wahluke site, on Monument CR and research opportunities to enhance the knowledge of the Monument.
- Partner with local historical societies, museums, the DOE, Hanford/White Bluffs Heritage pioneers and others who have an interest in historical research and documentation.

- Work with the DOE on preservation/interpretation and management options for structures adjacent to the Monument.
- Approach the Mid-Columbia Archaeological Society about volunteering on project and to build a site stewardship/public watch program.

Conclusion

The cultural heritage aspects of the Monument span many centuries and cross many cultures. Native Americans, Chinese miners, explorers, fur trappers and traders, soldiers, missionaries, settlers, farmers and ranchers have lived or passed through the Hanford Reach. Remnants of these events have been preserved by the establishment of the Monument. It is now our job to determine how we manage these resources. Balancing the values of all resources requires a collaborative effort and will be the challenge for all of us. Significant cultural sites, such as National Register Districts, may provide constraints to public access and use and subsequent development of recreation facilities. For example, the informal boat launch and dispersed camping at Vernita has already adversely impacted a significant Native American village site and possible sacred area. Continued operation, and possible expansion, of the observatory on top of Rattlesnake Mountain is potentially an incompatible use of a Traditional Cultural Property.

Habitat Management should include both wildlife and human food resources. Edible shoots, bulbs, roots, seeds and berries abounded and provided food and medicine prior to agricultural development and grazing. Native Americans in the area still collect various plants for food, medicine, tools and other products. Reestablishing appropriate environments and plant species for human harvest is an additional consideration.

The first step in providing clear and concise management direction for the CR program is to analyze and synthesize the existing data. Data gaps need to be identified to ensure the record is complete and unbiased. This is essential not only to understanding the history of the Monument area within the context of the Columbia Basin but also to avoid duplication of effort in future cultural resource investigation.

The following recommendations for the cultural resource issues and opportunities are based on the field reviews and subsequent discussions.

Recommendations:

- **Provide adequate funding for the CR Program**
The Monument Proclamation clearly identifies the preservation of cultural resources as equally important to natural resources. An effort should be made to elevate the CR management program to the level of the biological program by increasing funding and staff.

- **Analyze and synthesize data from previous CR investigations**
A determination of the number of sites, type of sites, condition of sites within the Monument is necessary to go forward with any management program. Once the information is collected, data gaps should be obvious and a program established to inventory all areas of the Monument with limited or no information.
- **Conduct baseline inventories of CR on Monument**
Survey data is limited or dated in most areas of the Monument. Prior to doing a management plan, comprehensive field survey needs to be conducted in order to determine the affected environment and reduce inherent biases. Little is known about many areas of the Monument.
- **Work with Tribes to establish collaborative programs**
Currently tribal members participate in field activities on the Monument including survey, research, resource collecting, and habitat restoration. The latter should include opportunities to plant native plant resources as well as wildlife habitat.
- **Establish volunteer program**
Several Mid-Columbia Archaeological Society members, who conducted much of the early investigation in the area, have expressed interest in working with the Monument. Their expertise and institutional history of the area is invaluable. In addition, the White Bluffs/Hanford Heritage pioneers have an interest in working with the Monument. In particular, they have proposed a monument commemorating the White Bluffs and Hanford town sites and those who gave their lives in the war.
- **Gather oral histories and other research on pre-Hanford era settlement**
Some research exists but lacks synthesis. As early informants disappear, data opportunities wane so immediate action is imperative.
- **Historic structure restoration**
White Bluffs Log Cabin has been stabilized to save it from impending collapse. However, additional preservation efforts and potentially future restoration should be addressed. An education and interpretation opportunity is critical as this is the earliest structure on the Monument.

White Bluffs Bank and Bruggeman Warehouse are both outside of the Monument but provide opportunities for restoration and interpretation. This work could be accomplished with interested historical groups and in partnership with the DOE in accordance with the MOU.
- **Site Protection**
Looting and damaging sites is a constant threat to CR on the Monument. As public use increases the potential for damage will likely increase as well. Additional law

enforcement staff and training are necessary to contend with potential site impacts. Data recovery may be appropriate as mitigation for eroding or looted sites.

- **Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) Inventory, Evaluation and Nomination**
Several sacred areas, including Rattlesnake Mountain, Gable Butte and Gable Mountain exist within or adjacent to the Monument. The process to identify these as TCPs needs to be undertaken in collaboration with the Native Americans in the region.

Monument Project Leader
Gregory M. Hughes

Date

Monument Cultural Resource Manager
Jenna Gaston

Date

Regional Office Cultural Resource Manager
Anan Raymond

Date

Regional Office Refuge Supervisor
Don Voros

Date

Regional Office Refuge Chief
Carolyn Bohan

Date

CR REVIEW PARTICIPANTS

<u>Name & Address</u>	<u>Phone</u>	<u>Fax</u>	<u>E-Mail</u>
Rex Buck, Wanapum People P.O. Box 878 Ephrata, WA. 98823	509-932-3571x3113	509-766-2522	rbuck@gcpud.org
Paula Call, USFWS 3250 Port of Benton Blvd., Richland, WA 99352	509-371-1801	509-375-0196	Paula_Call@fws.gov
Kevin Clarke, DOE- Tribal Coordinator MS A7-75; P.O. Box 550; Richland, WA 99352	509-376-6332	509-376-1563	kevin_v_clarke@rl.gov
Kristie Baptiste-Eke, Nez Perce Tribe/ERWM P.O. Box 365; Lapwai, ID 83540	208-843-7375	208-843-7378	krisrieb@nezperce.org
Connie Estep, CREHST Museum 95 Lee Blvd; Richland, WA 99352	509-943-9000	509-943-1770	cestep@crehst.org
Michele Gerber, MS B3-30 Flour Hanford Inc. P.O. Box 1000; Richland, WA 99352	509-376-1475	509-376-5704	michele_s_gerber@rl.gov
David Harvey, PNNL K6-75, P.O. Box 999, Richland, WA 99352	509-373-2945	509-376-2210	david.harvey@pnl.gov
Andy Johnson, Franklin Co. Historical Society 304 N. 4 th St.; Pasco, WA 99301			washarioanz@aol.com
Clifford Lawyer, Nez Perce P.O. Box 364, Lapwai, ID 83540			
Julie Longenecker, Hanford Operations Office-Umatilla Tribe 750 Swift Blvd., #12, Richland, WA 99352	509-946-1859	509-946-1954	JLONGENE@aol.com
Tom Marceau, Bechtel Hanford Inc. 3350 Geo. Wash. Way; Richland, WA 99352	509-372-9289	509-372-9654	temarcea@bhi-erc.com
Jay McConnaughey, Yakama Indian Nation 425 N. Columbia Center Blvd. I201 Kennewick, WA 99336	509-945-4797		wscutthroat@worldnett.att.net
Vera Morgan, Morgan Consulting Services 21364 Wanapum Village Lp.; Beverly, WA 99321	509-932-5420	509-932-5767	mcrs@bentonrea.com
Guy Moura, Hist./Arch. Confed. Tribes of Colville Res. P.O. Box 150; Nespelem, WA 99155	509-634-2695	509-634-2694	thpo@televar.com

David Rice, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Archaeologist P.O. Box 3755; Seattle, WA 98124	206-764-3654	206-764-4470	david.g.rice@usace.army.mil
Wade Riggsbee, Yakama Indian Nation 1216 W. Kennewick Ave.; Kennewick, WA 99336	509-582-6889	509-582-6889 please call prior	riggsbee@owt.com
Annabelle Rodriguez, U.S. DOE P.O. Box 550, MS-IN A5-58, 825 Jadwin, Richland, WA 99352	509-372-0277	509-376-0306	annabelle_1_rodrigues@rl.gov
Russell Jim, Manager, Yakama Indian Nation ERWM/Leah S. Aleck, 2808 Main St., Union Gap, WA 98901	509-452-2502	509452-2503	leah@yakama.com
Lenora Buck Seelatsee, Wanapum; Grant Co. PUD CR Dept.; P.O. Box 878; Ephrata, WA 98823	509-754-5088x3172 509-754-0500	509-766-2522	lseelat@gcpud.org
Kim Simmons 510 E. 3 rd , Kennewick, WA 99336	509-373-1265 W 509-586-4806 H		kim.simmons@verizon.net
Vera Sonneck/Rico Cruz, Cultural Resource program, Nez Perce Tribe, P.O. Box 365; Lapwai, ID 83540	208-843-7313	208-843-7419	veras@nezperce.org ricoc@nezperce.org
Darby Stapp, K6-75, Pacific NW Lab P.O. Box 999, Richland, WA 99352	509-373-2894	509-373-2958	Darby.stapp@pnl.gov
Dana C. Ward, DOE P.O. Box 550 Ms A2-15, 825 Jadwin, Richland, WA 99352	509-372-1261	509-376-4963	dana_c_ward@rl.gov
Rob Whitlam, State Historic Preservation Office	360-586-3080	360-586-3067	RobW@cted.wa.gov