



Archaeological Sites Analysis TWG Actions

**By Shane Capron
Chair, Technical Work Group**



Task

- **AMWG motion:**
 - **Request TWG review HEC-RAS model and flow lines associated with archaeological sites**
 - **Advise on how these flow lines may be used to make choices about monitoring/mitigation of sites**
- **TWG reviewed an initial analysis October 15-16, 2008**
- **After a lengthy discussion it was remanded to the CRAHG**
- **GCMRC revised the analysis to include error ranges around flow lines**



CRAHG Review

- CRAHG reviewed revised analysis January 6, 2009
- CRAHG generally agreed that although the analysis was useful in determining inundation, other factors such as current condition, information potential, and potential for future degradation should also be considered and this might be best accomplished through a geomorphological model.
- TWG reviewed the CRAHG recommendation in March 2009



TWG Recommendation

TWG motion was 12 to 1 to adopt the following motion:

The TWG recommends to the AMWG that the existing virtual shorelines generated by HEC-RAS model are good predictors of river stage and are reliable predictors of the inundation of archaeological site surfaces. However, river stage is not the only consideration employed for determining which archaeological sites need to be treated. Other proximate, secondary, and tertiary causes must be considered in determining archaeological site condition and the need for treatment. Additional modeling is necessary to evaluate which combination of variables has the most explanatory value in assessing current site condition. The current monitoring and treatment of archaeological sites should continue while the utility of alternative models (i.e. geomorphological) is investigated.