CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY OF THE 36TH STREET NORTH DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, TULSA, OKLAHOMA

TULSA COUNTY, OKLAHOMA

USPLSS: N ½ Section 19, T20N, R13E, Tulsa Co., Oklahoma.
UTM (NAD 83): NE Corner of APE, Z15, 4,010,664 N / 234,058 E
MAP: USGS 7.5' Tulsa, Okla. 1954 (1982)

Conducted for:

Kevin Howard, White Tundra Environmental, LLC
3501 South Yale, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74135
(918) 986 9780, (918) 346 4849
kevin@white-tundra.com

By:

Donald O. Henry, PhD, Consulting Archaeologist, LLC
2102 E. 25th Street., Tulsa, Oklahoma 74114
(918) 688 4466
donald-henry@utulsa.edu

BLM Cultural Resource Permit # 36-2920-15-Q

11 October 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary of Findings and Recommendations …….. Pg 3

Nature and Description of Project ……. Pg 3

Location of the Study Area……Pg 3

Archaeologists and Dates of Survey …… Pg 3

Prefield Investigation…… Pg 3

Literature Review …….. Pg 4

General Setting and Environmental Description ……. Pg 5

Field Methodology …… Pg 6

Cultural Resource Findings …….……... Pg 6

Recommendations…….. Pg 9

Figure 1: USGS Map of APE…… Pg 11

Figure 2: Google Earth Image of APE…… Pg 11

Figure 3: Digital Images of APE…… Pg 12

Figure 4: Map of Shovel Test Units in APE……Pg 13

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The prefield review did not identify a cultural resource within or near the area of potential effect (APE) and none is on record with the Oklahoma Archeological Survey or State Historic Preservation Office. The intensive, pedestrian field inspection identified: (a) five pre-1966 building foundations (archaeological sites 34TU205, 34TU206, 34TU207, 34TU208, 34TU209), (b) a pre-1966 building as a standing structure, and (c) several terrain features consisting of isolated, displaced concrete bases used for support of oil field equipment, graveled roadways, discontinuous tabular sandstone walls, and many modern trash dumps.

None of the cultural resource discoveries is considered eligible for nomination to listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Given the results of the study, there is a finding of no adverse effect on cultural resources by the proposed project and it is recommended that clearance be given for the project to proceed without additional investigation of cultural resources.

NATURE AND DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

An archaeological and cultural resource survey of an area (~126 acres) proposed for development (Figures 1 & 2) was conducted at the request of Kevin Howard, White Tundra Environmental, LLC.

The proposed construction activity will significantly disturb the surface and subsurface deposits along with any cultural resources contained therein. The study, addressing federal compliance requirements (National Historic Preservation Act and National Environmental Policy Act), involved an intensive pedestrian survey of the area, detailed descriptions of methodology and findings, evaluations of significance, and a cultural resource management recommendation for the APE.

.

LOCATIONS OF THE STUDY AREA

USPLSS, UTM COORDINATES & MAP

USPLSS: N ½ Section 19, T20N, R13E, Tulsa Co., Oklahoma.
UTM (NAD 83): NE Corner of APE, Z15, 4,010,664 N / 234,058 E
MAP: USGS 7.5’ Tulsa, Okla. 1954 (1982)

ARCHAEOLOGIST AND ASSISTANTS:	***DATE(S) OF SURVEY:***
Donald O. Henry, PhD	4-6 October 2016
Nancy A. Henry, MLS	
Veronica Mraz, MA, PhD (ABD)	

PREFIELD INVESTIGATION

No archaeological site is on record within or near the APE with the Oklahoma

Archeological Survey (email 19 September 2016). The list of NRHP properties on the SHPO website www.okhistory.org/shpo/nrhandbk.htm (accessed September 2016) did not show a listing in or near the study area. The nearest archaeological site or historic property includes a house location shown on the 1898 General Land Office map located ~0.25 W of the APE and two Late Prehistoric/ Proto-Historic sites (34TU103 & 34TU104) located along Dirty Butter Creek ~ 0.75 miles N of the APE (OAS file search; Dickerson et al 1991).

The review of historic maps of the study area included the 1898 General Land Office Map (http://www.glorecords.blm.gov/default.aspx), the 1915-1939 Sanborn Insurance Map of Tulsa (http://guides.tulsalibrary.org/content.php?pid=140063&sid=1196538), the 1901 and 1914 USGS topographic series (Claremore 250,000) and the 1954 USGS topographic series (Tulsa 24,000) from the National Map: Historic Topographic Map Collection (http:// nationalmap. gov/historical).

The Natural Resources Conservation Service soil survey map (www.ncrs.usda. gov.) of the area was also consulted in an effort to better understand landscape features and, through cross-referencing with the known regional archaeological succession, their ages.

LITERATURE AND RECORDS REVIEW

The relevant archaeological literature of the region indicates that the physiographic setting of the study area makes it a likely location for prehistoric occupations.

Bell, R.E. (Ed.)
1984 *The Prehistory of Oklahoma*. Academic Press, New York.

Diamond, J.
1998 Analysis of historical artifacts. In *Archaeological Laboratory Methods* (M. Sutton and B. Arkush, eds.), Kendall Hunt: Dubuque, Iowa.

Dickerson, K., Shingleton, K, Müller, K. and Henry, D.O.
1991 Tulsa/N Triangle: An Archaeological Survey of Northern Tulsa and Western Rogers Counties, Oklahoma. Submitted to the Oklahoma Historical Society, State Historic Preservation Office. University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Hall, J.
2009 *The Early Developmental History of Concrete Block in America.* Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana.

Henry, D.O.
1998 Late Holocene prehistory in the area of Tulsa, Oklahoma *Bulletin of the Oklahoma Anthropological Society*, Special Tulsa Centennial Issue, XLVII:67-81.
1979 Late Prehistoric occupations in northeastern Oklahoma. *Current Anthropology*, 20:1:236-237.
1979 (with S.A. Hall and B.S. Butler) The Late Prehistoric human ecology of Birch Creek Valley, northeastern Oklahoma. *Plains Anthropologist* 24:85:207-238, Lincoln.
1978 Big Hawk Shelter, northeastern Oklahoma: environmental, economic, and cultural changes. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 5:269-287, Boston.

Hoffman, Michael P., Nancy E. Myer, Dan Printup, and Clell L. Bond (Eds.)
1989 *From Clovis to the Comanchero: Archeological Overview of the Southern Great Plains*. Arkansas Archeological Survey Research Series, No. 35, Fayetteville.

Natural Resources Conservation Service website, http://soils.usda.gov/.

Snodgrass, K.
2008 *Early 20th-Century Building Materials: Siding and Roofing.* U.S. Forest Service (http://www.fs.fed.us/t-d/pubs/pdfpubs/pdf08732308/pdf08732308dpi72.pdf)

State Historic Preservation Office website, www.okhistory.org/shpo/nrhandbk.htm

Wyckoff, D. and R. Brooks
1983 *Oklahoma Archaeology: A 1981 Perspective of the State's Archaeological Resources, Their Significance, Their Problems and Some Proposed Solutions*. Archeological Resource Survey Report, Number 16. Oklahoma Archeological Survey, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma.

GENERAL SETTINGS AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESCRIPTIONS

The study area rests in the Arkansas River Valley and Ridges Major Land Resource Area (MLRA) of the Arkansas Valley Section of the Ouachita Province of the Interior Highlands. Pristine vegetation of the area was composed of woodland represented by hardwoods, junipers and sycamores (NCRS MLRA; http://apps.cei.psu.edu/mlra). Currently, the area consists of patchy secondary growth woodlands interspersed with open areas of mixed grasses and forbs. It forms part of an abandoned oil field resting within the urban development of the City of Tulsa and as such has experienced extensive landscape degradation (Figure 3).

Specifically, the APE is situated on the NW flank of a low, NE-SW trending ridge overlooking Dirty Butter Creek. The stream drains to the NE, joining Flat Rock Creek and ultimately Bird Creek as part of the Verdigris Basin drainage network. From a geomorphic perspective, the APE encompasses an alluvial setting along Dirty Butter Creek and a more extensive upland landscape along the low ridge. The APE's substrate includes sandstone and shale deposits of Pennsylvanian age. Chert is not locally available.

The surface sediments of the APE are dominated by Coweta-Bates sandy/gravelly loam that has formed on hillslopes from residuum weathered from sandstone and shale (http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx). This colluvial unit shallowly mantles bedrock. Although much less extensive, Radley Silt Loam (a lateral facies of Verdigris and Wynona silty loams) is associated with the 2nd terrace along Dirty Butter Creek and represents the most likely setting for holding prehistoric material in primary context. Inspection of cutbanks along the stream revealed blockish, uniform stratigraphy with occasional gravel lenses. Absence of the region-wide, well-dated Late Holocene, Copan Paleosol within the exposures suggests that the alluvial fill of the APE post-dates 1,000-1,100bp. This age estimate is also consistent with the Late Prehistoric/Proto-Historic dating of 34TU103 and 34TU104 found downstream along Dirty Butter Creek (OAS file search; Dickerson et al 1991) that are found within the Radley fill.

The setting of the APE within an old oil field and urban landscape has resulted in extensive areas of terrain disturbance. The NRCS soils map showing disturbed areas as Wynona Urban Land Complex, Coweta-Bates Urban Land Complex and Pits (mine spoil) were used in conjunctions with field and map observations of an old sand/gravel quarry and areas of major terrain modifications to identify disturbed portions of the APE (Figure 3).

FIELD METHODOLOGY

An on-foot survey was conducted over a three-day period under warm, partly cloudy conditions. The study area was identified in the field on the basis of a map and directions supplied by the client coupled with GPS coordinates (Garmin GPS map60CSx and 64), roads, prominent natural features, *Google Earth* imagery and a digitized USGS 7.5' quad sheet provided by iGage: All Topo Maps (Oklahoma R2).

The APE was sub-divided into seven study units (SU's, A-G) based on differences in terrain, vegetation cover and prominent landscape features in an order to facilitate on ground inspection (Figure 2). Each of the SU's was surveyed on-foot using both old and recently cut paths and cleared areas for access and surface inspection. Surface visibility within the APE was highly variable ranging from poor (<25%) to excellent (>75%) as a result of a mix of dense brushy areas, open fallow fields and recently cleared bare ground. In conjunction with the surface inspection, 50 shovel test units or STU's (35cm x 35cm x 20-35cm) were dug in undisturbed deposits across the APE for sub-surface inspection (Figure 4, Table 1). While the STU's were systematically distributed to achieve relatively even spatial coverage within the APE, a higher density (1 STU per acre) was dug in the alluvial setting along the stream (the most likely setting for prehistoric sites) than in the rest of the APE (i.e., 1 STU/2.9 acres). Matrix from the STU's was shovel sliced and hand kneaded, findings noted, stratigraphy and sediments documented, and locations (UTM coordinates) recorded. All the shovel test units were immediately back-filled.

CULTURAL RESOURCE FINDINGS

The prefield review found no evidence of a cultural resource and no cultural resource or historic property is on record within or near the APE with the Oklahoma Archeological Survey or State Historic Preservation Office. The field inspection identified: (a) five archaeological sites represented by the foundations of pre-1966 buildings, (b) a pre-1966 standing structure, and (c) four concrete bases or mountings for oil field equipment.

Archaeological Sites

Each of the five sites was located with GPS (UTM coordinates, NAD 83), photographed, mapped (EDM Bushnell 1500) and documented on an OAS site form. Each site was surface inspected and three STU's were dug around the perimeter of the foundation. Artifacts were examined and some were imaged, but none was collected. Through study of the plan, style and construction materials and artifacts associated with a foundation, an effort was made to determine: (a) the age of construction and occupation and (b) the nature of the occupation – industrial or domestic.

34TU205 (see Appendix A for detailed description)

The site consists of a rectangular (8 x 15m) foundation constructed with four courses of natural tabular sandstone overlain with a concrete slab. The N end of the structure is partially demolished. The floor of the building displays three elevated, concrete platforms of different sizes and configurations. Findings within the surface artifact scatter and three shovel tests produced clear plate glass fragments, various small metal pieces and asbestos (?) bushings. The area around the foundation has been dozed and a pile of displaced concrete supports is located 6m SW of the building.

The site location agrees with that shown for a building on the 1954 Tulsa quad sheet which is surrounded by three well sites. The building's location, internal machinery supports and artifacts (lacking domestic items) points to its use in industry for oil production and distribution.

34TU206 (see Appendix A for detailed description)

The site consists of a large rectangular (12 x 25m) foundation constructed with concrete and heavy timber and overlain with a concrete slab. Much of the foundation, especially E and S sides, have been destroyed. The S three-quarters of the building displays eight elevated, rectangular (1.5 x 3m) supports built of concrete. These are set in two rows with smaller rectangular supports positioned along the walls. A smaller, concrete walled enclosure is located at the N end of the structure at a lower level than the slab. The area around the foundation has been dozed and the three shovel tests all revealed disturbed sediments. The surface scatter of artifacts within and outside the foundation contained a high density of modern trash mixed in with historic material.

The 1954 Tulsa quad sheet shows a building at this location and time-sensitive artifacts and construction materials point to an early 20th century construction and occupation. The concrete contains very large crushed limestone aggregate, commonly associated with early 20th century buildings. In addition, fragments of *purpled glass* were noted in the artifact scatter, suggesting a date prior to 1916/17 (Diamond 1998:192). This is when selenium replaced manganese as a clarifier in glass production and eliminated the purpling of glass when exposed to sunlight. The early building may have already fallen into ruin by 1954 and thus was recorded as an unoccupied structure on the quad sheet. In any event, the building's location, internal machinery supports and artifacts (lacking domestic items) indicate its use in industry for oil production and distribution.

34TU207 (see Appendix A for detailed description)

The site consists of a rectangular (8 x 13m) foundation constructed with hollow concrete blocks and tabular sandstone. The concrete blocks were faced with a veneer of sandstone that had been sculpted in a scallop pattern and the tabular sandstone blocks were treated in the same way. The area around the building had been dozed and the shovel test units revealed disturbed deposits and were all negative in findings.

The site displayed various domestic artifacts (e.g., lavatory, washing machine, toy truck) which indicate that it served as a residence. Chronologically diagnostic artifacts and building materials point to the construction and occupation in the house beginning in the 1930's. Concrete block used in house construction peaked between 1900-1930 (Hall 2009). Also, the top panel of a Bendix washing machine matched the style common from 1937-1941 (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bendix_Corporation#Washing_machines). Oddly, there is no indication of a house site on the 1954 USGS quad sheet nor the 1982 photo revsion and the area is not shown (beyond the city limits) on the earlier 1916-1939 Sanborn Insurance Map.

34TU208 (see Appendix A for detailed description)

The site consists of two foundations: (a) a long rectangular (7.5 x 3.5m) one constructed of hollow concrete blocks enclosing a concrete slab floor and (b) a rectangular (5 x 10m) one built of poured concrete supporting a concrete slab floor located ~35m to the N. The northern feature displays concrete steps at the center of the S wall and red brick columns (likely porch supports) at the corners of the N wall. The area around the S feature and the area between the features has been dozed and trenched. The walls of the ~2m deep trench and some of the deeper dozed portions were inspected for sub-surface material – none was observed. The presence of melted asphalt shingles and glass suggests that the house, at some point, burned.

Time sensitive artifacts and building materials point to a construction date and early occupation of the house in the 1920-1930 time frame. Hollow concrete block (Hall 2009) asbestos siding (Snodgrass 2008), non-locking asphalt shingles (http://www.casma.ca/history-of-asphalt-shingles), and marked fire brick - Evens & Howard St Louis (https: //en.wikipedia. org/ wiki/Evens_%26_Howard_Fire_Brick_Co) are all consistent with the early 20th century age. The presence of domestic artifacts (e.g., fruit jars, ceramic tile, lavatory fragments) in the N feature is indicative of a residence, whereas the S feature was likely an outbuilding, perhaps a chicken house as the base of a poultry waterer was found in association. Moreover, a house site and outbuilding are shown at the location on the 1954 USGS quad sheet.

34TU209 (see Appendix A for detailed description)

The site consists of a rectangular poured concrete foundation (06.5 x 8m) with the S portion capped with a concrete slab. The W wall of this portion is also bowed out slightly from the rest of the building. The area around the building has been dozed and trenched. The walls of excavated areas were inspected and no artifact was observed. Similarly, the shovel test units were negative.

The building likely served as an oil field facility and its location is matches that of a building shown on the 1954 USGS quad sheet.

Pre-1966 Historic Property (see Appendix B)

The rectangular building (7.3 x 3m) is constructed of concrete blocks with a concrete slab floor and corrugated metal, shed roof supported by dimensional lumber and metal pipes. The building is divided into three rooms, the two western ones are open to the S and the eastern-most

entirely enclosed. The building appears to have served as an animal shed with the open portion used to house livestock and the enclosed room for tack and feed.

The building is not shown on the 1954 USGS quad sheet nor the 1982 photorevision, but it may appear on the 1977 Tulsa County, Soil Conservation Survey Sheet. The construction materials (hollow core block and corrugated metal roof), condition and maturity of vegetation in contact with the building suggest a pre-1966 age.

Isolated Landscape Features

Several isolated landscape features including the displaced mountings for oil field equipment, low discontinuous flagstone walls, and old graveled roadbeds were noted in the field inspection. Numerous areas that had served as trash dumps were observed, but all of these appeared to be of a relatively recent age.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The prefield review did not identify a cultural resource within or near the area of potential effect (APE) and none is on record with the Oklahoma Archeological Survey or State Historic Preservation Office.

The intensive, pedestrian field inspection identified: (a) five pre-1966 building foundations (archaeological sites 34TU205, 34TU206, 34TU207, 34TU208, 34TU209), (b) a pre-1966 building as a standing structure, and (c) several terrain features consisting of isolated, displaced concrete bases used for support of oil field equipment, graveled roadways, discontinuous tabular sandstone walls, and many modern trash dumps.

Evaluations

An evaluation of each of the sites/property relative to National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility considers criteria:

> *A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or*
>
> *B. That are associated with the lives of significant persons in or past; or*
>
> *C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or*
>
> *D. That have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.*

Archaeological Sites

Sites 34TU205, 34TU206, and 34TU209 are primarily represented by foundations that

were associated with buildings serving as oil field facilities active during the early 20th century and, as such, fall principally under NRHP criteria A, B and D. While each of these sites would have been tied to the *oil boom period* a significant, transformative event for the region that stretched from 1915-1930 (Gregory 2003; http://www.okhistory.org/ publications/enc), none of these sites is well preserved nor unique in construction or occurrence. Such facilities are common to the region and many are intact. Relative to Criterion D, from an archaeological perspective, additional investigation of each of the sites is unlikely to yield important information.

Sites 34TU207 and 34TU208 are represented by foundations associated with houses that appear to have been constructed and initially occupied within the 1920-1930 time-frame. In context, each of the sites is evaluated according to NRHP criteria B and D. Neither site appears to have been associated with the lives of significant historic persons as established by a search of the *Oklahoma Chronicles of Oklahoma* (http://digital.library.okstate.edu/Chronicles/) for the names found holding titles in the land records (https://lrmis.tulsacounty.org/) associated with each site. Relative to Criterion D, from an archaeological perspective, additional investigation of each of the sites is unlikely to yield important information.

Historic Property, Pre-1966 Standing Structure

The single standing structure found within the APE consists of an animal shed constructed of concrete blocks with a concrete slab floor and corrugated metal, shed roof supported by dimensional lumber and metal pipes. The building is of uncertain age, but its construction materials, condition, and the maturity of vegetation in contact with the building suggest a pre-1966 age. The building is not shown on the 1954 USGS quad sheet nor the 1982 photo-revision, but it may appear on the 1977 Tulsa County, Soil Conservation Survey Sheet. The property does not meet the NRHP criteria for eligibility.

Isolated Landscape Features

None of the isolated landscape features observed in the field inspection meet the NRHP criteria for eligibility.

Conclusion and Recommendation

None of the cultural resource finds is considered eligible for nomination to listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Given the results of the study, there is a finding of no adverse effect on cultural resources by the proposed project and it is recommended that clearance be given for the project to proceed without additional investigation of cultural resources.

Donald O. Henry 11 October 2016



Figure 1: Portion of USGS Tulsa, Okla showing the locations of the APE (shaded pink), archaeological sites (34TU205-209), SHPO standing structure, and prominent natural and cultural landscape features.



Figure 2: *Google Earth* image showing APE and areas of disturbed terrain (shaded grey).

Figure 3: Images of landscape features in APE; (A) Dirty Butter Creek channel in Study Unit B; (B) erosional zone in Study Unit D; (C) old quarry surface in Study Unit E; and (D) vehicle path in Study Unit C.



Figure 4: The distribution of shovel test units within the APE drawn from ExpertGPS 2015.

Table 1: Log of shovel test units (STU), UTM coordinates (NAD83), elevations, descriptions and findings.

STU	Date	Easting	Northing	Zone	Elevation	Description, Finding
1	Oct. 6, 20166	232892	4010368.9	15S	649	Dk Brn SCL, very compact, moderatre roots, wood frags., Negative.
2	Oct. 6, 2016	232858	4010386.15	15S	645	Lght Brn SL, moderate compaction, Negative.
3	Oct. 6, 2016	232809	4010379.57	15S	644	Med Brn SL, moderate compation, sub-angular SS, Negative.
4	Oct. 6, 2016	232735	4010363.11	15S	640	Lght to Med Brn SL, lots of organics, Sm sub-angular SS, Negative.
5	Oct. 6, 2016	232715	4010383.27	15S	637	0-5cm coal/shale layer, DK Brn SL, lots of roots, Negative.
6	Oct. 6, 2016	232775	4010404.92	15S	641	Med Brn w/Orange streaks, moderate compaction, Negative.
7	Oct. 6, 2016	232792	4010437.69	15S	639	DK Brn SL, no rocks, Negative.
8	Oct. 6, 2016	232791	4010542.78	15S	636	Lght Brn SL, Roots, Negative.
9	Oct. 6, 2016	232831	4010565.7	15S	643	Lght Brn SL, Sm SS sub-angular, Negative.
10	Oct. 6, 2016	232822	4010525.91	15S	645	Lght Brn SL, Sm SS sub-angular, Negative.
11	Oct. 6, 2016	232883	4010473.11	15S	645	Med. Brn SL, roots, Negative.
12	Oct. 6, 2016	232932	4010490.98	15S	645	DK Brn SL, angular SS, organics and roots, Negative.
13	Oct. 6, 2016	233354	4010693.5	15S	656	Med Brn SL, Roots, Wood Frags., Modern debris on surface, Negative.
14	Oct. 6, 2016	233310	4010773.32	15S	656	DK Brn SL, roots, Negative
15	Oct. 6, 2016	233337	4010817.01	15S	656	Lght Brn SL, Lots of roots, Negative.
16	Oct. 6, 2016	233242	4010602.28	15S	670	Lght Brn SL, angular SS, lots of roots, Negative.
17	Oct. 6, 2016	233229	4010685.79	15S	666	Lght Brn SL, at 20cm hit erosional gravel layer, Negative.
18	Oct. 6, 2016	233224	4010781.8	15S	658	Lght Brn SL, Lots of roots, Negative.
19	Oct. 6, 2016	233125	4010712.06	15S	652	Lght Brn SL, Lots of roots, bottom SS gravel, Negative.
20	Oct. 6, 2016	233110	4010715.54	15S	649	Mounting #4, Negative.
21	Oct. 6, 2016	233307	4010797.67	15S	656	Foundation #5, Negative 5
22	Oct. 6, 2016	233408	4010739.75	15S	649	Med Brn w/Orange streaks SL, roots, Negative.
23	Oct. 6, 2016	233556	4010758.01	15S	665	Med Brn SL, roots, glass shards 0-5cm .
24	Oct. 6, 2016	233521	4010723.9	15S	643	Med Brn SL, bottomed out on SS clasts, Negative.
25	Oct. 6, 2016	233083	4010297.83	15S	669	Med Brn SL, organics, Negative.
26	Oct. 6, 2016	233116	4010343.83	15S	665	Redish Brn SL, sandstone clasts, Negative.
27	Oct. 6, 2016	233368	4010503.87	15S	662	Lght Brn SL, lots of roots, organics, Negative.
28	Oct. 6, 2016	233396	4010547.41	15S	660	Lght Brn SL, Negative.
29	Oct. 6, 2016	233308	4010405.33	15S	662	Med Brn SL, SS bottom (15-20cm deep), Negative.
30	Oct. 6, 2016	233391	4010468.22	15S	651	Med Brn SL, small SS clasts, Negative.

SCL-Silty Clay Loam SL-Silty Loam SS-Sandstone Med-Medium DK-Dark Med-Medium DK-Dark Brn-Brown Sm-Small

Table 1: continued

STU	Date	Easting	Northing	Zone	Elevation	Description, Finding
1x	Oct. 4, 2016	232820	4010482	15S	596	Mounting #1, Negative.
2x	Oct. 4, 2016	233201	4010547	15S	643	Mounting #2, Foundation # 1, Plate Glass Frags. 0-5cm
3x	Oct. 4, 2016	233254	4010564	15S	643	Mounting #3, Negative.
4x	Oct. 4, 2016	233358	4010590	15S	661	Foundation #2, All disturbed, Negative.
5x	Oct. 4, 2016	233229	4010486	15S	665	Foundation # 4, Disturbed, Negative.
6x	Oct. 4, 2016	233136	4010454	15S	659	SHPO, Standing Structure, Barn, Plastic bits, Negative.
7x	Oct.4, 2016	233208	4010797	15S	651	Foundation #5, Negative.
8x	Oct.4, 2016	233089	4010563	15S	657	Lght Brn SL, Roots, Negative.
9x	Oct. 4, 2016	233167	4001602	15S	650	Lght Brn SL, Sm SS sub-angular, Negative.
10x	Oct. 4, 2016	233069	4010602	15S	697	DK Brn SL, angular SS, organics and roots, Negative..
11x	Oct. 5, 2016	233110	4010526	15S	660	Redish Brn SL, sandstone clasts, Negative.
12x	Oct. 5, 2016	233544	4010536	15S	659	Redish Brn SL, sandstone clasts, Negative.
13x	Oct. 5, 2016	233661	4010557	15S	684	Lght Brn SL, Sm SS sub-angular, Negative.
14x	Oct. 5, 2016	233624	4010648	15S	669	Lght Brn SL, Sm SS sub-angular, Negative.
15x	Oct. 5, 2016	233668	4010663	15S	661	Lght Brn SL, Negative.
16x	Oct. 5, 2016	233811	4010712	15S	653	ght Brn SL, Negative.
17x	Oct. 5, 2016	233875	4010832	15S	671	Lght Brn SL, Lots of roots, Negative.
18x	Oct. 5, 2016	233944	4010840	15S	670	ght Brn SL, Negative.
19x	Oct. 5, 2016	234013	4010744	15S	658	Lght Brn SL, Sm SS sub-angular, Negative.
20x	Oct. 5, 2016	233913	4010729	15S	659	Mounting #4, Negative.

SCL-Silty Clay Loam SL-Silty Loam SS-Sandstone Med-Medium DK-Dark Med-Medium DK-Dark Brn-Brown Sm-Small

X – GPS #2

APPENDIX A

OKLAHOMA ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE SURVEY FORM

Site **34TU206**
County **Tulsa**

COMPLETE ALL SECTIONS

1. **SITE NUMBER AND NAME**

Site Name NA (derived from owner's name, etc.)
Project No. **Site #2** (Temporary number or name assigned during project)

2. **LOCATIONAL INFORMATION** *For Office Use*

U.T.M. Reference

Zone	*Northing*	*Easting*	
15	**4 010 590**	**233 358**	**NAD83**

Legal Description
SW1/4, NW1/4, NE1/4 Section 19, T20N/R13E, Tulsa County, Oklahoma

U.S.G.S. Quad Name **Tulsa, Okla.**
Quad Date (revised) **1954 (1982)**

Other Locational References (i.e., benchmarks, road intersections, bridges, etc.; please give distance and bearing to site)

3. **OWNER(S) OF PROPERTY**

NA

Street and Number
NA
City, Town **State**
NA

4. **SITE SURVEYED BY:**

Name
D.O. Henry

Date Recorded

10/5/16

REPORTED BY:
(if different)
Name

Time spent at site and time of day
1 hour morning

5. **CULTURAL AFFILIATION**
Cultural Periods

_____**Unassigned Prehistoric**

___ **Paleoindian** ___**Early** ___**Middle** ___**Late**

___ **Archaic** ___**Early** ___**Middle** ___**Late**

___ **Woodland** ___**Eastern** __**Plains**

___ **Village Farming/Mississippi** ___**Plains Village**

___ **Protohistoric/Historic Indian X_Historic non-Ind. X**

Archaeological Cultures, Phases, etc. represented:

_____

How was cultural affiliation determined? (diagnostic artifacts, radiocarbon dates, etc.)
Land records

6. HISTORIC PHASE IDENTIFICATION (ETHNIC) NA

1. Choctaw	*11. Pawnee*	*21. Creek*
2. Cherokee	*12. Arapaho*	*22. Dakotas*
3. Sauk-Fox	*13. Ottawa*	*23. Chickasaw*
4. Pottowatomie	*14. Wichita*	*24. 12 & 17*
5. Seminole	*15. Quapaw*	*25. Missouri-Oto*
6. Comanche	*16. Osage*	*26. Iowa*
7. Apache	*17. Cheyenne*	*27. Anglo-American*
8. Kiowa	*18. Caddo*	*28. French*
9. Kiowa-Apache	*19. Shawnee*	*29. Spanish*
10. Kickapoo	*20. Delaware*	*30. Other*

How was historic identification determined?

Land records

7. HISTORIC SITE RANGE 5

0. Missing data;	*5. 1890-1929*
1. pre-1800	~~6. 1930-1950~~
2. 1800-1830	7. 1800-1900
3. 1830-1859	8. 1800-present
4. 1869-1889	9. 1900-present

8. INFERRED SITE TYPE (can be more than one category)

___ open habitation w/o mounds	___ petroglyph-pictograph
___ open habitation w/ mounds	___ isolated burials (<2)
___ earth mound	___ cemetery (>2)
___ mound complex	___ specialized activity
___ stone mounds/rock piles	___ rock alignments
___ burned rock concentrations	___ historic farmstead
___ non-mound earthworks	X historic
___ rockshelter	___ historic fort
___ cave	___ dugout
___ quarry/workshop	___ historic trash dump

9. MIDDEN AT SITE
NA

___ don't know	___ present, earth
___ absent	___ present, shell
	___ present, rock

10. MATERIALS COLLECTED None

Type	Number
Ceramics & glass	
ground stone	
scrapers (unhaft	
hafted scrapers	
projectile points	
base fragments	
drills	
bifaces/biface	
unifaces	
perforators/	
gravers	

spokeshaves _____
debitage _____
worked bone/shell_____
other prehistoric_____
faunal remains _____
floral remains _____
human bone _____

---

11. ARTIFACT REPOSITORY
Name of institution where artifacts are to be stored.

Photos Yes
_ black and white _____ no. of pictures
_ X color ___4 no. of pictures
Name and address of institution where photos are filed:
D.O. Henry, Dept Anthropology, U of Tulsa

12. EVIDENCE OF RECENT VANDALISM OBSERVED: X no ___

13. SITE CONDITION: 3

1. apparently undisturbed
2. < 25% disturbed
3. 26-50% disturbed
4. 51-75% disturbed
5. 76-99% disturbed
6. totally destroyed
7. disturbed, % unknown

14. MAJOR LAND USE:

__ cultivated field ___ modern cemetery ___ commercial

__pasture ___ mining ___ military

X woods, forest ___ inundated _____ logging/fire break

___ road/trail __X_ industrial X scrub/secondary growth/old field

___ ditch/dike/borrow pit ___ residential ___ modern dump

___ landfill ___ recreation

Other: _____

15. AMOUNT OF GROUND SURFACE VISIBLE: 5
1. <10%
2. 11-25%
3. 26-50%
4. 51-75%
5. 76-90%
6. 91-100%

Survey Conditions (variable)

16. PHYSIOGRAPHIC DIVISION: 6
1. High Plains
2. Gypsum Hills
3. Wichita Mtns.
4. Red Bed Plains
5. Arbuckle Mtns.
6. Sandstone Hills
7. Prairie Plains
8. Ozark Plateau
9. Ouachita Mtns.
10. Red River Plains

17. LANDFORM TYPE: 3
1. Floodplain **4. Dissected Uplands**
2. Terrace ***5.* Undissected Uplands**
3. Hillside-Valley Wall

18. LOCALITY TYPE (specific site setting):1
1. Level **5. Mesa**
2. Knoll-Low Land **6. Slope**
3. Blowout **7. Bluff Crest**
4. Ridge-Upland **8. Bluff Base**

19.SOILS (if known)
Coweta-Bates Series Type

20. 201m/661ft Elevation (msl);0-10 Slope (deg); N_ Slope Dir facing

21. NATURAL VEGETATION: 8
1. short grasses **6. Mesquite**
2. mixed grasses **7. Juniper-Pinon**
3. tall grasses **8. Oak-Hickory Forest**
4. Cross-Timber **9. Oak-Pine**
5. Shin-Oak **10. Loblolly Pine Forest**

22. SITE AREA: ~150 (square meters)
Basis for area estimate:
1. Taped 3. Guessed **5. Alidade/Transit**
2. Paced 4. Range-Finder

Confident of site boundaries? X yes
23. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE:

Give a physical description of the site and its setting, including dimensions, features, nature of the materials and artifact concentrations. Include a copy of a U.S.G.S. topographic map with the site's location and boundaries marked.

The site consists of a large rectangular (12 x 25m) foundation constructed with concrete and heavy timber and overlain with a concrete slab. Much of the foundation, especially E and S sides, have been destroyed. The S three-quarters of the building displays eight elevated, rectangular (1.5 x 3m) supports built of concrete. These are set in two rows with smaller rectangular supports positioned along the walls. A smaller, concrete walled enclosure is located at the N end of the structure at a lower level than the slab. The area around the foundation has been dozed and the three shovel tests all revealed disturbed sediments. The surface scatter of artifacts within and outside the foundation contained a high density of modern trash mixed in with historic material.

The 1954 Tulsa quad sheet shows a building at this location and time-sensitive artifacts and construction materials point to an early 20th century construction and occupation. The concrete contains very large crushed limestone aggregate, commonly associated with early 20th century buildings. In addition, fragments of *purpled glass* were noted in the artifact scatter, suggesting a date prior to 1916/17 (Diamond 1998:192). This is when selenium replaced manganese as a clarifier in glass production and eliminated the purpling of glass when exposed to sunlight. The early building may have already fallen into ruin by 1954 and thus was recorded as an unoccupied structure on the quad sheet. In any event, the building's location, internal machinery supports and artifacts (lacking domestic items) point to its use in industry for oil production and distribution.

24. DRAINAGE: 17

1. Arkansas	7. Illinois	13. Poteau
2. Beaver-N Canadian	8. Kiamichi	14. Red
3. Canadian	9. Little River	15. Salt Fork
4. Caney	10. Muddy Boggy	16. Salt Fork Red
5. Cimarron	11. Neosho	17. Verdigris
6. Deep Fork	12. N. Fork Red	18. Washita

25. NEAREST NATURAL SOURCE OF WATER: 2

1. Permanent stream/creek
2. Intermittent stream
3. Permanent stream
4. Intermittent spring/seep/bog
5. Natural lake
6. River
7. Slough or oxbow lake
8. Relic stream channel (if observable)
9. Wells, if site is historic

26. DISTANCE TO WATER (in 10's of meters)**:60**

27. INVESTIGATION TYPE: 2

1. Reconnaissance (survey)
2. Intensive (survey & testing)
3. Excavated
4. Volunteered report

28. SIGNIFICANCE STATUS: Inventory site

___ National Register property
___ Eligible for National Register
___ Nominated to National Register by S.H.P.O.
___ Considered eligible but not nominated by S.H.P.O.
__X Inventory site
___ National Register status not assessed

29. DISCUSS THE POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SITE:

Sites 34TU205, 34TU206, and 34TU209 are primarily represented by foundations that were associated with buildings serving as oil field facilities active during the early 20th century and, as such, fall principally under NRHP criteria A, B and D. While each of these sites would have been tied to the *oil boom period* a significant, transformative event for the region that stretched from 1915-1930 (Gregory 2003; http://www.okhistory.org/ publications/enc), none of these sites is well preserved nor unique in construction or occurrence. Such facilities are common to the region and many are intact. Relative to Criterion D, from an archaeological perspective, additional investigation of each of the sites is unlikely to yield important information.

30. PUBLISHED OR FORTHCOMING REPORTS ON THE SITE:

Donald O. Henry (2016) *Cultural Resource Survey of the 36th Street North Development Project, Tulsa, Oklahoma.* Submitted to Kevin Howard, White Tundra Environmental, LLC, 3501 South Yale, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74135. (918) 986 9780, (918) 346 4849.



USGS 7.5' Tulsa, Okla. Showing location of Site 34TU207

.



Site plan of 34TU206

Looking N across 34TU207.

Looking E across 34TU207

OKLAHOMA ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE SURVEY FORM

Site **34TU208**
County **Tulsa**

COMPLETE ALL SECTIONS

1. **SITE NUMBER AND NAME**

Site Name NA (derived from owner's name, etc.)
Project No. **Site #4** (Temporary number or name assigned during project)

2. **LOCATIONAL INFORMATION** *For Office Use*

U.T.M. Reference

Zone	*Northing*	*Easting*	
15	**4 010 797**	**233 208**	**NAD83**

Legal Description
SE1/4, NE1/4, NW1/4 Section 19, T20N/R13E, Tulsa County, Oklahoma

U.S.G.S. Quad Name **Tulsa, Okla.**
Quad Date (revised) **1954 (1982)**

Other Locational References (i.e., benchmarks, road intersections, bridges, etc.; please give distance and bearing to site)

3. **OWNER(S) OF PROPERTY**

NA

Street and Number
NA
City, Town **State**
NA

4. **SITE SURVEYED BY:**

Name
D.O. Henry

Date Recorded

10/6/16

REPORTED BY:
(if different)
Name

Time spent at site and time of day
2 hour afternoon

5. **CULTURAL AFFILIATION**
Cultural Periods

_____**Unassigned Prehistoric**

___ **Paleoindian** ___**Early** ___**Middle** ___**Late**

___ **Archaic** ___**Early** ___**Middle** ___**Late**

___ **Woodland** ___**Eastern** __**Plains**

___ **Village Farming/Mississippi** ___**Plains Village**

___ **Protohistoric/Historic Indian X_Historic non-Ind. X**

Archaeological Cultures, Phases, etc. represented:

_____

How was cultural affiliation determined? (diagnostic artifacts, radiocarbon dates, etc.)
Land records

6. HISTORIC PHASE IDENTIFICATION (ETHNIC) NA

1. Choctaw	*11. Pawnee*	*21. Creek*
2. Cherokee	*12. Arapaho*	*22. Dakotas*
3. Sauk-Fox	*13. Ottawa*	*23. Chickasaw*
4. Pottowatomie	*14. Wichita*	*24. 12 & 17*
5. Seminole	*15. Quapaw*	*25. Missouri-Oto*
6. Comanche	*16. Osage*	*26. Iowa*
7. Apache	*17. Cheyenne*	*27. Anglo-American*
8. Kiowa	*18. Caddo*	*28. French*
9. Kiowa-Apache	*19. Shawnee*	*29. Spanish*
10. Kickapoo	*20. Delaware*	*30. Other*

How was historic identification determined?

Land records

7. HISTORIC SITE RANGE 5/6

0. Missing data;	5. 1890-1929
1. pre-1800	6. 1930-1950
2. 1800-1830	7. 1800-1900
3. 1830-1859	8. 1800-present
4. 1869-1889	9. 1900-present

8. INFERRED SITE TYPE (can be more than one category)

___ open habitation w/o mounds	___ petroglyph-pictograph
___ open habitation w/ mounds	___ isolated burials (<2)
___ earth mound	___ cemetery (>2)
___ mound complex	___ specialized activity
___ stone mounds/rock piles	___ rock alignments
___ burned rock concentrations	___ historic farmstead
___ non-mound earthworks	X historic
___ rockshelter	___ historic fort
___ cave	___ dugout
___ quarry/workshop	___ historic trash dump

9. MIDDEN AT SITE

NA

___ don't know	___ present, earth
___ absent	___ present, shell
	___ present, rock

10. MATERIALS COLLECTED None

Type	Number
Ceramics & glass	
ground stone	
scrapers (unhaft	
hafted scrapers	
projectile points	
base fragments	
drills	
bifaces/biface	
unifaces	
perforators/	
gravers	

spokeshaves _____
debitage _____
worked bone/shell_____
other prehistoric_____
faunal remains _____
floral remains _____
human bone _____

---

11. ARTIFACT REPOSITORY
Name of institution where artifacts are to be stored.

Photos Yes
_ black and white _____ no. of pictures
_ X color ___4 no. of pictures
Name and address of institution where photos are filed:
D.O. Henry, Dept Anthropology, U of Tulsa

12. EVIDENCE OF RECENT VANDALISM OBSERVED: X no ___

13. SITE CONDITION: 3

1. apparently undisturbed
2. < 25% disturbed
3. 26-50% disturbed
4. 51-75% disturbed
5. 76-99% disturbed
6. totally destroyed
7. disturbed, % unknown

14. MAJOR LAND USE:

__ cultivated field ___ modern cemetery ___ commercial

__pasture ___ mining ___ military

X woods, forest ___ inundated _____ logging/fire break

___ road/trail __X_ industrial X scrub/secondary growth/old field

___ ditch/dike/borrow pit ___ residential ___ modern dump

___ landfill ___ recreation

Other: _____

15. AMOUNT OF GROUND SURFACE VISIBLE: 5
1. <10%
2. 11-25%
3. 26-50%
4. 51-75%
5. 76-90%
6. 91-100%

Survey Conditions (variable)

16. PHYSIOGRAPHIC DIVISION: 6
1. High Plains
2. Gypsum Hills
3. Wichita Mtns.
4. Red Bed Plains
5. Arbuckle Mtns.
6. Sandstone Hills
7. Prairie Plains
8. Ozark Plateau
9. Ouachita Mtns.
10. Red River Plains

17. LANDFORM TYPE: 3
1. Floodplain **4. Dissected Uplands**
2. Terrace ***5.* Undissected Uplands**
3. Hillside-Valley Wall

18. LOCALITY TYPE (specific site setting):4
1. Level **5. Mesa**
2. Knoll-Low Land **6. Slope**
3. Blowout **7. Bluff Crest**
4. Ridge-Upland **8. Bluff Base**

19.SOILS (if known)
Coweta-Bates Series Type

20. 273m/651ft Elevation (msl);0-10 Slope (deg); N_ Slope Dir facing

21. NATURAL VEGETATION: 8
1. short grasses **6. Mesquite**
2. mixed grasses **7. Juniper-Pinon**
3. tall grasses **8. Oak-Hickory Forest**
4. Cross-Timber **9. Oak-Pine**
5. Shin-Oak **10. Loblolly Pine Forest**

22. SITE AREA: ~350 (square meters)
Basis for area estimate:
1. Taped 3. Guessed **5. Alidade/Transit**
2. Paced 4. Range-Finder

Confident of site boundaries? X yes
23. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE:

Give a physical description of the site and its setting, including dimensions, features, nature of the materials and artifact concentrations. Include a copy of a U.S.G.S. topographic map with the site's location and boundaries marked.

The site consists of two foundations: (a) a long rectangular (7.5 x 3.5m) one constructed of hollow concrete blocks enclosing a concrete slab floor and (b) a rectangular (5 x 10m) one built of poured concrete supporting a concrete slab floor located ~35m to the N. The northern feature displays concrete steps at the center of the S wall and red brick columns (likely porch supports) at the corners of the N wall. The area around the S feature and the area between the features has been dozed and trenched. The walls of the ~2m deep trench and some of the deeper dozed portions were inspected for sub-surface material – none was observed. The presence of melted asphalt shingles and glass suggests that the house, at some point, burned.

Time sensitive artifacts and building materials point to a construction date and early occupation of the house in the 1920-1930 time frame. Hollow concrete block (Hall 2009) asbestos siding (Snodgrass 2008), non-locking asphalt shingles (http://www.casma.ca/history-of-asphalt-shingles), and marked fire brick - Evens & Howard St Louis (https: //en.wikipedia. org/ wiki/Evens_%26_Howard_Fire_Brick_Co) are all consistent with the early 20th century age. The presence of domestic artifacts (e.g., fruit jars, ceramic tile, lavatory fragments) in the N feature is indicative of a residence, whereas the S feature was likely an outbuilding, perhaps a chicken house as the base of a poultry waterer was found in association. Moreover, a house site and outbuilding are shown at the location on the 1954 USGS quad sheet.

24. DRAINAGE: 17

1. Arkansas	**7. Illinois**	**13. Poteau**
2. Beaver-N Canadian	**8. Kiamichi**	**14. Red**
3. Canadian	**9. Little River**	**15. Salt Fork**
4. Caney	**10. Muddy Boggy**	**16. Salt Fork Red**
5. Cimarron	**11. Neosho**	**17. Verdigris**
6. Deep Fork	**12. N. Fork Red**	**18. Washita**

25. NEAREST NATURAL SOURCE OF WATER: 2

1. Permanent stream/creek	**6. River**
2. Intermittent stream	**7. Slough or oxbow lake**
3. Permanent stream	**8. Relic stream channel**
4. Intermittent spring/seep/bog	**(if observable)**
5. Natural lake	**9. Wells, if site is historic**

26. DISTANCE TO WATER (in 10's of meters):160

27. INVESTIGATION TYPE: 2

1. Reconnaissance (survey)	**3. Excavated**
2. Intensive (survey & testing)	**4. Volunteered report**

28. SIGNIFICANCE STATUS: Inventory site

___ National Register property
___ Eligible for National Register
___ Nominated to National Register by S.H.P.O.
___ Considered eligible but not nominated by S.H.P.O.
__X Inventory site
___ National Register status not assessed

29. DISCUSS THE POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SITE:

Sites 34TU207 and 34TU208 are represented by foundations associated with houses that appear to have been constructed and initially occupied within the 1920-1930 time-frame. In context, each of the sites is evaluated according to NRHP criteria B and D. Neither site appears to have been associated with the lives of significant historic persons as established by a search of the *Oklahoma Chronicles of Oklahoma* (http://digital.library.okstate.edu/Chronicles/) for the names holding the titles in the land records (https://lrmis.tulsacounty.org/) associated with each site. Relative to Criterion D, from an archaeological perspective, additional investigation of each of the sites is unlikely to yield important information.

30. PUBLISHED OR FORTHCOMING REPORTS ON THE SITE:

Donald O. Henry (2016) *Cultural Resource Survey of the 36th Street North Development Project, Tulsa, Oklahoma.* Submitted to Kevin Howard, White Tundra Environmental, LLC, 3501 South Yale, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74135. (918) 986 9780, (918) 346 4849.



USGS 7.5’ Tulsa, Okla. Showing location of Site 34TU208

.



Site plan of 34TU208

Looking S across southern feature of site 34TU208.

Looking NW across across northern feature of site 34TU208

OKLAHOMA ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE SURVEY FORM

Site **34TU207**
County **Tulsa**

COMPLETE ALL SECTIONS

1. **SITE NUMBER AND NAME**

Site Name NA (derived from owner's name, etc.)
Project No. **Site #3** (Temporary number or name assigned during project)

2. **LOCATIONAL INFORMATION** *For Office Use*

U.T.M. Reference

Zone	*Northing*	*Easting*	
15	**4 010 486**	**233 229**	**NAD83**

Legal Description
SE1/4, NE1/4, NW1/4 Section 19, T20N/R13E, Tulsa County, Oklahoma

U.S.G.S. Quad Name **Tulsa, Okla.**
Quad Date (revised) **1954 (1982)**

Other Locational References (i.e., benchmarks, road intersections, bridges, etc.; please give distance and bearing to site)

3. **OWNER(S) OF PROPERTY**

NA

Street and Number
NA
City, Town **State**
NA

4. **SITE SURVEYED BY:**

Name
D.O. Henry

Date Recorded

10/5/16

REPORTED BY:
(if different)
Name

Time spent at site and time of day
1 hour afternoon

5. **CULTURAL AFFILIATION**
Cultural Periods

_____**Unassigned Prehistoric**

___ **Paleoindian** ___**Early** ___**Middle** ___**Late**

___ **Archaic** ___**Early** ___**Middle** ___**Late**

___ **Woodland** ___**Eastern** __**Plains**

___ **Village Farming/Mississippi** ___**Plains Village**

___ **Protohistoric/Historic Indian X_Historic non-Ind. X**

Archaeological Cultures, Phases, etc. represented:

_____

How was cultural affiliation determined? (diagnostic artifacts, radiocarbon dates, etc.)
Land records

6. HISTORIC PHASE IDENTIFICATION (ETHNIC) NA

1. Choctaw	*11. Pawnee*	*21. Creek*
2. Cherokee	*12. Arapaho*	*22. Dakotas*
3. Sauk-Fox	*13. Ottawa*	*23. Chickasaw*
4. Pottowatomie	*14. Wichita*	*24. 12 & 17*
5. Seminole	*15. Quapaw*	*25. Missouri-Oto*
6. Comanche	*16. Osage*	*26. Iowa*
7. Apache	*17. Cheyenne*	*27. Anglo-American*
8. Kiowa	*18. Caddo*	*28. French*
9. Kiowa-Apache	*19. Shawnee*	*29. Spanish*
10. Kickapoo	*20. Delaware*	*30. Other*

How was historic identification determined?

Land records

7. HISTORIC SITE RANGE 5

0. Missing data;	*5. 1890-1929*
1. pre-1800	~~6. 1930-1950~~
2. 1800-1830	7. 1800-1900
3. 1830-1859	8. 1800-present
4. 1869-1889	9. 1900-present

8. INFERRED SITE TYPE (can be more than one category)

___ open habitation w/o mounds	___ petroglyph-pictograph
___ open habitation w/ mounds	___ isolated burials (<2)
___ earth mound	___ cemetery (>2)
___ mound complex	___ specialized activity
___ stone mounds/rock piles	___ rock alignments
___ burned rock concentrations	___ historic farmstead
___ non-mound earthworks	X historic
___ rockshelter	___ historic fort
___ cave	___ dugout
___ quarry/workshop	___ historic trash dump

9. MIDDEN AT SITE
NA

___ don't know	___ present, earth
___ absent	___ present, shell
	___ present, rock

10. MATERIALS COLLECTED None

Type	Number
Ceramics & glass	
ground stone	
scrapers (unhaft	
hafted scrapers	
projectile points	
base fragments	
drills	
bifaces/biface	
unifaces	
perforators/	
gravers	

spokeshaves _____
debitage _____
worked bone/shell_____
other prehistoric_____
faunal remains _____
floral remains _____
human bone _____

---

11. ARTIFACT REPOSITORY
Name of institution where artifacts are to be stored.

Photos Yes
_ black and white _____ no. of pictures
_ X color ___4 no. of pictures
Name and address of institution where photos are filed:
D.O. Henry, Dept Anthropology, U of Tulsa

12. EVIDENCE OF RECENT VANDALISM OBSERVED: X no ___

13. SITE CONDITION: 3

1. apparently undisturbed
2. < 25% disturbed
3. 26-50% disturbed
4. 51-75% disturbed
5. 76-99% disturbed
6. totally destroyed
7. disturbed, % unknown

14. MAJOR LAND USE:

__ cultivated field ___ modern cemetery ___ commercial

__pasture ___ mining ___ military

X woods, forest ___ inundated _____ logging/fire break

___ road/trail __X_ industrial X scrub/secondary growth/old field

___ ditch/dike/borrow pit ___ residential ___ modern dump

___ landfill ___ recreation

Other: _____

15. AMOUNT OF GROUND SURFACE VISIBLE: 5
1. <10%
2. 11-25%
3. 26-50%
4. 51-75%
5. 76-90%
6. 91-100%

Survey Conditions (variable)

16. PHYSIOGRAPHIC DIVISION: 6
1. High Plains
2. Gypsum Hills
3. Wichita Mtns.
4. Red Bed Plains
5. Arbuckle Mtns.
6. Sandstone Hills
7. Prairie Plains
8. Ozark Plateau
9. Ouachita Mtns.
10. Red River Plains

17. LANDFORM TYPE: 3
1. Floodplain **4. Dissected Uplands**
2. Terrace **5. Undissected Uplands**
3. Hillside-Valley Wall

18. LOCALITY TYPE (specific site setting):1
1. Level **5. Mesa**
2. Knoll-Low Land **6. Slope**
3. Blowout **7. Bluff Crest**
4. Ridge-Upland **8. Bluff Base**

19.SOILS (if known)
Coweta-Bates Series Type

20. 203m/665ft Elevation (msl);0-10 Slope (deg); N_ Slope Dir facing

21. NATURAL VEGETATION: 8
1. short grasses **6. Mesquite**
2. mixed grasses **7. Juniper-Pinon**
3. tall grasses **8. Oak-Hickory Forest**
4. Cross-Timber **9. Oak-Pine**
5. Shin-Oak **10. Loblolly Pine Forest**

22. SITE AREA: ~150 (square meters)
Basis for area estimate:
1. Taped 3. Guessed 5. Alidade/Transit
2. Paced 4. Range-Finder

Confident of site boundaries? X yes
23. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE:

Give a physical description of the site and its setting, including dimensions, features, nature of the materials and artifact concentrations. Include a copy of a U.S.G.S. topographic map with the site's location and boundaries marked.

The site consists of a rectangular (8 x 13m) foundation constructed with hollow concrete blocks and tabular sandstone. The concrete blocks were faced with a veneer of sandstone that had been sculpted in a scallop pattern and the tabular sandstone blocks were treated in the same way. The area around the building had been dozed and the shovel test units revealed disturbed deposits and were all negative in findings.

The site displayed various domestic artifacts (e.g., lavatory, washing machine, toy truck) which indicate that it served as a residence. Chronologically diagnostic artifacts and building materials point to the construction and occupation in the house beginning in the 1930's. Concrete block used in house construction peaked between 1900-1930 (Hall 2009). Also, the top panel of a Bendix washing machine matched the style common from 1937-1941 (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bendix_Corporation#Washing_machines). Oddly, there is no indication of a house site on the 1954 USGS quad sheet nor the 1982 photo revision and the area is not shown (beyond the city limits) on the earlier 1916-1939 Sanborn Insurance Map.

24. DRAINAGE: 17

1. Arkansas	7. Illinois	13. Poteau
2. Beaver-N Canadian	8. Kiamichi	14. Red
3. Canadian	9. Little River	15. Salt Fork
4. Caney	10. Muddy Boggy	16. Salt Fork Red
5. Cimarron	11. Neosho	17. Verdigris
6. Deep Fork	12. N. Fork Red	18. Washita

25. NEAREST NATURAL SOURCE OF WATER: 2

1. Permanent stream/creek
2. Intermittent stream
3. Permanent stream
4. Intermittent spring/seep/bog
5. Natural lake
6. River
7. Slough or oxbow lake
8. Relic stream channel (if observable)
9. Wells, if site is historic

26. DISTANCE TO WATER (in 10's of meters):110

27. INVESTIGATION TYPE: 2

1. Reconnaissance (survey)
2. Intensive (survey & testing)
3. Excavated
4. Volunteered report

28. SIGNIFICANCE STATUS: Inventory site

___ National Register property
___ Eligible for National Register
___ Nominated to National Register by S.H.P.O.
___ Considered eligible but not nominated by S.H.P.O.
__X Inventory site
___ National Register status not assessed

29. DISCUSS THE POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SITE:

Sites 34TU207 and 34TU208 are represented by foundations associated with houses that appear to have been constructed and initially occupied within the 1920-1930 time-frame. In context, each of the sites is evaluated according to NRHP criteria B and D. Neither site appears to have been associated with the lives of significant historic persons as established by a search of the *Oklahoma Chronicles of Oklahoma* http://digital.library.okstate.edu/Chronicles/) for the names found holding titles in the land records (https://lrmis.tulsacounty.org/) associated with each site. Relative to Criterion D, from an archaeological perspective, additional investigation of each of the sites is unlikely to yield important information.

30. PUBLISHED OR FORTHCOMING REPORTS ON THE SITE:

Donald O. Henry (2016) *Cultural Resource Survey of the 36th Street North Development Project, Tulsa, Oklahoma.* Submitted to Kevin Howard, White Tundra Environmental, LLC, 3501 South Yale, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74135. (918) 986 9780, (918) 346 4849.



USGS 7.5' Tulsa, Okla. Showing location of Site 34TU207

.



Site plan of 34TU207

Looking E across 34TU207.

Looking W across 34TU207

OKLAHOMA ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE SURVEY FORM

Site **34TU205**
County **Tulsa**

COMPLETE ALL SECTIONS

1. **SITE NUMBER AND NAME**

Site Name NA (derived from owner's name, etc.)
Project No. **Site #1** (Temporary number or name assigned during project)

2. **LOCATIONAL INFORMATION** *For Office Use*

U.T.M. Reference

Zone	*Northing*	*Easting*	
15	**4 010 547**	**233 201**	**NAD83**

Legal Description
SE1/4, NE1/4, SW1/4 Section 19, T20N/R13E, Tulsa County, Oklahoma

U.S.G.S. Quad Name **Tulsa, Okla.**
Quad Date (revised) **1954 (1982)**

Other Locational References (i.e., benchmarks, road intersections, bridges, etc.; please give distance and bearing to site)

3. OWNER(S) OF PROPERTY

NA

Street and Number
NA
City, Town **State**
NA

4. SITE SURVEYED BY:

Name
D.O. Henry

Date Recorded

10/5/16

REPORTED BY:
(if different)
Name

Time spent at site and time of day
1 hour morning

5. CULTURAL AFFILIATION
Cultural Periods

_____**Unassigned Prehistoric**

___ **Paleoindian** ___**Early** ___**Middle** ___**Late**

___ **Archaic** ___**Early** ___**Middle** ___**Late**

___ **Woodland** ___**Eastern** __**Plains**

___ **Village Farming/Mississippi** ___**Plains Village**

___ **Protohistoric/Historic Indian X_Historic non-Ind. X**

Archaeological Cultures, Phases, etc. represented:

_____

How was cultural affiliation determined? (diagnostic artifacts, radiocarbon dates, etc.)
Land records

6. HISTORIC PHASE IDENTIFICATION (ETHNIC) NA

1. Choctaw	*11. Pawnee*	*21. Creek*
2. Cherokee	*12. Arapaho*	*22. Dakotas*
3. Sauk-Fox	*13. Ottawa*	*23. Chickasaw*
4. Pottowatomie	*14. Wichita*	*24. 12 & 17*
5. Seminole	*15. Quapaw*	*25. Missouri-Oto*
6. Comanche	*16. Osage*	*26. Iowa*
7. Apache	*17. Cheyenne*	*27. Anglo-American*
8. Kiowa	*18. Caddo*	*28. French*
9. Kiowa-Apache	*19. Shawnee*	*29. Spanish*
10. Kickapoo	*20. Delaware*	*30. Other*

How was historic identification determined?

Land records

7. HISTORIC SITE RANGE 5

0. Missing data;	*5. 1890-1929*
1. pre-1800	~~6. 1930-1950~~
2. 1800-1830	7. 1800-1900
3. 1830-1859	8. 1800-present
4. 1869-1889	9. 1900-present

8. INFERRED SITE TYPE (can be more than one category)

___ open habitation w/o mounds	___ petroglyph-pictograph
___ open habitation w/ mounds	___ isolated burials (<2)
___ earth mound	___ cemetery (>2)
___ mound complex	___ specialized activity
___ stone mounds/rock piles	___ rock alignments
___ burned rock concentrations	___ historic farmstead
___ non-mound earthworks	X historic
___ rockshelter	___ historic fort
___ cave	___ dugout
___ quarry/workshop	___ historic trash dump

9. MIDDEN AT SITE
NA

___ don't know	___ present, earth
___ absent	___ present, shell
	___ present, rock

10. MATERIALS COLLECTED None

Type	Number
Ceramics & glass	
ground stone	
scrapers (unhaft	
hafted scrapers	
projectile points	
base fragments	
drills	
bifaces/biface	
unifaces	
perforators/	
gravers	

spokeshaves _____
debitage _____
worked bone/shell_____
other prehistoric_____
faunal remains _____
floral remains _____
human bone _____

---

11. ARTIFACT REPOSITORY
Name of institution where artifacts are to be stored.

Photos Yes
_ black and white _____ no. of pictures
_ X color ___4 no. of pictures
Name and address of institution where photos are filed:
D.O. Henry, Dept Anthropology, U of Tulsa

12. EVIDENCE OF RECENT VANDALISM OBSERVED: X no ___

13. SITE CONDITION: _3

1. apparently undisturbed
2. < 25% disturbed
3. 26-50% disturbed
4. 51-75% disturbed
5. 76-99% disturbed
6. totally destroyed
7. disturbed, % unknown

14. MAJOR LAND USE:

__ cultivated field ___ modern cemetery ___ commercial

_pasture ___ mining ___ military

X woods, forest ___ inundated _____ logging/fire break

___ road/trail _X_ industrial scrub/secondary growth/old field

___ ditch/dike/borrow pit ___ residential ___ modern dump

___ landfill _____ recreation

Other: _____

15. AMOUNT OF GROUND SURFACE VISIBLE: 5
1. <10%
2. 11-25%
3. 26-50%
4. 51-75%
5. 76-90%
6. 91-100%
Survey Conditions (variable)

16. PHYSIOGRAPHIC DIVISION: 6
1. High Plains
2. Gypsum Hills
3. Wichita Mtns.
4. Red Bed Plains
5. Arbuckle Mtns.
6. Sandstone Hills
7. Prairie Plains
8. Ozark Plateau
9. Ouachita Mtns.
10. Red River Plains

17. LANDFORM TYPE: 3
1. Floodplain **4. Dissected Uplands**
2. Terrace ***5.* Undissected Uplands**
3. Hillside-Valley Wall

18. LOCALITY TYPE (specific site setting):1
1. Level **5. Mesa**
2. Knoll-Low Land **6. Slope**
3. Blowout **7. Bluff Crest**
4. Ridge-Upland **8. Bluff Base**

19.SOILS (if known)
Coweta-Bates Series Type

20. 196m/643ft Elevation (msl);0-10 Slope (deg); N_ Slope Dir facing

21. NATURAL VEGETATION: 8
1. short grasses **6. Mesquite**
2. mixed grasses **7. Juniper-Pinon**
3. tall grasses **8. Oak-Hickory Forest**
4. Cross-Timber **9. Oak-Pine**
5. Shin-Oak **10. Loblolly Pine Forest**

22. SITE AREA: ~160 (square meters)
Basis for area estimate:
1. Taped 3. Guessed **5. Alidade/Transit**
2. Paced 4. Range-Finder

Confident of site boundaries? X yes
23. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE:

Give a physical description of the site and its setting, including dimensions, features, nature of the materials and artifact concentrations. Include a copy of a U.S.G.S. topographic map with the site's location and boundaries marked.

The site consists of a rectangular (8 x 15m) foundation constructed with four courses of natural tabular sandstone overlain with a concrete slab. The N end of the structure is partially demolished. The floor of the building displays three elevated, concrete platforms of different sizes and configurations. Findings within the surface artifact scatter and three shovel tests produced clear plate glass fragments, various small metal pieces and asbestos (?) bushings. The area around the foundation has been dozed and a pile of displaced concrete supports is located 6m SW of the building.

The site location agrees with that shown for a building on the 1954 Tulsa quad sheet which is surrounded by three well sites. The building's location, internal machinery supports and artifacts (lacking domestic items) points to its use in industry for oil production and distribution.

24. DRAINAGE: 17
1. Arkansas **7. Illinois** **13. Poteau**
2. Beaver-N Canadian **8. Kiamichi** **14. Red**
3. Canadian **9. Little River** **15. Salt Fork**

4. Caney 10. Muddy Boggy 16. Salt Fork Red
5. Cimarron 11. Neosho 17. Verdigris
6. Deep Fork 12. N. Fork Red 18. Washita

25. NEAREST NATURAL SOURCE OF WATER: 2

1. Permanent stream/creek 6. River
2. Intermittent stream 7. Slough or oxbow lake
3. Permanent stream 8. Relic stream channel
4. Intermittent spring/seep/bog (if observable)
5. Natural lake 9. Wells, if site is historic

26. DISTANCE TO WATER (in 10's of meters):120

27. INVESTIGATION TYPE: 2
1. Reconnaissance (survey) 3. Excavated
2. Intensive (survey & testing) 4. Volunteered report

28. SIGNIFICANCE STATUS: Inventory site

___ National Register property
___ Eligible for National Register
___ Nominated to National Register by S.H.P.O.
___ Considered eligible but not nominated by S.H.P.O.
__X Inventory site
___ National Register status not assessed

29. DISCUSS THE POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SITE:

Sites 34TU205, 34TU206, and 34TU209 are primarily represented by foundations that were associated with buildings serving as oil field facilities active during the early 20th century and, as such, fall principally under NRHP criteria A, B and D. While each of these sites would have been tied to the *oil boom period* a significant, transformative event for the region that stretched from 1915-1930 (Gregory 2003; http://www.okhistory.org/ publications/enc), none of these sites is well preserved nor unique in construction or occurrence. Such facilities are common to the region and many are intact. Relative to Criterion D, from an archaeological perspective, additional investigation of each of the sites is unlikely to yield important information.

Sites 34TU207 and 34TU208 are represented by foundations associated with houses that appear to have been constructed and initially occupied within the 1920-1930 time-frame. In context, each of the sites is evaluated according to NRHP criteria B and D. Neither site appears to have been associated with the lives of significant historic persons as established by a search of the *Oklahoma Chronicles of Oklahoma* (http://digital.library.okstate.edu/Chronicles/) for the names found holding titles in the land records (https://lrmis.tulsacounty.org/) associated with each site. Relative to Criterion D, from an archaeological perspective, additional investigation of each of the sites is unlikely to yield important information.

30. PUBLISHED OR FORTHCOMING REPORTS ON THE SITE:

Donald O. Henry (2016) *Cultural Resource Survey of the 36th Street North Development Project, Tulsa, Oklahoma.* Submitted to Kevin Howard, White Tundra Environmental, LLC, 3501 South Yale, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74135. (918) 986 9780, (918) 346 4849.



USGS 7.5’ Tulsa, Okla. Showing location of Site 34TU205.



Site plan of 34TU205

Looking N across 34TU205.

Looking E across 34TU205

OKLAHOMA ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE SURVEY FORM

Site **34TU209**
County **Tulsa**

COMPLETE ALL SECTIONS

1. **SITE NUMBER AND NAME**

Site Name NA (derived from owner's name, etc.)
Project No. **Site #5** (Temporary number or name assigned during project)

2. **LOCATIONAL INFORMATION** *For Office Use*

U.T.M. Reference

Zone	*Northing*	*Easting*	
15	**4 010 797**	**233 208**	**NAD83**

Legal Description
SE1/4, NE1/4, NW1/4 Section 19, T20N/R13E, Tulsa County, Oklahoma

U.S.G.S. Quad Name **Tulsa, Okla.**
Quad Date (revised) **1954 (1982)**

Other Locational References (i.e., benchmarks, road intersections, bridges, etc.; please give distance and bearing to site)

3. **OWNER(S) OF PROPERTY**

NA

Street and Number
NA
City, Town **State**
NA

4. **SITE SURVEYED BY:**

Name
D.O. Henry

Date Recorded

10/6/16

REPORTED BY:
(if different)
Name

Time spent at site and time of day
1 hour afternoon

5. **CULTURAL AFFILIATION**
Cultural Periods

_____**Unassigned Prehistoric**

___ **Paleoindian** ___**Early** ___**Middle** ___**Late**

___ **Archaic** ___**Early** ___**Middle** ___**Late**

___ **Woodland** ___**Eastern** __**Plains**

___ **Village Farming/Mississippi** ___**Plains Village**

___ **Protohistoric/Historic Indian X_Historic non-Ind. X**

Archaeological Cultures, Phases, etc. represented:

_____

How was cultural affiliation determined? (diagnostic artifacts, radiocarbon dates, etc.)
Land records

6. HISTORIC PHASE IDENTIFICATION (ETHNIC) NA

1. Choctaw	*11. Pawnee*	*21. Creek*
2. Cherokee	*12. Arapaho*	*22. Dakotas*
3. Sauk-Fox	*13. Ottawa*	*23. Chickasaw*
4. Pottowatomie	*14. Wichita*	*24. 12 & 17*
5. Seminole	*15. Quapaw*	*25. Missouri-Oto*
6. Comanche	*16. Osage*	*26. Iowa*
7. Apache	*17. Cheyenne*	*27. Anglo-American*
8. Kiowa	*18. Caddo*	*28. French*
9. Kiowa-Apache	*19. Shawnee*	*29. Spanish*
10. Kickapoo	*20. Delaware*	*30. Other*

How was historic identification determined?

Land records

7. HISTORIC SITE RANGE 5

0. Missing data;	*5. 1890-1929*
1. pre-1800	~~6. 1930-1950~~
2. 1800-1830	7. 1800-1900
3. 1830-1859	8. 1800-present
4. 1869-1889	9. 1900-present

8. INFERRED SITE TYPE (can be more than one category)

___ open habitation w/o mounds	___ petroglyph-pictograph
___ open habitation w/ mounds	___ isolated burials (<2)
___ earth mound	___ cemetery (>2)
___ mound complex	___ specialized activity
___ stone mounds/rock piles	___ rock alignments
___ burned rock concentrations	___ historic farmstead
___ non-mound earthworks	X historic
___ rockshelter	___ historic fort
___ cave	___ dugout
___ quarry/workshop	___ historic trash dump

9. MIDDEN AT SITE
NA

___ don't know	___ present, earth
___ absent	___ present, shell
	___ present, rock

10. MATERIALS COLLECTED None

Type	Number
Ceramics & glass	
ground stone	
scrapers (unhaft	
hafted scrapers	
projectile points	
base fragments	
drills	
bifaces/biface	
unifaces	
perforators/	
gravers	

spokeshaves _____
debitage _____
worked bone/shell_____
other prehistoric_____
faunal remains _____
floral remains _____
human bone _____

---

11. ARTIFACT REPOSITORY
Name of institution where artifacts are to be stored.

Photos Yes
_ black and white _____ no. of pictures
_ X color ___4 no. of pictures
Name and address of institution where photos are filed:
D.O. Henry, Dept Anthropology, U of Tulsa

12. EVIDENCE OF RECENT VANDALISM OBSERVED: X no ___

13. SITE CONDITION: 3

1. apparently undisturbed
2. < 25% disturbed
3. 26-50% disturbed
4. 51-75% disturbed
5. 76-99% disturbed
6. totally destroyed
7. disturbed, % unknown

14. MAJOR LAND USE:

__ cultivated field ___ modern cemetery ___ commercial
__pasture ___ mining ___ military
X woods, forest ___ inundated _____ logging/fire break
___ road/trail __X_ industrial X scrub/secondary growth/old field
___ ditch/dike/borrow pit ___ residential ___ modern dump
___ landfill ___ recreation
Other: _____

15. AMOUNT OF GROUND SURFACE VISIBLE: 5
1. <10% 3. 26-50% 5. 76-90%
2. 11-25% 4. 51-75% 6. 91-100%
Survey Conditions (variable)

16. PHYSIOGRAPHIC DIVISION: 6
1. High Plains 6. Sandstone Hills
2. Gypsum Hills 7. Prairie Plains
3. Wichita Mtns. 8. Ozark Plateau
4. Red Bed Plains 9. Ouachita Mtns.
5. Arbuckle Mtns. 10. Red River Plains

17. LANDFORM TYPE: 3
1. Floodplain **4. Dissected Uplands**
2. Terrace ***5.* Undissected Uplands**
3. Hillside-Valley Wall

18. LOCALITY TYPE (specific site setting):1
1. Level **5. Mesa**
2. Knoll-Low Land **6. Slope**
3. Blowout **7. Bluff Crest**
4. Ridge-Upland **8. Bluff Base**

19.SOILS (if known)
Coweta-Bates Series Type

20. 201m/661ft Elevation (msl);0-10 Slope (deg); N_ Slope Dir facing

21. NATURAL VEGETATION: 8
1. short grasses **6. Mesquite**
2. mixed grasses **7. Juniper-Pinon**
3. tall grasses **8. Oak-Hickory Forest**
4. Cross-Timber **9. Oak-Pine**
5. Shin-Oak **10. Loblolly Pine Forest**

22. SITE AREA: ~75 (square meters)
Basis for area estimate:
1. Taped 3. Guessed **5. Alidade/Transit**
2. Paced 4. Range-Finder

Confident of site boundaries? X yes
23. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE:

Give a physical description of the site and its setting, including dimensions, features, nature of the materials and artifact concentrations. Include a copy of a U.S.G.S. topographic map with the site's location and boundaries marked.

The site consists of a rectangular poured concrete foundation (06.5 x 8m) with the S portion capped with a concrete slab. The W wall of this portion is also bowed out slightly from the rest of the building. The area around the building has been dozed and trenched. The walls of excavated areas were inspected and no artifact was observed. Similarly, the shovel test units were negative.

The building likely served as an oil field facility and its location is matches that of a building shown on the 1954 USGS quad sheet.

24. DRAINAGE: 17
1. Arkansas **7. Illinois** **13. Poteau**
2. Beaver-N Canadian **8. Kiamichi** **14. Red**
3. Canadian **9. Little River** **15. Salt Fork**
4. Caney **10. Muddy Boggy** **16. Salt Fork Red**
5. Cimarron **11. Neosho** **17. Verdigris**
6. Deep Fork **12. N. Fork Red** **18. Washita**

25. NEAREST NATURAL SOURCE OF WATER: 2

1. Permanent stream/creek **6. River**

2. Intermittent stream 7. Slough or oxbow lake
3. Permanent stream 8. Relic stream channel
4. Intermittent spring/seep/bog (if observable)
5. Natural lake 9. Wells, if site is historic

26. DISTANCE TO WATER (in 10's of meters):60

27. INVESTIGATION TYPE: 2
1. Reconnaissance (survey) 3. Excavated
2. Intensive (survey & testing) 4. Volunteered report

28. SIGNIFICANCE STATUS: Inventory site

___ National Register property
___ Eligible for National Register
___ Nominated to National Register by S.H.P.O.
___ Considered eligible but not nominated by S.H.P.O.
__X Inventory site
___ National Register status not assessed

29. DISCUSS THE POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SITE:

Sites 34TU205, 34TU206, and 34TU209 are primarily represented by foundations that were associated with buildings serving as oil field facilities active during the early 20th century and, as such, fall principally under NRHP criteria A, B and D. While each of these sites would have been tied to the *oil boom period* a significant, transformative event for the region that stretched from 1915-1930 (Gregory 2003; http://www.okhistory.org/ publications/enc), none of these sites is well preserved nor unique in construction or occurrence. Such facilities are common to the region and many are intact. Relative to Criterion D, from an archaeological perspective, additional investigation of each of the sites is unlikely to yield important information.

30. PUBLISHED OR FORTHCOMING REPORTS ON THE SITE:

Donald O. Henry (2016) *Cultural Resource Survey of the 36th Street North Development Project, Tulsa, Oklahoma.* Submitted to Kevin Howard, White Tundra Environmental, LLC, 3501 South Yale, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74135. (918) 986 9780, (918) 346 4849.



USGS 7.5' Tulsa, Okla. Showing location of Site 34TU207

.



Site plan of 34TU209

Looking S across 34TU209.

Looking W across 34TU209

APPENDIX B

Name of property : Building #1. 36th Street North Development Project

Location: Tulsa Co., N1/2, Section 19, T20N, R13E, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Name of photographer: Donald O. Henry

Date of photograph: October 2016

Location of photograph negative (firm name): Donald Henry, PhD, Consulting Archaeologist

Indication of direction camera is pointing: North

Number of photograph in series : 1 of 2

Name of property : Building #1. 36th Street North Development Project

Location: Tulsa Co., N1/2, Section 19, T20N, R13E, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Name of photographer: Donald O. Henry

Date of photograph: October 2016

Location of photograph negative (firm name): Donald Henry, PhD, Consulting Archaeologist

Indication of direction camera is pointing: South

Number of photograph in series : 2 of 2



Building #1

HISTORIC PRESERVATION RESOURCE IDENTIFICATION FORM

PLEASE TYPE ALL DATA IN UPPERCASE - FIELDS IN RED ARE REQUIRED

1. PROPERTY NAME: 36TH STREET NORTH DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

2. RESOURCE NAME: BUILDING #1 (BARN)

3. ADDRESS: N/A

4. CITY: TULSA 5. VICINITY:

6. COUNTY NAME: TULSA

7. LOT: N/A 8. BLOCK: N/A 9. PLAT NAME: N/A

10. SECTION: N 1/2 SECT. 19 11. TOWNSHIP: T20N 12. RANGE: R13E

13. LATITUDE (NORTH): (ENTER AS: "dd.ddddd")

14. LONGITUDE (WEST): (ENTER AS: "-dd.ddddd")

15. UTM ZONE: 15 16. NORTHINGS: 4,010,664N 17. EASTINGS: 234,028E

18. RESOURCE TYPE: BUILDING

19. HISTORIC FUNCTION: AGRICULTURAL OUTBUILDING

20. CURRENT FUNCTION: VACANT/NOT IN USE

21. AREA OF SIGNIFICANCE, PRIMARY: AGRICULTURE

22. AREA OF SIGNIFICANCE, SECONDARY:

23. DESCRIPTION OF SIGNIFICANCE: THIS BUILDING HAS NO HISTORICAL OR CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE

24. DOCUMENTATION RESOURCE: 1898 GENERAL LAND OFFICE MAP
USGS TOPOGRAPHIC SERIES: CLAREMORE 1901, 1914
USGS TOPOGRAPHIC SERIES: TULSA 1954 (APPEARS ONLY ON THIS MAP)

25. NAME OF PREPARER: NANCY A. HENRY

59. SURVEY PROJECT YES 26. PROJECT NAME: 36TH ST. NORTH DEVELOPMENT PROJI

27. DATE OF PREPARATION: October 9, 2016 28. PHOTOGRAPHS 2

29. YEAR: 2016

30. ARCHITECT/BUILDER: UNKNOWN

31. YEAR BUILT: PRE-1966

32. ORIGINAL SITE: Yes

33. DATE MOVED: N/A

34. FROM WHERE: N/A

35. ACCESSIBLE: YES

36. ARCHITECTURAL STYLE: NO STYLE

37. OTHER ARCHITECTURAL STYLE:

38. FOUNDATION MATERIAL: CONCRETE

39. ROOF TYPE: FLAT

40. ROOF MATERIAL: METAL

41. WALL MATERIAL, PRIMARY: CONCRETE

42. WALL MATERIAL, SECONDARY:

43. WINDOW TYPE: N/A

44. WINDOW MATERIAL:

45. DOOR TYPE: PLANK

46. DOOR MATERIAL: WOOD

47. EXTERIOR FEATURES: TWO OPEN BAYS. NO EXTERIOR WINDOWS OR DOORS.

48. INTERIOR FEATURES: NONE

49. DECORATIVE DETAILS: NONE

50. CONDITION OF RESOURCE: POOR (BADLY IN NEED OF MAINTENANCE)

51. DESCRIPTION OF RESOURCE: CONCRETE BLOCK, 2 BAY BARN WITH A DIVIDED STALL FOR ANIMALS. BUILT ON A CONCRETE SLAB FOUNDATION, WITH A FLAT CORRUGATED METAL ROOF. INCLUDES AN ENCLOSED FEED/TACK STORAGE

52. COMMENTS:

53. ATTACH LOCATION MAP

54. LISTED ON NATIONAL REGISTER: NO

55. NATIONAL REGISTER ENTRY:

56. CONTINUATION