APPENDIX D
CULTURAL RESOURCES COORDINATION

DEPARTMENT OF ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS, TULSA DISTRICT
1645 SOUTH 101ST EAST AVENUE
TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74128-4609

September 23, 2004

Planning, Environmental, and Regulatory Division
Environmental Analysis and Compliance Branch

Dr. Robert Brooks
State Archeologist
Oklahoma Archeological Survey
111 East Chesapeake
Norman, OK 73019-0575

Dear Dr. Brooks:

The purpose of this letter is to initiate consultation pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) concerning the proposed disposal of property acquired for construction of the Candy Lake project in Osage County, Oklahoma.

Section 563(c) of the Water Resource Development Act (WRDA) of 1999, Public Law 106-53, 113 Stat. 269, as amended by Section 348 of WRDA 2000, directs the conveyance of the Government's interest in the land acquired for the Candy Lake project (except all flowage easements which are extinguished), and that the previous owners of the land, or their descendants, be given the first option to purchase the property at Fair Market Value. The property to be disposed of totals 3657 acres, and is located in Sections 3, 4, and 5 of T23N R12E, and Sections 7, 8, 17, 18, 19, 20, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 34 of T24N R12E in Osage County, Oklahoma (Figures 1 and 2). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Tulsa District, has administered the lands comprising the Candy Lake project since their purchase in the 1980s.

USACE has conducted archeological work in the Candy Lake project area since the early 1970s. The earliest USACE sponsored work in the Candy Lake project area was conducted by Cheek and Wilcox and is documented in the 1974 report entitled "An Assessment of the Cultural Historical Resources of Candy Creek Reservoir, Osage County, Oklahoma." In this report Cheek and Wilcox provide initial descriptions of prehistoric and historic sites they located within the Candy Creek valley and environs, specifically sites 34OS147 - 158.

In 1976 additional archeological survey was undertaken by Archeological Research Associates of Tulsa, Oklahoma. This work is documented in the report "Archeological Investigations at Candy Lake, Osage County, Oklahoma" by D. Kevin Leehan and dated

1977. During the execution of this contract approximately 675 acres located in the northern one-third of Candy Lake in Sections 6, 7, 8, 17, 18, and 19 of T24N R12E were surveyed for archeological sites. In addition, sites 34OS147, 151, 154, 155, 157, and 158 were tested for National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility. Sites 34OS149 and 153 were also to have been tested, but problems with property access prevented this work. All of the sites investigated in 1976 were prehistoric in nature. Due to the low density of artifacts recovered in the testing, sites 34OS147, 151, 154, 157, and 158 were recommended as being ineligible for listing on the NRHP. Sites 34OS149 and 153 were recommended for further archeological work in order to determine their potential significance, while site 34OS155 was recommended for mitigation through archeological data recovery.

In 1979, Archeological Research Associates returned to Candy Lake to test sites 34OS149 and 153 and to mitigate 34OS155. This work was documented in the report "A Reassessment of Certain Archeological Sites in the Candy Lake Area, Oklahoma" by Joe Saunders and dated 1980. As a result of this work sites 34OS149 and 153 were found to contain very limited cultural materials and have minimal sub-surface deposits. According to the researchers, these sites did not contribute significant information on the prehistory of the region, and as such were not recommended for further investigation. Excavations at 34OS155 revealed the presence of three separate occupation areas, one dating to the Late Archaic and the other two dating to the Late Woodland period.

More recently, two large pedestrian archeological surveys have been conducted that in total cover the entire COE administered property at Candy Lake. Beginning in late 2001, engineering-environmental Management, Inc. (e2M) conducted an intensive pedestrian cultural resources survey of 1224 acres composed of parcels located at the northern and southern ends of the Candy Lake property. The results of this survey are documented in the enclosed report entitled "Cultural Resources Inventory of 1224 Acres at Candy Lake, Osage County, Oklahoma" and dated August 2002.

During this survey a total of four previously recorded sites (34OS155, 187, 191, and 192) were revisited and one new archeological site (34OS664) was recorded (see enclosed report and site forms). Efforts to relocate 34OS155 in 2001 proved unsuccessful, probably due in large part to the low surface and subsurface artifact densities previously noted for the site.

e2M recommends no further work at the site. We concur with the opinion of e2M that the previous archeological excavations at 34OS155 have been sufficient to mitigate any potential adverse effect to the site that may result from the transfer of the property from federal ownership. Site 34OS187 was recorded in 1976 as a small historic artifact scatter. Reported as destroyed in the original recordation of the site, the site was determined to be ineligible for listing on the NRHP due to a lack of site integrity. Efforts by e2M to relocate the site in 2001 proved unsuccessful, but resulted in the discovery of a single prehistoric lithic biface from the surface of the presumed site area. Based on observations in the field, it appears likely that the site has been further disturbed by earth moving activities associated with more recent road and pipeline construction. We concur with e2M that 34OS187 is not eligible for listing on the NRHP. Site 34OS191 was recorded in 1976 as a small prehistoric lithic scatter located within the Candy Creek floodplain. The site was determined to be ineligible for the NRHP due to a lack of site integrity. Efforts by e2M to relocate the site were unsuccessful, and it appears that the site has been destroyed. We concur with the opinion of e2M that site 34OS191 is not eligible for listing on the NRHP. Site 34OS192 was recorded in 1976 as a small scatter of historic artifacts, and was assessed as ineligible for listing on the NRHP. Efforts by e2M to relocate the site were unsuccessful, and it also appears that this site has been destroyed. We agree with the opinion of e2M that site 34OS192 is not eligible for listing on the NRHP. We request your comment on our opinion of NRHP eligibility regarding these previously recorded sites.

One new site, 34OS664, was recorded by e2M during their 2001 field work. This site is located upstream of 34OS155 on the west bank of Candy Creek. This site consists of a buried layer of bone and chipped stone artifacts, including a portion of a possible fluted projectile point, in a layer of gravel exposed on the west cutbank of Candy Creek. We agree with e2M that additional archeological and geomorphological work is required at 34OS664 to assess the integrity of the cultural deposits before a determination of NRHP eligibility can be made. We request your comment on our opinion of NRHP eligibility regarding site 34OS664.

The other recent large cultural resources survey at Candy Lake was also undertaken by e2M under contract to Gulf South Research Corporation (GSRC). This effort focused on the remaining 2434 acres at Candy Lake that was not covered by the 2001 work. Undertaken in 2003 and 2004, the results of this

survey are documented in the enclosed draft report entitled "Cultural Resources Inventory of 2434 Acres at Candy Lake, Osage County, Oklahoma" and dated June 1, 2004.

During this most recent survey work a total of eight previously recorded sites (34OS148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, and 158) were revisited and two new archeological sites (34OS699 and 700) were recorded (see enclosed report and site forms). Site 34OS148 was originally recorded as a small historic artifact scatter, and sites 34OS151, 153, and 158 were originally recorded as prehistoric lithic scatters. Efforts to relocate sites 34OS148, 151, 153, and 158 were unsuccessful. Site 34OS154 was also not relocated, and appears to have been destroyed by earthmoving activities associated with construction of a pond at the site. We feel that site 34OS154 is ineligible for listing on the NRHP due to a loss of site integrity. Site 34OS152 was originally recorded as a possible rock wall across an erosional channel near a tributary of Candy Creek. Reexamination of the area by e2m revealed that the feature is in fact composed of naturally occurring limestone blocks that have fractured in blocky shapes that resemble shaped building stones. This natural rock feature does not qualify as an archeological site or a historic property. We request your comment on our opinion of NRHP eligibility regarding these sites.

Sites relocated during the latest e2M cultural resources inventory include 34OS149 and 150. Site 34OS149 was identified by e2M as a surface prehistoric lithic scatter within a two-track road. A single shovel test transect paralleling the road recovered 4 additional flakes and a single historic transfer-print sherd. Artifacts were recovered from 0 to 60cm below the existing ground surface. e2M feels that the deposits remaining at 34OS149 are extensive enough for the site to be considered to be potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP. We disagree with the NRHP assessment of e2M regarding 34OS149. As previously documented by testing efforts at the site in 1979, cultural deposits at 34OS149 appear to be of very low density and may have a questionable degree of integrity. For those reasons, we feel that site 34OS149 is ineligible for listing on the NRHP. Site 34OS150 was also relocated. Previously recorded as a historic site, e2M found a single flake in one shovel test at a depth of 20-30cm below the ground surface. On the basis of the recovery of a previously undocumented prehistoric component at the site, e2M is recommending additional archeological work at 34OS150 to determine NRHP eligibility. We disagree with the assessment of e2M that additional archeological work at the site is needed to determine NRHP eligibility. Shovel tests at the

site only recovered a single flake from one shovel test, and provided no indication of the presence of intact prehistoric or historic cultural deposits at the site. Accordingly, we feel that site 34OS150 is ineligible for listing on the NRHP. We request your comment on our opinion of NRHP eligibility regarding these previously recorded sites.

In addition to the previously recorded sites, e2M found three new historic period archeological sites. One of these sites, the Riddle Homestead and cemetery (34OS698), was found to be located on a privately held parcel within the Candy Lake project, and will not be dealt with further as part of this coordination effort. The second new historic site found by e2M is 34OS699. Identified as a more recent historic home site containing concrete foundations, corrugated sheet metal, lumber, and shallow cultural deposits, e2M assessed this site as being ineligible for listing on the NRHP. We agree with e2M that site 34OS699 is ineligible for inclusion on the NRHP. The third new historic site identified by e2M was 34OS700. Consisting of the remains of a residence, well, and associated outbuildings and improvements, this farmstead may be associated with the original Osage tribal allottee of the property. E2M feels that additional archeological and archival research is necessary to assess the NRHP eligibility of this site. We agree with e2M that additional archeological and archival research is needed at 34OS700 in order to adequately assess the NRHP eligibility of the site. We request your comment on our opinion of NRHP eligibility regarding these newly recorded historic sites.

To summarize, cultural resources investigations since 1974 in the Candy Lake project area have identified a number of prehistoric and historic archeological sites. Based on previous archeological work, we feel that sites 34OS147, 148, 151, 153, 154, 157, 158, 187, 191, and 192 are ineligible for listing on the NRHP. Site 34OS149 was previously determined to have limited cultural materials and minimal sub-surface deposits, and the most recent revisit to the site confirms these earlier assessments. We feel that site 34OS149 is ineligible for listing on the NRHP. Site 34OS150 is a previously recorded historic site with a newly discovered prehistoric component. We feel that site 34OS150 is ineligible for listing on the NRHP due to the low density of cultural remains present at the site. Site 34OS152 has been determined to be a natural rock feature, and is not eligible for the NRHP. Site 34OS154 appears to have been destroyed by earthmoving activities associated with pond construction. We feel that site 34OS154 is ineligible for listing on the NRHP due to a loss of site integrity. Site

340S155, previously determined to be eligible for the NRHP, was mitigated through archeological excavation in 1979. The proposed property disposal will have "no effect" on this site due to the previous mitigation effort. Site 340S664 is a buried cultural deposit in the west cutbank of Candy Creek. We feel that site 340S664 requires additional archeological and geomorphological work in order to assess the integrity of the cultural deposits at the site. Sites 340S699 and 700 are both historic sites. We feel that site 340S699 is ineligible for the NRHP, while site 340S700 requires additional archeological and archival research to adequately assess the NRHP eligibility of the site.

As documented by earlier research in the region (and confirmed by the more recent discovery of site 340S664), the Candy Lake project area has a high probability of buried cultural deposits existing in the Candy Creek valley and adjacent stream terraces. As previously discussed with your office, we agree that additional subsurface exploration of the Candy Creek valley is warranted to adequately assess the potential effect of the proposed transfer of the Candy Lake project property on cultural resources. We propose to establish the specific locations of these trenches in consultation with your office and based on an actual field assessment of the terrain, but in general the trenches would be situated in portions of Sections 4 and 5, T23N R12E, and Sections 19, 29, 32, and 33, T24N R12E (specifically in portions of tracts 102, 107, 113, 121, and 201). Placing the trenches in these specific tracts will allow access to landforms representative of Candy Creek valley while maximizing the number of tracts that will be immediately available for sale to the previous landowners (Figure 3).

In accordance with public law, proceeds from the sale of Candy Lake property to the previous landowners or their descendants may be utilized to recover expenses related to the disposal of the property. However, any parcels not conveyed to the previous owners or their descendents as prescribed by the legislation shall be reported as excess to the General Services Administration, and shall be disposed of according to standard methods (i.e. property shall be offered to other federal agencies, state agencies, and the general public, in that order).

We feel that the proposed project will have "no effect" on historic properties involving Candy Lake parcels that do not contain sites or areas previously proposed as requiring

additional archeological work. Specifically, the parcels of property that do not contain sites or areas requiring additional archeological work include Tracts 101-1, 101-2, 106, 107-E10, 108, 109, 110E, 112, 114-1, 114-2, 116, 117, 118, 119-1, 119-2, 202, 203, 204, 206-1, 206-2, 207-1, 207-2, and 207-E17 (Figures 4 and 5). We propose to proceed with the disposition of these tracts of land in accordance with federal law as soon as possible. We request your comment on our opinion of effect regarding this project.

Thank you for your help with this request. We look forward to working with you on this project. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Louis Vogele, Archeologist, at 918-669-4934.

Sincerely,

Susan J. Haslett
Acting Chief,
Planning, Environmental,
and Regulatory Division

Enclosures

DEPARTMENT OF ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS, TULSA DISTRICT
1645 SOUTH 101ST EAST AVENUE
TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74128-4609

September 23, 2004

Planning, Environmental, and Regulatory Division
Environmental Analysis and Compliance Branch

Dr. Bob Blackburn
State Historic Preservation Officer
Oklahoma Historical Society
2704 Villa Prom, Shepherd Mall
Oklahoma City, OK 73107

Dear Dr. Blackburn:

The purpose of this letter is to initiate consultation pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) concerning the proposed disposal of property acquired for construction of the Candy Lake project in Osage County, Oklahoma.

Section 563(c) of the Water Resource Development Act (WRDA) of 1999, Public Law 106-53, 113 Stat. 269, as amended by Section 348 of WRDA 2000, directs the conveyance of the Government's interest in the land acquired for the Candy Lake project (except all flowage easements which are extinguished), and that the previous owners of the land, or their descendants, be given the first option to purchase the property at Fair Market Value. The property to be disposed of totals 3657 acres, and is located in Sections 3, 4, and 5 of T23N R12E, and Sections 7, 8, 17, 18, 19, 20, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 34 of T24N R12E in Osage County, Oklahoma (Figures 1 and 2). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Tulsa District, has administered the lands comprising the Candy Lake project since their purchase in the 1980s.

USACE has conducted archeological work in the Candy Lake project area since the early 1970s. The earliest USACE sponsored work in the Candy Lake project area was conducted by Cheek and Wilcox and is documented in the 1974 report entitled "An Assessment of the Cultural Historical Resources of Candy Creek Reservoir, Osage County, Oklahoma." In this report Cheek and Wilcox provide initial descriptions of prehistoric and historic sites they located within the Candy Creek valley and environs, specifically sites 34OS147 - 158.

In 1976 additional archeological survey was undertaken by Archeological Research Associates of Tulsa, Oklahoma. This work is documented in the report "Archeological Investigations at Candy Lake, Osage County, Oklahoma" by D. Kevin Leehan and dated

1977. During the execution of this contract approximately 675 acres located in the northern one-third of Candy Lake in Sections 6, 7, 8, 17, 18, and 19 of T24N R12E were surveyed for archeological sites. In addition, sites 34OS147, 151, 154, 155, 157, and 158 were tested for National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility. Sites 34OS149 and 153 were also to have been tested, but problems with property access prevented this work. All of the sites investigated in 1976 were prehistoric in nature. Due to the low density of artifacts recovered in the testing, sites 34OS147, 151, 154, 157, and 158 were recommended as being ineligible for listing on the NRHP. Sites 34OS149 and 153 were recommended for further archeological work in order to determine their potential significance, while site 34OS155 was recommended for mitigation through archeological data recovery.

In 1979, Archeological Research Associates returned to Candy Lake to test sites 34OS149 and 153 and to mitigate 34OS155. This work was documented in the report "A Reassessment of Certain Archeological Sites in the Candy Lake Area, Oklahoma" by Joe Saunders and dated 1980. As a result of this work sites 34OS149 and 153 were found to contain very limited cultural materials and have minimal sub-surface deposits. According to the researchers, these sites did not contribute significant information on the prehistory of the region, and as such were not recommended for further investigation. Excavations at 34OS155 revealed the presence of three separate occupation areas, one dating to the Late Archaic and the other two dating to the Late Woodland period.

More recently, two large pedestrian archeological surveys have been conducted that in total cover the entire COE administered property at Candy Lake. Beginning in late 2001, engineering-environmental Management, Inc. (e2M) conducted an intensive pedestrian cultural resources survey of 1224 acres composed of parcels located at the northern and southern ends of the Candy Lake property. The results of this survey are documented in the enclosed report entitled "Cultural Resources Inventory of 1224 Acres at Candy Lake, Osage County, Oklahoma" and dated August 2002.

During this survey a total of four previously recorded sites (34OS155, 187, 191, and 192) were revisited and one new archeological site (34OS664) was recorded (see enclosed report and site forms). Efforts to relocate 34OS155 in 2001 proved unsuccessful, probably due in large part to the low surface and subsurface artifact densities previously noted for the site.

e2M recommends no further work at the site. We concur with the opinion of e2M that the previous archeological excavations at 34OS155 have been sufficient to mitigate any potential adverse effect to the site that may result from the transfer of the property from federal ownership. Site 34OS187 was recorded in 1976 as a small historic artifact scatter. Reported as destroyed in the original recordation of the site, the site was determined to be ineligible for listing on the NRHP due to a lack of site integrity. Efforts by e2M to relocate the site in 2001 proved unsuccessful, but resulted in the discovery of a single prehistoric lithic biface from the surface of the presumed site area. Based on observations in the field, it appears likely that the site has been further disturbed by earth moving activities associated with more recent road and pipeline construction. We concur with e2M that 34OS187 is not eligible for listing on the NRHP. Site 34OS191 was recorded in 1976 as a small prehistoric lithic scatter located within the Candy Creek floodplain. The site was determined to be ineligible for the NRHP due to a lack of site integrity. Efforts by e2M to relocate the site were unsuccessful, and it appears that the site has been destroyed. We concur with the opinion of e2M that site 34OS191 is not eligible for listing on the NRHP. Site 34OS192 was recorded in 1976 as a small scatter of historic artifacts, and was assessed as ineligible for listing on the NRHP. Efforts by e2M to relocate the site were unsuccessful, and it also appears that this site has been destroyed. We agree with the opinion of e2M that site 34OS192 is not eligible for listing on the NRHP. We request your comment on our opinion of NRHP eligibility regarding these previously recorded sites.

One new site, 34OS664, was recorded by e2M during their 2001 field work. This site is located upstream of 34OS155 on the west bank of Candy Creek. This site consists of a buried layer of bone and chipped stone artifacts, including a portion of a possible fluted projectile point, in a layer of gravel exposed on the west cutbank of Candy Creek. We agree with e2M that additional archeological and geomorphological work is required at 34OS664 to assess the integrity of the cultural deposits before a determination of NRHP eligibility can be made. We request your comment on our opinion of NRHP eligibility regarding site 34OS664.

The other recent large cultural resources survey at Candy Lake was also undertaken by e2M under contract to Gulf South Research Corporation (GSRC). This effort focused on the remaining 2434 acres at Candy Lake that was not covered by the 2001 work. Undertaken in 2003 and 2004, the results of this

survey are documented in the enclosed draft report entitled "Cultural Resources Inventory of 2434 Acres at Candy Lake, Osage County, Oklahoma" and dated June 1, 2004.

During this most recent survey work a total of eight previously recorded sites (34OS148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, and 158) were revisited and two new archeological sites (34OS699 and 700) were recorded (see enclosed report and site forms). Site 34OS148 was originally recorded as a small historic artifact scatter, and sites 34OS151, 153, and 158 were originally recorded as prehistoric lithic scatters. Efforts to relocate sites 34OS148, 151, 153, and 158 were unsuccessful. Site 34OS154 was also not relocated, and appears to have been destroyed by earthmoving activities associated with construction of a pond at the site. We feel that site 34OS154 is ineligible for listing on the NRHP due to a loss of site integrity. Site 34OS152 was originally recorded as a possible rock wall across an erosional channel near a tributary of Candy Creek. Reexamination of the area by e2m revealed that the feature is in fact composed of naturally occurring limestone blocks that have fractured in blocky shapes that resemble shaped building stones. This natural rock feature does not qualify as an archeological site or a historic property. We request your comment on our opinion of NRHP eligibility regarding these sites.

Sites relocated during the latest e2M cultural resources inventory include 34OS149 and 150. Site 34OS149 was identified by e2M as a surface prehistoric lithic scatter within a two-track road. A single shovel test transect paralleling the road recovered 4 additional flakes and a single historic transfer-print sherd. Artifacts were recovered from 0 to 60cm below the existing ground surface. e2M feels that the deposits remaining at 34OS149 are extensive enough for the site to be considered to be potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP. We disagree with the NRHP assessment of e2M regarding 34OS149. As

previously documented by testing efforts at the site in 1979, cultural deposits at 34OS149 appear to be of very low density and may have a questionable degree of integrity. For those reasons, we feel that site 34OS149 is ineligible for listing on the NRHP. Site 34OS150 was also relocated. Previously recorded as a historic site, e2M found a single flake in one shovel test at a depth of 20-30cm below the ground surface. On the basis of the recovery of a previously undocumented prehistoric component at the site, e2M is recommending additional archeological work at 34OS150 to determine NRHP eligibility. We disagree with the assessment of e2M that additional archeological work at the site

is needed to determine NRHP eligibility. Shovel tests at the site only recovered a single flake from one shovel test, and provided no indication of the presence of intact prehistoric or historic cultural deposits at the site. Accordingly, we feel that site 34OS150 is ineligible for listing on the NRHP. We request your comment on our opinion of NRHP eligibility regarding these previously recorded sites.

In addition to the previously recorded sites, e2M found three new historic period archeological sites. One of these sites, the Riddle Homestead and cemetery (34OS698), was found to be located on a privately held parcel within the Candy Lake project, and will not be dealt with further as part of this coordination effort. The second new historic site found by e2M is 34OS699. Identified as a more recent historic home site containing concrete foundations, corrugated sheet metal, lumber, and shallow cultural deposits, e2M assessed this site as being ineligible for listing on the NRHP. We agree with e2M that site 34OS699 is ineligible for inclusion on the NRHP. The third new historic site identified by e2M was 34OS700. Consisting of the remains of a residence, well, and associated outbuildings and improvements, this farmstead may be associated with the original Osage tribal allottee of the property. E2M feels that additional archeological and archival research is necessary to assess the NRHP eligibility of this site. We agree with e2M that additional archeological and archival research is needed at 34OS700 in order to adequately assess the NRHP eligibility of the site. We request your comment on our opinion of NRHP eligibility regarding these newly recorded historic sites.

To summarize, cultural resources investigations since 1974 in the Candy Lake project area have identified a number of prehistoric and historic archeological sites. Based on previous archeological work, we feel that sites 34OS147, 148, 151, 153, 154, 157, 158, 187, 191, and 192 are ineligible for listing on the NRHP. Site 34OS149 was previously determined to have limited cultural materials and minimal sub-surface deposits, and the most recent revisit to the site confirms these earlier assessments. We feel that site 34OS149 is ineligible for listing on the NRHP. Site 34OS150 is a previously recorded historic site with a newly discovered prehistoric component. We feel that site 34OS150 is ineligible for listing on the NRHP due to the low density of cultural remains present at the site. Site 34OS152 has been determined to be a natural rock feature, and is not eligible for the NRHP. Site 34OS154 appears to have been destroyed by earthmoving activities associated with pond construction. We feel that site 34OS154 is ineligible for

listing on the NRHP due to a loss of site integrity. Site 340S155, previously determined to be eligible for the NRHP, was mitigated through archeological excavation in 1979. The proposed property disposal will have "no effect" on this site due to the previous mitigation effort. Site 340S664 is a buried cultural deposit in the west cutbank of Candy Creek. We feel that site 340S664 requires additional archeological and geomorphological work in order to assess the integrity of the cultural deposits at the site. Sites 340S699 and 700 are both historic sites. We feel that site 340S699 is ineligible for the NRHP, while site 340S700 requires additional archeological and archival research to adequately assess the NRHP eligibility of the site.

As documented by earlier research in the region (and confirmed by the more recent discovery of site 340S664), the Candy Lake project area has a high probability of buried cultural deposits existing in the Candy Creek valley and adjacent stream terraces. As previously discussed with your office, we agree that additional subsurface exploration of the Candy Creek valley is warranted to adequately assess the potential effect of the proposed transfer of the Candy Lake project property on cultural resources. We propose to establish the specific locations of these trenches in consultation with your office and based on an actual field assessment of the terrain, but in general the trenches would be situated in portions of Sections 4 and 5, T23N R12E, and Sections 19, 29, 32, and 33, T24N R12E (specifically in portions of tracts 102, 107, 113, 121, and 201). Placing the trenches in these specific tracts will allow access to landforms representative of Candy Creek valley while maximizing the number of tracts that will be immediately available for sale to the previous landowners (Figure 3).

In accordance with public law, proceeds from the sale of Candy Lake property to the previous landowners or their descendants may be utilized to recover expenses related to the disposal of the property. However, any parcels not conveyed to the previous owners or their descendents as prescribed by the legislation shall be reported as excess to the General Services Administration, and shall be disposed of according to standard methods (i.e. property shall be offered to other federal agencies, state agencies, and the general public, in that order).

We feel that the proposed project will have "no effect" on historic properties involving Candy Lake parcels that do not

contain sites or areas previously proposed as requiring additional archeological work. Specifically, the parcels of property that do not contain sites or areas requiring additional archeological work include Tracts 101-1, 101-2, 106, 107-E10, 108, 109, 110E, 112, 114-1, 114-2, 116, 117, 118, 119-1, 119-2, 202, 203, 204, 206-1, 206-2, 207-1, 207-2, and 207-E17 (Figures 4 and 5). We propose to proceed with the disposition of these tracts of land in accordance with federal law as soon as possible. We request your comment on our opinion of effect regarding this project.

Thank you for your help with this request. We look forward to working with you on this project. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Louis Vogele, Archeologist, at 918-669-4934.

Sincerely,

Susan J. Haslett
Acting Chief,
Planning, Environmental,
and Regulatory Division

Enclosures

DEPARTMENT OF ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS, TULSA DISTRICT
1645 SOUTH 101ST EAST AVENUE
TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74128-4609

September 24, 2004

Planning, Environmental, and Regulatory Division
Environmental Analysis and Compliance Branch

Mr. Gary McAdams, President
Wichita and Affiliated Tribes of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 729
Anadarko, OK 73005

Dear President McAdams:

In accordance with 36 CFR 800.4, Protection of Historic Properties, the purpose of this letter is to request your assistance in identifying cultural properties that may be of traditional religious or cultural significance to the Wichita and Affiliated Tribes in property acquired for construction of the Candy Lake project in Osage County, Oklahoma.

Section 563(c) of the Water Resource Development Act (WRDA) of 1999, Public Law 106-53, 113 Stat. 269, as amended by Section 348 of WRDA 2000, directs the conveyance of the Government's interest in the land acquired for the Candy Lake project (except all flowage easements which are extinguished), and that the previous owners of the land, or their descendants, be given the first option to purchase the property at Fair Market Value. Any parcels not conveyed to the previous owners or their descendents as prescribed by the legislation shall be reported as excess to the General Services Administration, and shall be disposed of according to standard methods (i.e. property shall be offered to other federal agencies, state agencies, and the general public, in that order). The property to be disposed of totals 3657 acres, and is located in Sections 3, 4, and 5 of T23N R12E, and Sections 7, 8, 17, 18, 19, 20, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 34 of T24N R12E in Osage County, Oklahoma (Figures 1 and 2). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Tulsa District, has administered the lands comprising the Candy Lake project since their purchase in the 1980s.

USACE has conducted archeological work in the Candy Lake project area since the early 1970s. Most recently, two large pedestrian archeological surveys have been conducted that in total cover the entire USACE administered property at the Candy

Lake project. As a result of these surveys, we have identified one prehistoric and one historic archeological site that we feel require additional archeological and/or archival research before we can make an assessment of their eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. In addition, we have identified areas within the Candy Creek valley portion of the project area that will require additional deep trenching in order to determine whether additional buried archeological sites may be present. In order to assist us in the assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed property disposal on cultural resources, we are requesting information that the Wichita and Affiliated Tribes are willing to share on any traditional religious or culturally significant properties located within the proposed project area so that we may adequately assess the effects of the proposed project on cultural resources.

Thank you for your help with this request. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Louis Vogele, Archeologist, at 918-669-4934.

Sincerely,

for Stephen L. Nolen

Susan J. Haslett
Acting Chief, Planning, Environmental,
and Regulatory Division

Enclosures

DEPARTMENT OF ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS, TULSA DISTRICT
1645 SOUTH 101ST EAST AVENUE
TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74128-4609

September 24, 2004

Planning, Environmental, and Regulatory Division
Environmental Analysis and Compliance Branch

Quapaw Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 765
Quapaw, OK 74363

Dear Sirs:

In accordance with 36 CFR 800.4, Protection of Historic Properties, the purpose of this letter is to request your assistance in identifying cultural properties that may be of traditional religious or cultural significance to the Quapaw Tribe in property acquired for construction of the Candy Lake project in Osage County, Oklahoma.

Section 563(c) of the Water Resource Development Act (WRDA) of 1999, Public Law 106-53, 113 Stat. 269, as amended by Section 348 of WRDA 2000, directs the conveyance of the Government's interest in the land acquired for the Candy Lake project (except all flowage easements which are extinguished), and that the previous owners of the land, or their descendants, be given the first option to purchase the property at Fair Market Value. Any parcels not conveyed to the previous owners or their descendents as prescribed by the legislation shall be reported as excess to the General Services Administration, and shall be disposed of according to standard methods (i.e. property shall be offered to other federal agencies, state agencies, and the general public, in that order). The property to be disposed of totals 3657 acres, and is located in Sections 3, 4, and 5 of T23N R12E, and Sections 7, 8, 17, 18, 19, 20, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 34 of T24N R12E in Osage County, Oklahoma (Figures 1 and 2). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Tulsa District, has administered the lands comprising the Candy Lake project since their purchase in the 1980s.

USACE has conducted archeological work in the Candy Lake project area since the early 1970s. Most recently, two large pedestrian archeological surveys have been conducted that in total cover the entire USACE administered property at the Candy Lake project. As a result of these surveys, we have identified one prehistoric and one historic archeological site that we feel

require additional archeological and/or archival research before we can make an assessment of their eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. In addition, we have identified areas within the Candy Creek valley portion of the project area that will require additional deep trenching in order to determine whether additional buried archeological sites may be present. In order to assist us in the assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed property disposal on cultural resources, we are requesting information that the Quapaw Tribe is willing to share on any traditional religious or culturally significant properties located within the proposed project area so that we may adequately assess the effects of the proposed project on cultural resources.

Thank you for your help with this request. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Louis Vogele, Archeologist, at 918-669-4934.

Sincerely,

for Stephen L. Hohn

Susan J. Haslett
Acting Chief, Planning,
Environmental, and Regulatory
Division

Enclosures

DEPARTMENT OF ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS, TULSA DISTRICT
1645 SOUTH 101ST EAST AVENUE
TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74128-4609

September 24, 2004

Planning, Environmental, and Regulatory Division
Environmental Analysis and Compliance Branch

Mr. Anthony Whitehorn
Cultural Resource Management
Osage Nation of Oklahoma
627 Grandview Ave.
Pawhuska, OK 74056

Dear Mr. Whitehorn:

In accordance with 36 CFR 800.4, Protection of Historic Properties, the purpose of this letter is to request your assistance in identifying cultural properties that may be of traditional religious or cultural significance to the Osage Nation in property acquired for construction of the Candy Lake project in Osage County, Oklahoma.

Section 563(c) of the Water Resource Development Act (WRDA) of 1999, Public Law 106-53, 113 Stat. 269, as amended by Section 348 of WRDA 2000, directs the conveyance of the Government's interest in the land acquired for the Candy Lake project (except all flowage easements which are extinguished), and that the previous owners of the land, or their descendants, be given the first option to purchase the property at Fair Market Value. Any parcels not conveyed to the previous owners or their descendents as prescribed by the legislation shall be reported as excess to the General Services Administration, and shall be disposed of according to standard methods (i.e. property shall be offered to other federal agencies, state agencies, and the general public, in that order). The property to be disposed of totals 3657 acres, and is located in Sections 3, 4, and 5 of T23N R12E, and Sections 7, 8, 17, 18, 19, 20, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 34 of T24N R12E in Osage County, Oklahoma (Figures 1 and 2). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Tulsa District, has administered the lands comprising the Candy Lake project since their purchase in the 1980s.

USACE has conducted archeological work in the Candy Lake project area since the early 1970s. Most recently, two large pedestrian archeological surveys have been conducted that in total cover the entire USACE administered property at the Candy

Lake project. As a result of these surveys, we have identified one prehistoric and one historic archeological site that we feel require additional archeological and/or archival research before we can make an assessment of their eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. In addition, we have identified areas within the Candy Creek valley portion of the project area that will require additional deep trenching in order to determine whether additional buried archeological sites may be present. In order to assist us in the assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed property disposal on cultural resources, we are requesting information that the Osage Nation is willing to share on any traditional religious or culturally significant properties located within the proposed project area so that we may adequately assess the effects of the proposed project on cultural resources.

Thank you for your help with this request. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Louis Vogele, Archeologist, at 918-669-4934.

Sincerely,

for Susan J. Haslett
Acting Chief, Planning, Environmental,
and Regulatory Division

Enclosures

DEPARTMENT OF ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS, TULSA DISTRICT
1645 SOUTH 101ST EAST AVENUE
TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74128-4609

September 24, 2004

Planning, Environmental, and Regulatory Division
Environmental Analysis and Compliance Branch

Kaw Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Drawer 50
Kaw City, OK 74641

Dear Sirs:

In accordance with 36 CFR 800.4, Protection of Historic Properties, the purpose of this letter is to request your assistance in identifying cultural properties that may be of traditional religious or cultural significance to the Kaw Tribe in property acquired for construction of the Candy Lake project in Osage County, Oklahoma.

Section 563(c) of the Water Resource Development Act (WRDA) of 1999, Public Law 106-53, 113 Stat. 269, as amended by Section 348 of WRDA 2000, directs the conveyance of the Government's interest in the land acquired for the Candy Lake project (except all flowage easements which are extinguished), and that the previous owners of the land, or their descendants, be given the first option to purchase the property at Fair Market Value. Any parcels not conveyed to the previous owners or their descendents as prescribed by the legislation shall be reported as excess to the General Services Administration, and shall be disposed of according to standard methods (i.e. property shall be offered to other federal agencies, state agencies, and the general public, in that order). The property to be disposed of totals 3657 acres, and is located in Sections 3, 4, and 5 of T23N R12E, and Sections 7, 8, 17, 18, 19, 20, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 34 of T24N R12E in Osage County, Oklahoma (Figures 1 and 2). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Tulsa District, has administered the lands comprising the Candy Lake project since their purchase in the 1980s.

USACE has conducted archeological work in the Candy Lake project area since the early 1970s. Most recently, two large pedestrian archeological surveys have been conducted that in total cover the entire USACE administered property at the Candy Lake project. As a result of these surveys, we have identified one prehistoric and one historic archeological site that we feel

require additional archeological and/or archival research before we can make an assessment of their eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. In addition, we have identified areas within the Candy Creek valley portion of the project area that will require additional deep trenching in order to determine whether additional buried archeological sites may be present. In order to assist us in the assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed property disposal on cultural resources, we are requesting information that the Kaw Tribe is willing to share on any traditional religious or culturally significant properties located within the proposed project area so that we may adequately assess the effects of the proposed project on cultural resources.

Thank you for your help with this request. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Louis Vogele, Archeologist, at 918-669-4934.

Sincerely,

Susan J. Haslett
Acting Chief, Planning, Environmental,
and Regulatory Division

Enclosures

DEPARTMENT OF ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS, TULSA DISTRICT
1645 SOUTH 101ST EAST AVENUE
TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74128-4609

September 24, 2004

Planning, Environmental, and Regulatory Division
Environmental Analysis and Compliance Branch

Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 948
Tahlequah, OK 74465

Dear Sirs:

In accordance with 36 CFR 800.4, Protection of Historic Properties, the purpose of this letter is to request your assistance in identifying cultural properties that may be of traditional religious or cultural significance to the Cherokee Nation in property acquired for construction of the Candy Lake project in Osage County, Oklahoma.

Section 563(c) of the Water Resource Development Act (WRDA) of 1999, Public Law 106-53, 113 Stat. 269, as amended by Section 348 of WRDA 2000, directs the conveyance of the Government's interest in the land acquired for the Candy Lake project (except all flowage easements which are extinguished), and that the previous owners of the land, or their descendants, be given the first option to purchase the property at Fair Market Value. Any parcels not conveyed to the previous owners or their descendents as prescribed by the legislation shall be reported as excess to the General Services Administration, and shall be disposed of according to standard methods (i.e. property shall be offered to other federal agencies, state agencies, and the general public, in that order). The property to be disposed of totals 3657 acres, and is located in Sections 3, 4, and 5 of T23N R12E, and Sections 7, 8, 17, 18, 19, 20, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 34 of T24N R12E in Osage County, Oklahoma (Figures 1 and 2). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Tulsa District, has administered the lands comprising the Candy Lake project since their purchase in the 1980s.

USACE has conducted archeological work in the Candy Lake project area since the early 1970s. Most recently, two large pedestrian archeological surveys have been conducted that in total cover the entire USACE administered property at the Candy Lake project. As a result of these surveys, we have identified one prehistoric and one historic archeological site that we feel

require additional archeological and/or archival research before we can make an assessment of their eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. In addition, we have identified areas within the Candy Creek valley portion of the project area that will require additional deep trenching in order to determine whether additional buried archeological sites may be present. In order to assist us in the assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed property disposal on cultural resources, we are requesting information that the Cherokee Nation is willing to share on any traditional religious or culturally significant properties located within the proposed project area so that we may adequately assess the effects of the proposed project on cultural resources.

Thank you for your help with this request. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Louis Vogele, Archeologist, at 918-669-4934.

Sincerely,

for Susan J. Haslett
Acting Chief, Planning,
Environmental, and Regulatory
Division

Enclosures

Oklahoma Archeological Survey

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

September 30, 2004

Susan J. Haslett
Acting Chief, Planning, Environmental,
and Regulatory Division
Department of the Army
Corps of Engineers, Tulsa District
1645 South 101st East Ave
Tulsa, OK 74128-4609

Re: Proposed disposal of property acquired through the Candy Lake project.
Legal Description: Section 5 T23N R12E; Sections 7, 8, 17-20, 28-30,
And 32-34 T24N R12E, Osage County, Oklahoma.

Dear Ms. Haslett:

I have received two reports and a series of appendices documenting the results of cultural resource investigations for the above referenced action. This work was accomplished by Engineering- Environmental Management (E^2M) on December 9-17, 2001, September 9-18, 2003 and May 11-13, 2004. Some 3658 acres was re-inventoried by their personnel with additional effort allocated to the reexamination of 34OS148-155, 158, 187, and 191-192. Four previously unrecorded archaeological sites (34OS664, 698-700) were also documented during the survey efforts.

Previously recorded archaeological sites 34OS148, 151, 153, 154, 158, 187, 191, and 192 were not relocated or the location was revisited with no additional cultural materials being visible due to site loss through erosion or cultural disturbances. As these sites were previously identified as not meeting the criteria for National Register eligibility, I concur with the findings of E^2M and the Corps of Engineers regarding these cultural resources. **However, I defer to further comment from the Historic Archaeologist with the State Historic Preservation Office concerning those sites with historic material that were not relocated.** Site 34OS152, previously identified as a culturally derived stone wall was documented by E^2M as naturally occurring limestone slabs. **Here, I also defer to the Historical Archaeologist with the Sate Historic Preservation Office regarding the cultural/natural origin of the stone, potential eligibility, and project effect.** Site 34OS155 was also not relocated. However, this site received extensive data recovery

111 E. Chesapeake, Norman, Oklahoma 73019-0575 PHONE: (405) 325-7211 FAX: (405) 325-7604
A UNIT OF ARTS AND SCIENCES SERVING THE PEOPLE OF OKLAHOMA

treatment in 1979 and I concur with the Corps of Engineers assessment that this resource has received adequate treatment. Engineering-Environmental Management has recommended as potentially eligible 34OS149. This is based on a total of five items (4 flakes and 1 historic sherd) from up to 60 cm below surface. I concur with the Corps of Engineers that the return on shovel testing does not hold the content in respect to the prehistoric record to merit further evaluation and that at least the prehistoric component at 34OS149 is ineligible for the National Register. **I defer comment on the historic ceramic from 34OS149 to the Historic Archaeologist with the State Historic Preservation Office.** I also agree with the Corps of Engineers that one flake from a shovel test at 34OS150 is insufficient evidence to warrant further National Register eligibility consideration (at least regarding the prehistoric component). **However, the potential eligibility of the historic comment needs to be addressed by the Historic Archaeologist from the State Historic Preservation Office. I also defer comment on the three new historic sites recorded during the survey (34OS698-700) to the State Historic Preservation Office.**

From this assessment, one prehistoric site recorded during the recent survey effort (34OS664) merits additional evaluation. This is a deeply buried site along the stream channel. At this point, the site appears to have a quite complex depositional history that merit further study, especially considering the presence of a Paleoindian biface fragment within the context of these deposits. Work should focus on clarification of the depositional history as well as the substantive content of the cultural deposits. This site also points to the potential for additional buried cultural deposits within the Candy Creek valley. As the Corps of Engineers will be returning this land from federal ownership and protection, there is a responsibility to inventory the nature of this action. From my perspective this also includes an assessment of buried deposits necessitating deep testing at high probability locations by a geomorphologist with archaeological training.

This review has been conducted in cooperation with the State Historic Preservation Office, Oklahoma Historical Society.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Brooks
State Archaeologist

Cc: SHPO
E^2M
Osage Nation
Wichita and Affiliated Tribes

Oklahoma Historical Society *Founded May 27, 1893*

State Historic Preservation Office • 2704 Villa Prom • Shepherd Mall • Oklahoma City, OK 73107-2441
Telephone 405/521-6249 • Fax 405/947-2918

October 21, 2004

Ms. Susan Haslett, Acting Chief
Planning, Environmental & Reg. Div.
Tulsa District Corps of Engineers
1645 South 101 East Avenue
Tulsa, OK 74128-4609

RE: File #2633-04; Candy Lake CORPS Surplus Land Disposal Project, Osage County

Dear Ms. Haslett:

We have reviewed the documentation submitted on the above project and are in agreement with your assessment that additional archeological and archival research is necessary before a determination can be made about the National Register eligibility of historic Osage allotment farmstead site 34OS700.

Furthermore, we concur with your assessment that historic and/or multicomponent prehistoric/historic archeological sites 34OS148, 34OS149, 34OS150, 34OS152, 34OS187, 34OS192 and 34OS699 are not eligible properties and that in certain instances (34OS149 & 34OS150) this opinion is not expressed by the authors. Also, none of the Isolated Find localities discussed in the reports are eligible for the National Register.

We defer to and are in agreement with Dr. Robert Brooks' assessment of the prehistoric sites discussed in the reports and in agreement with comments expressed in your September 23, 2004 letter concerning sites 34OS147, 34OS151, 34OS153, 34OS154, 34OS155, 34OS157, 34OS158, 34OS191 and 34OS664.

In regards to site 34OS698, the Riddle farmstead and cemetery, we do not have enough information on this site to agree with e2M's determination that this location is an eligible property. As discussed in the report, site 34OS698 is not on CORPS property. In this regard, the site will not be affected by the federal undertaking.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project. If you have any questions, please call Charles Wallis, Historical Archeologist, at 405/521-6381. Please reference the above underlined file number when responding. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Melvena Heisch
Deputy State Historic
Preservation Officer

MH:pm

cc: Robert Brooks

JIM GRAY
Principal Chief

KENNETH H. BIGHORSE
Assistant Principal Chief

MEMBERS OF COUNCIL
MARK FREEMAN Jr.
TERRY MASON MOORE
HARRY ROY RED EAGLE
JODIE SATEPAUHOODLE
JERRY SHAW
PAUL R. STABLER
DUDLEY WHITEHORN
JOHN W. WILLIAMS

OSAGE TRIBAL COUNCIL

October 19, 2004

US Army Corps of Engineers
Attn: Regulatory Branch
Attn: Susan J. Haslett
1645 South 101st East Ave.
Tulsa, OK 74128-4609

RE: Candy Lake Property Disposal, Osage County, OK

To Whom It May Concern:

The Osage Tribe of Oklahoma has evaluated the above reference sites, and we have determined that the site could have religious or cultural significance to the Osage Tribe being our former reservation & homeland. However, if construction activities should expose Osage archeological materials, such as bone, pottery, chipped stone, etc., we ask that construction activities cease, and this office be contacted so that an evaluation can be made.

Should you have any questions, you can reach me at (918) 287-5446.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Anthony P. Whitehorn
Tribal Enterprise Manager

Osage Tribal Council, P.O. Box 779, Pawhuska, OK 74056, (918) 287-5432, FAX (918) 287-2257

Oklahoma Archeological Survey
THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

December 14, 2004

Stephen L. Nolen
Chief, Environmental Analysis and
Compliance Branch
Planning, Environmental, and
Regulatory Division
Department of the Army
Corps of Engineers
1645 South 101st East Avenue
Tulsa, OK 74128-4609

Re: *Cultural Resource Inventory of 2434 Acres at Candy Lake, Osage County, Oklahoma* by E^2M.

Dear Mr. Nolen:

I have completed a review of the above referenced report. This work was accomplished as a Section 106 action as a consequence of dispersal of this federal property to private, state, Indian, or other entities. Cultural resource investigations for this portion of the project consisted of the examination of some 2434 acres for previously undocumented cultural resources. This work was accomplished by E^2M from September 9-18, 2003 and May 11-13, 2004 with three historic archaeological sites recorded (34OS698-700). **I defer opinion on the potential eligibility of these sites and the effect of the undertaking to the Historic Archaeologist with the State Historic Preservation Office.**

Investigations also included the reassessment of eight previously recorded archaeological sites (34OS148-154, 158). Of these sites, 34OS148 could not be relocated. Additionally, sites 34OS151, 153, and 158 yielded no additional material from surface survey or shovel tests. Previously recorded historic site 34OS152 has been redefined as a natural feature. It is my opinion that all of the above resources are not eligible for the National Register. Assuming that the investigators were at the correct locations, the absence of material on the surface and from shovel tests for 34OS151, 153, and 158 suggest minimal site content and context and further evaluation is probably not warranted. This concept also applies to 34OS148. **I defer additional comment on the natural feature issue of 34OS152 to the State Historic Preservation Office.**

111 E. Chesapeake, Room 102, Norman, Oklahoma 73019-5111 PHONE: (405) 325-7211 FAX: (405) 325-7604
A UNIT OF ARTS AND SCIENCES SERVING THE PEOPLE OF OKLAHOMA

Site 34OS 154 is reported destroyed by bulldozing and clearcutting. As the site was on federal property, there needs to be some accounting as why this site was not afforded protection until it was adequately assessed. Regardless of the status of Candy Lake, all sites on Corps of Engineers land should be afforded the same protection until they have been determined to be not eligible for the National Register and a no effect determination requested for the action.

Sites 34OS149 and 34OS150 contain prehistoric and historic materials. Based on the limited content from shovel tests at 34OS149, I question whether this site is potentially eligible. However, both sites merit further evaluation to qualify their status in respect to National Register eligibility. **I defer here to the Historic Archaeologist with the State Historic Preservation Office on the historic components at these sites.**

I also note that state site forms have not been submitted for 34OS698-700. This needs to be completed before the project file on Candy Lake is closed.

This review has been conducted in cooperation with the State Historic Preservation Office, Oklahoma Historical Society.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Brooks
State Archaeologist

Cc: SHPO
E^{2}M ✓
Wichita and Affiliated Tribes
Osage Nation