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Abstract

Pape-Dawson archaeologists conducted an intensive archaeological survey of the proposed Alecozay Tract Development Project in southwestern Bexar County, Texas. The irregularly shaped project area is bordered on the east by Palo Alto Road (State Highway 16 [SH 16]), while Loop 410 is about 0.25 mile (0.40 kilometer [km]) to the north. The project area is primarily surrounded by undeveloped land, although a small residential development is adjacent to the north, and another larger residential development is south of the property. The project area is maximally 1,291 feet (ft) (393.5 meters [m]) north to south and 4,422 ft (1,348 m) east to west, for a total area of 75.03 acres (30.36 hectares [ha]). While depth of impacts for all improvements will vary and have yet to be determined, average depth of vertical impact is considered to be up to 3 ft (0.9 m) below the ground surface throughout the project area and up to 8 ft (2.4 m) below the ground surface for utility installations.

The project is situated in the San Antonio city limits, requiring compliance with the Historic Preservation and Design Section of the city’s Unified Development Code (UDC). As no federal funding or permitting is anticipated for this project, and it is situated on private property, compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and the Antiquities Code of Texas (ACT) were not necessary. All work was done in accordance with the archaeological survey standards and guidelines as developed by the Council of Texas Archeologists (CTA) and adopted by the Texas Historical Commission (THC).

Pape Dawson’s investigations included an extensive background records search and literature review, followed by an intensive pedestrian survey with shovel testing and backhoe trenching. The presence of intact alluvial soils necessitated the use of mechanical excavation. The background review determined that the project area had not been previously surveyed and that no previously recorded archaeological sites were located within or adjacent to its boundary. Four archaeological sites (41BX599, 41BX704, 41BX1690, and 41BX1916) were identified within 0.62 mile (1 km) of the project area. One archaeological survey was previously conducted adjacent to the project area along Palo Alto Road/SH 16, and seven archaeological surveys were previously conducted within the study area.

Pape-Dawson archaeologists Virginia Moore, Katie Hill, Jacob I. Sullivan, and Megan Veltri conducted the field work on June 14, 15, 20, 22, and 28, 2017. Archaeologists excavated 60 shovel tests and four backhoe trenches within the project area, recording two sites (41BX2185 and 41BX2186) and one isolated find.

Site 41BX2185 is a multicomponent, prehistoric lithic scatter and mid-nineteenth- to late-twentieth-century farmstead, based on the artifact assemblage. The site includes structural remains, a scatter of historic-age debris, and a scatter of non-diagnostic lithic debitage. Archival research indicates the oldest artifacts at the site are probably associated with Mary Graham who owned the property adjacent to the north in the early-twentieth century. Later deposits at site 41BX2185 correspond to activities by the Schoellmans who owned the project area from 1943 to 2002.

Site 41BX2186 is an early- to late-twentieth-century farmstead with associated historic-age foundations and material. Archival research revealed that the site was owned by Elmer H. Acord and associated with the Acord Dairy between 1928 and 1943, and owned by the Schoellmans between 1943 and 2002.
Sites 41BX2185 and 41BX2186 were evaluated according to the criteria in 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 60.4 and in 13 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) 26.10. Based on these criteria, both sites are recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or for designation as an SAL, considering the lack of integrity and the paucity of subsurface deposits. However, site 41BX2185 potentially extends outside of the project area, and could include an artesian well. If archaeological deposits exist outside the project area, their NRHP and SAL status is unknown.

Consequently, Pape-Dawson recommends no further archaeological work at sites 41BX2185 and 41BX2186 or within the project area. Project records and photographs will be curated at the Center for Archaeological Research at the University of Texas at San Antonio. Collected artifacts will be returned to the landowner or discarded with landowner permission.
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Management Summary

KB Home proposes to construct a new residential subdivision in San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas. The irregularly shaped project area is bounded by Palo Alto Road (SH 16) to the east, undeveloped property to the west and south, and a residential development to the north. The project area is 1,291 ft (393.5 m) north to south and 4,422 ft (1,348 m) east to west, for a total area of 75.03 acres (30.36 ha). Depth of impacts will vary and have yet to be determined; however, for the survey, average depth of vertical impact is considered to be up to 3 ft (0.9 m) below the ground surface throughout the project area and up to 8 ft (2.4 m) below the ground surface for utility installations.

The project is situated in the San Antonio city limits, requiring compliance with the Historic Preservation and Design Section of the city’s UDC. As no federal funding or permitting is anticipated for this project, and it is situated on private property, compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA and the Antiquities Code of Texas was not necessary.

Fieldwork took place on June 14, 15, 20, 22, and 28, 2017. Mary Jo Galindo served as Principal Investigator and was assisted in the field by Katie Hill, Jacob I. Sullivan, and Megan Veltri. As a result of the survey, sites 41BX2185 and 41BX2186 and one isolated find were recorded.

Site 41BX2185 is a multicomponent, prehistoric lithic scatter and mid-nineteenth-to-late-twentieth-century farmstead, based on the artifact assemblage. The site includes structural remains, a scatter of historic-age debris, and a scatter of non-diagnostic lithic debitage. Shovel tests and historical aerials demonstrate disturbed deposits exist within sections of the site, while archival research indicates the oldest artifacts at the site are probably associated with Mary Graham who owned the property adjacent to the north in the early-twentieth century. Later deposits at site 41BX2185 correspond to activities by the Schoellmans who owned the project area from 1943 to 2002.

Site 41BX2186 is an early- to late-twentieth-century farmstead with associated historic-age foundations and material. Archival research revealed that the site was owned by Elmer H. Acord and associated with the Acord Dairy between 1928 and 1943, and then owned by the Schoellmans between 1943 and 2002.

Sites 41BX2185 and 41BX2186 were evaluated according to the criteria in 36 CFR 60.4 and in 13 TAC 26.10. Based on these criteria, both sites are recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or for designation as an SAL, considering the lack of integrity and the paucity of subsurface deposits. However, site 41BX2185 potentially extends outside of the project area, and could include an artesian well. If archaeological deposits exist outside the project area, their NRHP and SAL status is unknown.

Consequently, Pape-Dawson recommends no further archaeological work at sites 41BX2185 and 41BX2186 or within the project area. In the unlikely event that cultural material is encountered during construction, it is recommended that the discovery be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist who can provide guidance on how to proceed in accordance with the UDC.
Introduction
On behalf of KB Home, Pape-Dawson conducted an intensive archaeological survey of the proposed residential subdivision project area in San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas (Figures 1 and 2). The irregularly shaped, 75.03-acre (30.36-hectare [ha]) project area is bounded to the east by Palo Alto Road [State Highway 16 [SH 16]], with Loop 410 situated about 0.25 mile (0.40 kilometer) to the north. The project area is primarily surrounded by undeveloped land, although a small residential development is adjacent to the north, and another larger residential development is south of the property. The project area is maximally 1,291 feet (ft) (393.5 meters [m]) north to south and 4,422 ft (1,348 m) east to west. While depth of impacts for all improvements will vary and have yet to be determined, average depth of vertical impact is considered to be up to 3 ft (0.9 m) below the ground surface throughout the project area and up to 8 ft (2.4 m) below the ground surface for utility installations.

The project is situated in the San Antonio city limits, requiring compliance with the Historic Preservation and Design Section of the city’s Unified Development Code (UDC). As no federal funding or permitting is anticipated for this project, and it is situated on private property, compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and the Antiquities Code of Texas (ACT) will not be necessary. Pape Dawson’s investigations included an extensive background records and literature review, followed by an intensive pedestrian survey with shovel testing and mechanical trenching.

The goal of the work was to locate and identify all prehistoric and historic archaeological sites in the project area, to establish vertical and horizontal site boundaries within the project area, and to evaluate the significance and eligibility of any sites recorded within the project area for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or for designation as a State Antiquities Landmark (SAL), per the Archaeological Report Guidelines of the City of San Antonio Office of Historic Preservation (COSA-OHP). All work was done in accordance with the archaeological survey standards and guidelines as developed by the Council of Texas Archeologists (CTA) and adopted by the Texas Historical Commission (THC). Pape-Dawson archaeologists Virginia Moore, Katie Hill, Jacob I. Sullivan, and Megan Veltri conducted the field work on June 14, 15, 20, and 22, 2017.

Project Setting
Located in southwestern San Antonio, most of the project area consists of moderately sloping upland terrain. Within the eastern half of the project area, a relic channel of a tributary to Comanche Creek traverses the property from the north to the south, while a similarly oriented tributary of Leon Creek is adjacent to the western portion of the project area. Recent aerial maps depict the project area as undeveloped pasture with wooded areas along the boundary and internal fence lines, scattered oak, mesquite, and Ashe juniper trees, and a few larger Live Oaks associated with the Comanche Creek tributary.
Figure 1: Project Location Map
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Figure 2: Project Area Map
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Surface elevation of the site is approximately 600 ft (183 m) above mean sea level, with topographic relief sloping gently to the west and the Leon Creek drainage. Most of the project area is geologically mapped as Pleistocene-aged fluviatile terrace deposits associated with Leon Creek (Bureau of Economic Geology [BEG] 1983). The formation is composed of gravel, sand, silt, and clay deposited during the Pleistocene Era. The eastern margin of the project area is mapped as Eocene-era Undivided Wilcox Group, which consists of mostly mudstone with varying amounts of sandstone, lignite, iron concretions, sand, and silt. Thickness ranges from 440 to 1,200 feet (BEG 1983).

Six different soils series are mapped across the project area (U.S. Department of Agriculture-Natural Resources Conservation Service [USDA-NRCS] 2017) (Figure 3). About 42 percent is Lewisville silty clay (LvA) with 0 to 1 percent slopes on stream terraces. The Lewisville series is very deep, well-drained, and formed in calcareous clayey alluvium derived from mudstone. Approximately 33 percent is Houston Black gravelly clay (HuB) with 1 to 3 percent slopes on ridges. The Houston series is very deep, moderately well-drained, and derives from Upper Cretaceous-age calcareous mudstone.

About 12 percent is eroded Atco clay loam (KcC2) with 3 to 5 percent slopes, which usually forms on stream terraces. The Atco series is very deep, well-drained, and derived from calcareous loamy alluvium. The last 13 percent is made up of a combination of 1) Loire clay loam (Fr) with 0 to 2 percent slopes that are occasionally flooded (0.7 percent), 2) Gullied land-Sunev complex (Gu) with 3 to 20 percent slopes (1 percent), and 3) Tinn and Frio soils (Tf) with 0 to 1 percent slopes (11.2 percent) (USDA-NRCS 2017).

Both Loire clay loam (Fr) and Tinn and Frio soils (Tf) are typically found on flood plains. The Loire series is very deep, well-drained soil derived from a loamy alluvium parent material, while Tinn and Frio soils are from clayey alluvium of Holocene age derived from mixed sources. Gullied land-Sunev complex (Gu) is found on ridges and stream terraces, is well drained and derived from loamy alluvium of Quaternary age (USDA-NRCS 2017).

**Cultural Chronology**

Bexar County falls within the Central Texas archaeological region of the Central and Southern Planning Region as delineated by the THC (Mercado-Allinger et al, 1996). Cultural developments in this region are typically classified by archaeologists according to four primary chronological time periods: Paleoindian, Archaic, Late Prehistoric, and Historic. These classifications have been defined primarily by changes in material culture and subsistence strategies over time as evidenced through information and artifacts recovered from archaeological sites. This cultural chronology provides a brief summary of each major cultural period with reference to significant archaeological work that has occurred within the region.

**PALEOINDIAN (11,500 B.P. – 8,800 B.P.)**

Although there is some debate about whether pre-Clovis Paleoindian peoples lived in Texas, there is evidence of Paleoindian occupation within Texas by 11,500 B.P. Collins (1995:376, 381) has proposed dividing this period into early and late phases, with Dalton, San Patrice, and Plainview projectile points possibly providing the transition between them. Research has shown Paleoindians were gathering wild plants and hunting large mammals (mammoth, bison, etc.), as well as smaller terrestrial and aquatic
Figure 3: Soils Map
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animals (Collins 1995: 381; Bousman et al. 2004: 75). Projectile points characteristic of the Paleoin\ndian period in Central Texas are lanceolate-shaped and include Clovis, Plainview, and Folsom (Turner and Hester 1999). In Texas, most Paleoin\ndian sites are classified as procurement or consumption sites (Bousman et al. 2004: 76-78), but a few, such as the Wilson-Leonard site in Williamson County (Collins 1995) and the Pavo Real site in Bexar County (Collins et al. 2003; Figueroa and Frederick 2008), have produced in situ human burials (Collins 1995: 383). Other Paleoin\ndian sites discovered within Bexar County include site 41BX47 on Leon Creek (Tennis 1996), the Richard Beene site (41BX831) (Thoms et al. 2005; Thoms and Mandel 2007), and the St. Mary’s Hall site (41BX229), which has provided insight into a more diverse diet for Paleoin\ndian groups (Hester 1978). Recent excavations have documented a Paleoin\ndian component in Zilker Park in Austin (Nickels et al. 2010).

As the climate warmed, the Paleoin\ndian people began to shift away from hunting large animals. The changing environment, which led to extinction of the megafauna, likely influenced their decision to focus more on hunting small game animals, including deer and rabbit, as well as gathering edible roots, nuts, and fruits (Black 1989). This change in food supply, as well as a different set of stone tools, marks the transition into the Archaic Period.

**Archaic (8,800 B.P. – 1,200 B.P.)**

Usually divided into early, middle, late, and sometimes transitional sub-periods, the Archaic marks a gradual shift from hunting Megafauna and some smaller animals supplemented with wild plants to a focus on hunting and gathering medium and small animals and wild plants, and an eventual transition to agriculture. Beginning with Clear Fork gouges and Guadalupe bifaces in the Early Archaic (8500 B.P. – 6000 B.P.) (Turner and Hester 1999; Collins 1995), Early Archaic people produced a variety of point types. The variety of points and their scattered distribution over a large area in the Early Archaic may indicate smaller groups of people moving over larger territories (Prewitt 1981). Point types transition to Bell-Andice-Calf Creek, Taylor, and Nolan-Travis points in the Middle Archaic (6000 B.P. – 4000 B.P.) (Turner and Hester 1999; Collins 1995), and burned rock middens become an important characteristic. The Middle Archaic focus on constructing burned rock ovens to cook a diverse array of plant food (Black 1989) suggests a slightly more sedentary focus. The Bulverde, Pedernales, Ensor, Frio, and Marcos points in the Late Archaic (4000 B.P. – 1300 B.P.) (Turner and Hester 1999; Collins 1995) mirror the diversity of point types found in the Early Archaic. During the Late Archaic, cemeteries, especially associated with rock shelters, become common in central Texas (Dockall et al. 2006). In Bexar County, sites with Early Archaic components include the Housman Road site (41BX47), the Richard Beene site (41BX831) (Thoms et al. 2005; Thoms and Mandel 2007), the Higgins site (41BX184) (Black et al. 1998), and the Panther Springs site (41BX228) (Black and McGraw 1985). While the Elm Waterhole site (41BX300) is representative of a Middle Archaic site within Bexar County (McNatt et al. 2000), the Granberg site (41BX17\41BX271) in San Antonio is a multi-component site with occupations from both the Middle and Late Archaic sub-periods.

**Late Prehistoric (1,200 B.P. – 250 B.P.)**

As the Archaic transitioned into the Late Prehistoric period, several technological changes become apparent. The most notable change is the use of the bow and arrow rather than the spear and atlatl, as evidenced by smaller dart points. Another significant innovation is the creation and use of ceramic vessels.
Some groups began to practice consistent agriculture during this time as well; there is some evidence that peoples in Central Texas may have incorporated agriculture into their lives, but primarily remained hunter gatherers (Collins 1995). Also during this period, there are possible indications of major population movements, changes in settlement patterns and perhaps lower population densities (Black 1989). Archaeologists divide the Late Prehistoric into two phases: the Austin phase, followed by the Toyah.

**Historic (1600s – 1950)**

San Antonio was the site of many occupations by prehistoric peoples, and there is an overlap between the prehistoric and historic periods (sometimes called the protohistoric), but Europeans did not explore the area until the seventeenth century. Alonso de León’s 1689 and 1690 expeditions and Domingo Terán de los Ríos’ 1691 expedition were likely some of the first interactions between Europeans and Native groups (de la Teja 1995:6). According to historical accounts of the expeditions, these early Spanish explorers encountered numerous indigenous groups residing in and near Central Texas (Mercado-Allinger et al, 1996). These indigenous groups likely included the Payaya and the Pamaya who resided in the southern plains of Texas as well as the Tonkawa, Karankawa, Lipan Apache, and Comanche, who entered the area from the northern plains in pursuit of food and stopped at the areas springs (Long 2017). In 1691, Spanish explorers traveling through Bexar County began creating what would become the El Camino Real de los Tejas (The King’s Highway, also known as the Old San Antonio Road in portions) (United States Department of the Interior (DOI), 2011). This network of roadways at least in part likely followed existing trails already well established by the numerous highly mobile indigenous groups within the area.

These explorations helped the Spanish choose locations to establish five missions in and around what would later become San Antonio. Don Martín de Alarcón established the first mission, San Antonio de Valero, in 1718, on the west bank of the San Pedro Creek, followed by the Presidio San Antonio de Béxar and the Villa de Béxar (de la Teja 1995). However, by 1722 the Marqués de San Miguel de Aguayo had moved the presidio and villa downstream to a second location along San Pedro Creek. Other missions, including Mission San José y San Miguel de Aguayo, Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción, San Juan Capistrano, and San Francisco de la Espada were established in the area from 1720 to 1731 (Clark et al. 1975). Most of the Native American people recruited to live at these missions comprised many different groups (Campbell 1977), but it is difficult to know all the groups that were present due to the variations in spelling and phonetic complexity. The missions used this Native labor force to construct acequias, or irrigation ditches, which helped them to develop self-sustaining communities bordered by farmland (Long 2010).

In 1731, Spain sent 16 families from the Canary Islands to the villa de Béxar to establish the secular village. With the arrival of these families, surveyors set out the city’s main plaza, or Plaza de las Islas, next to the church, designated a spot for the Casas Reales, and began to establish residential lots (Spell 1962). This began San Antonio’s gradual secularization. In 1773, San Antonio de Béxar Presidio was named the capital of Spanish Texas, and the settlement including mission Indians had a population of about 2,000 by 1778 (Fehrenbach 2010).

During this period of early settlement, water was an essential component for successful settlement and survival. The acequia system, begun with the arrival of the missionaries, continued to expand to serve
irrigation and drinking water needs. The acequia system influenced the street layout in the city (Cox 2005:20) and played an integral part in contact between the Spanish, who brought the engineering concepts for the system, and the indigenous groups forced to provide the construction labor.

During the 1820s and early 1830s, American settlers began moving to San Antonio in increasing numbers, though the population remained predominately Mexican. In 1824, Texas and Coahuila were united into a single state with its capital at Saltillo. San Antonio fought for Mexican Independence in 1813, then for its own sovereignty during the Texas Revolution. The Siege of Bexar and the Battle of the Alamo, in 1835 and 1836, were both located within San Antonio, showing its importance in the region. After Texas gained its independence from Mexico in 1836, Bexar County was created and San Antonio was chartered as its seat (Long 2010). However, this was not the end of conflict in the city; a dispute with Comanche Indians resulted in the Council House Fight in 1840, and Woll’s invasion in 1842 precipitated Texas’ entrance into the United States as the 28th state. By 1846, San Antonio’s population had decreased to approximately 800 people (Fehrenbach 2010).

On March 2, 1861, Texas seceded from the Union about a month before the Civil War began. San Antonio became a Confederate storage area as well as a location where military units could be organized; however, the city kept its distance from most of the actual fighting (Fehrenbach 2010). After the Civil War, San Antonio continued to grow larger, spurred on by the arrival of the railroad in 1877 (Fehrenbach 2010). Industries such as cattle, distribution, ranching, mercantile, gas, oil, and military centers in San Antonio prospered. The city served as the distribution point for the Mexico-United States border as well as the rest of the southwest. At the turn of the twentieth century, San Antonio was the largest city in Texas with a population of more than 53,000. Much of the city’s growth after the Civil War was a result of an influx of southerners fleeing the decimated, reconstruction-era south. An additional population increase came after 1910, when large numbers of Mexicans began moving into Texas to escape the Mexican Revolution (Fehrenbach 2010).

Modernization increased dramatically between the 1880s and the 1890s, compared to the rest of the United States. Civic government, utilities, electric lights and street railways, street paving and maintenance, water supply, telephones, hospitals, and a city power plant were all built or planned around this time (Fehrenbach 2010). The First United States Volunteer Cavalry was organized in San Antonio during the Spanish-American War, and San Antonio was an important military center for the army and air forces during both world wars. Its five military bases provided an important economic base and contributed to the evolution of the city’s medical research industry.

**Methods**

**Records Review**

Prior to fieldwork, Pape-Dawson archaeologists conducted a thorough background literature and records search of the proposed project area. This research included reviewing the Terrell Wells (2998-241) U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle map at the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory (TARL) and searching the Texas Archeological Sites Atlas online database for any previously recorded surveys and historic or prehistoric archaeological sites located within a 0.62-mile (1-km) radius.
of the project area. The review also included information on the following types of cultural resources: NRHP-listed properties, sites, and districts, SALs, Official Texas Historical Markers (OTHM), Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks (RTHL), and cemeteries. In addition, archaeologists consulted the City of San Antonio (COSA) Historic Landmark Sites and Historic Geodatabases to locate any local historic landmarks and districts. Archaeologists also examined historic maps and aerials that depict the project area (Nationwide Environmental Title Research [NETR] Online 2017) and Stoner System Map Sheet 1107.

ARCHIVAL
Pape-Dawson archaeologists consulted online records from the San Antonio City Archives, maps from the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) Texas Historic Overlay, online records from the Bexar County Clerk, and census records and city directories available at HeritageQuest online. Secondary sources consulted include previous archaeological reports for the project area and the Handbook of Texas Online. This research was undertaken in order to determine the possible occupants associated with the historic sites.

FIELDWORK
Pape-Dawson archaeologists conducted an intensive cultural resources survey of the proposed 75.03-acre (30.36-ha) project area that included a 100-percent pedestrian survey augmented with shovel testing and mechanical trenching. The presence of alluvial soils necessitated the use of mechanical excavation. Pape-Dawson archaeologists excavated four trenches that were 3.9 to 5.9 ft (1.2 to 1.8 m) deep, 5 to 6.5 ft (1.5 to 2 m) long, 4.3 to 4.9 ft (1.3 to 1.5 m) wide. All trenching work was performed in accordance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations. All trenches were backfilled and leveled upon completion of excavation and recording.

Pape-Dawson archaeologists thoroughly photographed and recorded representative trench profiles, and mapped the trenches and any archaeological deposits with a sub-meter accurate, handheld Trimble Global Positioning System (GPS) unit. Site information was recorded on a TexSite form, and the form was submitted to the Texas Archaeology Research Lab (TARL). Diagnostic artifacts and a sample of non-diagnostic artifacts were collected and brought to Pape-Dawson’s Archaeological Laboratory in Austin for cleaning and analysis. Collected artifacts will be returned to the landowner or discarded with landowner permission. A representative sample of non-diagnostic artifacts observed during the survey was photographed and documented in the field, but not collected. Project records and photographs will be curated at the Center for Archaeological Research at the University of Texas at San Antonio (CAR-UTSA) following their specific standards of preparation. Pursuant to the Archaeological Report Guidelines of the COSA-OHP, archaeological sites were evaluated according to the NRHP criteria in 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 60.4. Archaeological sites were also evaluated as required by the Archaeological Report Guidelines of the COSA-OHP according to the criteria in 13 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) 26.10.

ARTIFACT ANALYSIS
Historic artifacts were initially divided into three broad categories by material type. The material categories for diagnostic artifacts collected consist of ceramic, glass, and metal. Additional attributes such as material, surface treatment, decorative element, maker’s mark, morphological characteristics,
technological variables, form, color, size, and condition were evaluated as warranted. Sorting criteria for each artifact category are discussed below.

Ceramics were initially categorized according to ware type and then sub-divided by categorical paste attributes. Historic ware types include coarse earthenware, refined earthenware, porcelain, and stoneware. Paste attributes such as color, hardness, and porosity can be used to identify specific paste types within each ware type. Examples of paste types for coarse earthenware include redware and terracotta, while refined earthenware can be further distinguished as whiteware, ironstone, semiporcelain, and yellowware.

Glass was subdivided into functional category (container or window), color, and embossing or decoration. Metal was subdivided into composition (ferrous, brass, etc.) and function.

All prehistoric lithic artifacts recovered were initially classified as either tools or non-tools and were then sorted by raw material type. Tools were divided into subcategories including biface and modified flake. Non-tools were categorized as debitage, core, or fire-cracked rock (FCR). The assemblage of lithic debitage as well as the collection of flake tools was further subdivided according to flake reduction stage (e.g. primary, secondary, and tertiary).

Results

Records Review

The background review determined that the project area had not been previously surveyed and that no previously recorded archaeological sites were located within or adjacent to its boundary (THC 2017). Likewise, there are no previously documented National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed properties or districts, State Antiquities Landmarks (SAL), Official Texas Historical Markers (OTHM), Registered Texas Historic Landmarks (RTHL), or COSA local historic districts or landmarks within a 0.62-mile 0.62-mile (1-km) radius. However, four archaeological sites (41BX599, 41BX704, 41BX1690, and 41BX1916) were identified within 0.62 mile (1 km) of the project area (Figure 4). One archaeological survey was previously conducted adjacent to the project area along Palo Alto Road/SH 16, and seven archaeological surveys were previously conducted within the larger 0.62-mile (1-km) radius (THC 2017).

Site 41BX599 is located approximately 0.57 mile (0.92 km) south of the project area. First recorded in 1983, the site consists of a prehistoric lithic scatter roughly 16 ft by 33 ft (5 m by 10 m) in size and is situated on the southeast side of Leon Creek. The surrounding area has been used as gravel and sand barrow pits and the site appears to have been heavily impacted by these activities. Though a Clear Fork Gouge was noted in an adjacent pit, the site is of unknown age. Additional materials documented include biface fragments, cores, flakes, and burned rocks.

Site 41BX704 is located approximately 0.21 mile (0.33 km) north of the project area. This prehistoric open campsite is situated on a high bluff above Leon Creek within the Loop 410 right-of-way (ROW). Approximately 328² ft (100² m) in size, the site is assumed to be Archaic and/or Late Prehistoric in age with deposits encountered in the upper 2 inches (5 cm) only. Artifacts were mixed with broken road
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The area was disturbed by road construction and the project area was cleared of subterranean structures, as indicated by aerial photographs. The remaining structural elements consist of concrete piers, partial stairs, and concrete slabs. Artifacts observed at the site include bottles (amber, green, and colorless glass), pop-top cans, machine made bricks, rubber tires, sheet metal, and aluminum cans.

**Historic Maps and Archival Research**

Fourteen historic maps from 1845, 1846, 1867, 1871, 1887, 1903, 1907, 1911, 1918, 1919, 1927, and 1953 (Foster et al. 2006) were examined for information about the current project area. Of these, only seven maps (1871, 1887, 1903, 1918, 1919, 1927, and 1953) contained information specific to the project area. Additionally, a circa 1930 Stoner System map (Sheet 1107) was found to contain relevant cultural information. Pape-Dawson also examined recent and historic-age topographic maps (1969 and 1959) and aerial photographs (2017, 2016, 2015, 2014, 2012, 2010, 2008, 2006, 2005, 2004, 2003, 2002, and 1995 [Google Earth 2017]) (1986, 1973, 1966, 1963, 1955 [NETR Online 2017]). This research was undertaken to identify historic-age structures that may be extant within the project area, previous impacts that may have occurred at the project location, and areas that have a high potential to contain historic-age archaeological deposits. The map and aerial photographs suggest the project area was cleared and may have been used for agricultural purposes from 1955 through around 2004, when vegetation appears in the previously cleared areas. Of note is the 1995 aerial which shows possible evidence of large scale disturbances in the central portion of the project area (Google Earth 2017). The following section incorporates the historic map information with census data, property records, and genealogy.

The 1871 map of Bexar County by the Texas General Land Office (GLO) depicts the project area at the northeastern corner of Survey No. 5 that was patented to Angel Navarro and extending eastward into Survey No. 50; however, this map appears to be incorrectly georeferenced because the modern boundaries of the tract are known to be entirely within the Navarro grant. The 1887 map of Bexar County by J. D. Rullmann (Foster et al. 2006) appears more accurately georeferenced and depicts the project area as encompassed by a land grant to José Angel Navarro (GLO 2017), a soldier and leading citizen of early Texas (Campbell 2012). Somerset Road enters the tract near its southeastern corner and traverses it to the northeast on the 1887 map, with Palo Alto Road/SH 16 corresponding to the league’s eastern boundary (Foster et al. 2006).
In 1833, the Mexican Government granted José Angel Navarro one league of land (4,428.4 acres) along Leon Creek, known as Survey No. 5, Abstract No. 12 (Bexar County Deed Records [BCDR] A2:362-365). The land grant was a square that measured 5,000 varas (2.6 miles) each side (BCDR A2:364). He was the eldest child of Ángel and María Josefa (nee Ruiz) Navarro, born in San Antonio in 1784 (Campbell 2012). Angel Navarro was serving as a lieutenant in the infantry in 1813 when Spanish general Joaquín Arredondo’s army came to San Antonio. Navarro was discharged and forced to flee when Arredondo learned that Navarro’s relatives were on the side of independence from Spain. Navarro returned in 1821, proclaiming Mexico’s independence and accepting the surrender of the Mexican governor (Campbell 2012). Navarro was serving as alcalde, or head of town council when he signed the Bexar Remonstrance in 1832. Navarro was elected political chief of the Department of Bexar in 1835 and resisted the occupation of the city by Gen. Martin Perfecto de Cos. Navarro died in 1836 (Campbell 2012), and it is unlikely that he or his family resided within the current project area.

The next transaction encountered in the archives that includes the current 75.03-acre (30.36-ha) project area occurred in 1833 when Jose Maria Flores, acting on behalf of the heirs of Jose Angel Navarro, leased the land grant with 1,500 varas (0.8 mile) of frontage along Leon Creek to Don Ignacio Cassiano and his father Jose Cassiano (BCDR J1:216-217). The lease was for 5 years and the $15 annual payment allowed for building ranch houses and a corral using available wood.

In 1893, a deed of trust was filed by H. B. Adams of Bexar County that conveyed a total of 11,244 acres including 3,848 acres of the José Angel Navarro land grant to Henry P. Drought, Trustee of Bexar County; also mentioned was a $91,000 debt owed to Francis Smith of Marion County, Indiana (BCDR 125:125-140). Four years later, Francis Smith purchased the same 11,244 acres for $15,767 at a Sheriff’s sale (BCDR 159:433-439). Again, the property included 3,848 acres of the José Angel Navarro land grant.

In February 1898, Francis Smith conveyed 1,916 acres (775.4 ha) of the José Angel Navarro land grant to Mrs. Eugenia A. T. Wickes, Mrs. Caroline Laager, and George C. Altgelt for $5 (BCDR 169:332-333). Smith was living in Marion County, Indiana, at the time of sale. The deed notes that the acreage had been formerly known as, “Adams and Wickes Pasture” (BCDR 169:332-333). Wickes—who was living in St. Louis, Missouri—received half interest, while Laager and Altgelt each received a fourth.

In March 1898, Eugenia A. T. Wickes, Caroline and Henry Laager, and George C. Altgelt conveyed back to Francis Smith 1,916 acres (Adams and Wickes Pasture) for $5 (BCDR 172:200-202). The conveyance was made “in consideration of partition between Mrs. Eugenia A. T. Wickes, Caroline Laager, George C. Altgelt, and Francis Smith” (BCDR 172:201). Mrs. Wickes was residing in Cook County, Illinois, at the time of the conveyance, while the Laagers and Altgelt were residents of Bexar County. Altgeld resided at 221 Stanley Avenue, while the Laagers lived near the 200 block of South Presa Avenue, according to the 1900 U.S. Census.

The 1903 USGS map of San Antonio depicts a two-track road traversing the middle of the project area (Foster et al. 2006). It originates to the northeast, at Palo Alto Road/SH 16, trends northeast to southwest, ending at a structure south of the project area and near the Leon Creek channel.
In 1904, Mrs. E. A. T. Wickes-Nease and David A. Nease—residents of New York City—conveyed their 958 acres (387.7 ha) of the Adams and Wickes Pasture to J. A., R. L., and C. E. Andrews, who were living in Jefferson County, Texas, and who paid $8,622 cash (BCDR 232:17). Three years later, Adolf Holz and Bruno E. Voelcker purchased the 958 acres, paying $20,000 (BCDR 266:121-122). The dramatic jump in price may indicate that improvements have been made, perhaps corresponding to the structure on the 1903 USGS map. The existence of an artesian well is first mentioned in this transaction because the Andrews owned an adjacent 300 acres and retained the right to water their property upon request for 1 hour out of 24 hours, as long as the well was flowing (BCDR 266:122). The well is located north of the current project area.

The circa 1930 Stoner System Map Sheet 1107 depicts the property adjacent to the north of the project area as a 110.33-acre tract owned by J. H. Graham. Mary Barbour Chapman’s second husband, James H. Graham, bought the property in 1915 in partnership with H. A. Ernst and Charles J. Ernst (BCDR 453:494-497). After James Graham’s death, Mary Graham partitioned the 110-acre tract with H. A. Ernst into Tract 1 and Tract 2 in 1932 (BCDR 1244:449-453). Ernst received Tract 1 (the northernmost), representing one-third of the property (40.21 acres), along with one-third use rights to the artesian well on Mary Graham’s Tract 2. Two houses are depicted on Tract 2, including one to the west near Leon Creek (BCDR 1244:453). The artesian well is illustrated near the house by the creek. When electrical service was extended to Graham’s property in July 1932, the route of the transmission line was given as 3,850 ft along the tract’s southern boundary from Palo Alto Road (boundary shared with current project area) (BCDR 1339:95). The easement is also described as, “300’ North West of a new house now being constructed” (BCDR 1339:96). This house may correspond to a $2,900 building materials lien executed by Mary Graham with the Petrich-Saur Lumber Company in June of 1932 (BCDR 174:577).

In 1909 when Holz and Voelcker sold 201.29 acres out of the overall 958 acres including the subject tract, they were also the owners of the adjacent 300 acres, and retained similar watering rights from Philemon and Alfonse Hooge, who paid $15,096.75 (BCDR 331:27-29). The following year, the Hooges partitioned the property according to the amount each man paid (Philemon got 110.71 acres; Alfonse got 90.58 acres), but water rights to the well were split evenly with Alfonse having right-of-way to dig an irrigation ditch (332:412-414). It is specified that Philemon was entitled to one extra day of water during each ten-day period, enabling him to furnish Holz and Voelcker with their one hour of water. Alfonse also granted Philemon the right to cross “my 90.58-acre tract of land at the crossing on the Leon Creek on account of the banks of said creek being very high and steep on his land” (332:412-414).

Alfonse and Annie Hooge sold their 90.58-acre tract for $8,000 in 1913 to M. L. Oppenheimer (BCDR 419:86). Five years later, M. L. and Rachael Oppenheimer sold the same property to M. H. Trice and F. F. Ludolph for $9,000 (BCDR 535:145-147). Water rights are also conveyed each time. The 1918 USACE map of Lytle depicts the project area with much the same information, except now an agricultural field is noted in association with the structure to the south of the project area (Foster et al. 2006). The 1919 map of Bexar Oil Fields labels the project area, “Trice & Ludolph,” illustrates the modern configuration of Palo Alto Road/SH 16, and has Leon Creek clipping the southeastern end of the project area (Foster et al. 2006).
The 1927 USACE map of West San Antonio depicts the project area with no structures (Foster et al. 2006). The northern boundary is a two-track road and a fence is indicated along the southern boundary. The western end is open to Leon Creek, while Palo Alto Road/SH 16 forms the eastern boundary. The two-track road turns south along Leon Creek, intersecting with another two-track before crossing the creek outside the project area (Foster et al. 2006).

The property is mentioned in several warranty deeds that provide extensions of a vendor’s lien (BCDR 789:578; 919:189-191; 1013:259) before M. H. and Lillian Trice and F. F. and Janie D. Ludolph conveyed the property in 1928 to C. R. Jackson of Dallas County, Texas, through a warranty deed for $10 and $3,000 in promissory notes (BCDR 1013:260). Although Trices and Ludophs owned the property for 10 years, U.S. Census and city directory data list them on Augusta Street and West Summit Avenue, respectively, during this period. Jackson then conveyed the property to J. J. Strickland for the same terms (BCDR 1013:259). Strickland in turn conveyed the property to Elmer H. Acord via a warranty deed in 1930 for $10 plus the assumption of four $1,000-notes payable to E. B. Chandler, and an installment note in favor of J. J. Strickland for $9,737, further secured by a deed of trust in 1932 (BCDR 1180:244-246; 1207:596-597). Elmer H. Acord conveyed the property back to Strickland in 1932 (1291:309-311), and this deed suggests that Acord had been operating a dairy farm on the property. He apparently continued with his dairy farm on the site because the following year he sells the dairy business and farm equipment and livestock that constitute Acord Dairy to his step-son Lawrence W. Maurice, noting that “the Acord Dairy (is) located eight miles out on the Palo Alto Road on the J. J. Strickland Ranch...” (BCDR 7:538).

The circa 1930 Stoner System Map Sheet 1107 depicts the project area within a 90.58-acre tract owned by Elmer H. Acord. The tract has 246.71 varas (685.3 ft [208.9 m]) of frontage along Palo Alto Road/SH 16 to the east, and a two-track road is adjacent to and parallel along its northern boundary, which is 2,072 varas (5,756 ft [1,754 m]). The southern boundary is also 2,072 varas long and was fenced. Five structures (presumably the dairy) are indicated in the southeastern corner of the tract. A two-track road extends south from and perpendicular to the roadway along the northern boundary, crossing the south boundary fence and extending further south to a group of three structures on the neighboring property, which was a 450-acre tract owned by Judge O. A. Mills (of Uvalde, Texas). In addition, there is a driveway leading to this group of structures from Palo Alto Road/SH 16. A segment of Leon Creek is also depicted within the tract owned by Elmer H. Acord.

Elmer H. Acord was born on December 18, 1878 in Joplin, Missouri, to John T. Acord (1842-1909) and Margaret Bailey Acord (1843-1932) (Find A Grave 2017). He married the widow Emma Olympia Carper who already had three children (Mary T. Maurice (also spelled Mourice), Lawrence W. Maurice, and Irene C. Maurice), and together they had a son, Joseph George Acord (Bexar County Deed Records [BCDR] 3979:275-277). The 1920 U.S. Census lists the Acord family living in Houston, but Elmer Acord registered his brand in Bexar County in 1928, which was the letter “J” on the left shoulder (BCDR V:146). Emma Carper first married in 1895 to Thomas Maurice, who died in 1901, then married Acord in 1903 (BCDR 3979:275). The 1930 Census lists Elmer, Emma, and their son George Acord, along with uncle Henry Chatman (age 70) and lodger Arthur Chaves (age 23) living on the subject property. All of the men worked on the dairy. By the 1940 U.S. Census, Acord’s step-son Lawrence Maurice (to whom Acord sold the dairy in 1933) is living on Dyer Road, a street that does not currently exist, but it would have been situated
roughly at Kelly Field, falling in the census after Acme and Castroville Roads, but before Holm Road. Further evidence that the Maurices did not live on the subject property is found in the 1934 city directory (John F. Worley Directory Company 1935), which lists Lawrence and Pauline Maurice at 885 East Hart Lane. By 1952, the Maurices reside at 1653 Somerset Road (John F. Worley Directory Company 1953). In 1959, the directory indicates that the Maurice Dairy is also at this location (R. L. Polk and Company 1960), which is situated about 3 miles (4.8 km) north of the subject property.

In 1943, the J. J. Strickland Estate sold 90.58 acres (including the project area) to John A. and Frances Perkins for $750 plus $6,750 in promissory notes (BCDR 1969:460). Two months later, the Perkins sold the warranty deed with a vendor’s lien to Leo and Ophelia Schoellman for $10 and $6,750 in promissory notes, with the Perkins retaining the vendor’s lien until the property is paid in full (BCDR 1971:617). The 1940 U.S. Census lists the Schoellmans as living at 306 Barrett Avenue, but they resided on the subject property by 1954 (BCDR 3473:30-32). Leo Schoellman registered his livestock brand (“8X” on the left side) in 1944 (BCDR M:365). The Schoellmans borrowed against the land in 1945 (BCDR 2138:375; 2142:168), earning a partial release in 1954 (BCDR 3470:503-504).

The 1953 Army Map Service map of Terrell Wells depicts the project area with a driveway along its northern boundary and a transmission line crossing from the southeast to the northwest near Leon Creek. Four structures are indicated along Palo Alto Road/SH 16 (Foster et al. 2006). A stock pond was constructed along the Comanche Creek drainage between the 1953 when none is depicted on the Terrell Wells USGS 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle (Foster et al. 2006) and 1955 (NETR Online 2017) when it first appears in aerial photography. The stock tank was still functioning at the time of survey. These fields and a stock pond created near the Comanche Creek drainage were likely associated with a cluster of four structures depicted on the 1955 aerial (NETR Online 2017).

When Palo Alto Road/SH 16 was widened in 1954 and the state purchased ROW from the Schoellmans, it was noted that their house was moved and their fences rebuilt at the new right-of-way line (BCDR 3473:30-32). After the death of Leo in 1971 (BCDR 2380:182), Ophelia Schoellman conveyed the property to her children, Leon J. Schoellman and Gladys Agnes Schoellman via a warranty deed in 1974 that specified Ophelia reserved the right “to use the premises and the rents, revenues, and profits thereof for and during her natural life” (BCDR 7335:216). Ophelia Schoellman died in 1981 (BCDR 2380:182). When Leon J. Schoellman and Gladys Agnes Schoellman sold the property in 2002 to the Alecozay Family Limited Partnership, it was noted that both grantors had homesteads elsewhere (BCDR 9453:2161).

By 1975, the topographic map shows at least two barns have been added. While the configuration may have changed slightly, several structures remain clearly visible through 1973; by 1986, the vegetation has grown in the area and it is difficult to verify whether the structures remain standing, though it appears they have all been demolished (NETR Online 2017). The western portion of the project area, just east of Leon Creek, has remained wooded since 1955 with two exceptions: a transmission line crossing this portion of the project area that first appears on the 1959 topographic map and the mining symbol on the 1975 topographic map that suggests the area east of the creek was subject to modification associated with mining. This is visible as a large pit on the 1973 aerial located roughly 625 ft (191 m) from the
southwest corner of the project area and about 100 ft (30 m) north of the southern project boundary (NETR Online 2017).

**Historic Maps and Archival Research Summary**

José Angel Navarro received a land grant containing the project area in 1833. The patriot died in 1836, making it unlikely that he or his family resided within the current project area. In 1893, a deed of trust was filed by H. B. Adams that conveyed a total of 11,244 acres including 3,848 acres of the José Angel Navarro land grant to Henry P. Drought, Trustee of Bexar County (BCDR 125:125-140). Four years later, Francis Smith of Marion County, Indiana, purchased the same 11,244 acres for $15,767 at a Sheriff’s sale (BCDR 159:433-439).

In 1898, Francis Smith conveyed 1,916 acres (775.4 ha) of the José Angel Navarro land grant, including the project area, to Mrs. Eugenia A. T. Wickes, Mrs. Caroline Laager, and George C. Altgelt (BCDR 169:332-333). The next month, Eugenia A. T. Wickes, Caroline and Henry Laager, and George C. Altgelt conveyed back to Francis Smith 1,916 acres (Adams and Wickes Pasture) for $5 (BCDR 172:200-202). The conveyance was made “in consideration of partition between Mrs. Eugenia A. T. Wickes, Caroline Laager, George C. Altgelt, and Francis Smith” (BCDR 172:201). Mrs. Wickes was residing in Cook County, Illinois, at the time of the conveyance, while the Laagers and Altgelt were residents of Bexar County. Altgeld resided at 221 Stanley Avenue, while the Laagers lived near the 200 block of South Presa Avenue, according to the 1900 U.S. Census.


M. H. and Lillian Trice and F. F. and Janie D. Ludolph conveyed the property in 1928 to C. R. Jackson of Dallas County, Texas (BCDR 1013:260). Although Trice and Ludolph owned the property for 10 years, they never lived here. Jackson quickly conveyed the property to J. J. Strickland (BCDR 1013:259). Strickland in turn conveyed the property to Elmer H. Acord in 1930 (BCDR 1180:244-246; 1207:596-597). The 1930 U.S. Census lists the Acord family on Palo Alto Road. Acord conveyed it back to Strickland in 1932 (1291:309-311), but apparently kept the Acord Dairy operating at that location because he sold it in 1933 to his stepson Lawrence W. Maurice, noting its location on the Strickland Ranch (BCDR 7:538). Maurice apparently never resided at the subject property.

In 1943, the J. J. Strickland Estate sold 90.58 acres (including the project area) to John A. and Frances Perkins (BCDR 1969:460). Two months later, the Perkins sold the warranty deed with a vendor’s lien to Leo and Ophelia Schoellman (BCDR 1971:617). After Leo’s death (BCDR 2380:182), Ophelia Schoellman conveyed the property to her children, Leon J. Schoellman and Gladys Agnes Schoellman in 1974,
specifying that Ophelia could “use the premises and the rents, revenues, and profits thereof for and during her natural life” (BCDR 7335:216). The 1940 U.S. Census lists the Schoellmans as residing at 306 Barrett Avenue, but they resided on the subject property by 1954 (BCDR 3473:30-32). Ophelia Schoellman died in 1981 (BCDR 2380:182). When Leon J. Schoellman and Gladys Agnes Schoellman sold the property in 2002 to the Alecozay Family Limited Partnership, it was noted that both grantors had homesteads elsewhere (BCDR 9453:2161).

Thus, the property changed hands multiple times between 1904 and 1943, with no one retaining it for more than a few years, and none of the owners apparently residing here, although the Acord Dairy operated here during the 1930s and the U.S. Census lists the Acord family along Palo Alto Road in 1930. Adjacent to the north of the project area is an artesian well with a nearby structure that was built 1915-1930. The Schoellmans, who owned the property from 1943 to 2002, were residing in San Antonio in 1940, but by 1954 they lived at the subject property, presumably until 1981 (BCDR 3473:30-32).

**Fieldwork**

Pape-Dawson archaeologists conducted an intensive archaeological survey of the 75.03 acres (30.36 ha) project area on June 14, 15, 20, 22, and 28, 2017. The archaeological survey consisted of a pedestrian survey with shovel testing followed by the excavation of backhoe trenches across stream terraces (Figure 5). The survey effort resulted in the recordation of two new archaeological sites (41BX2185 and 41BX2186) and one Isolated Find (IF). Site 41BX2185 contains historic and prehistoric material and is located in the western end of the project area, while 41BX2186 is a historic-age site at the eastern end. IF01 is a small scatter of historic glass.

The landscape of the project area consisted of level to gently sloping upland terraces and plains. Vegetation primarily consisted of short to tall grasses and groves of oak and mesquite (Figure 6). Tall grasses included giant ragweed intermixed with mesquite and oak that tend to correspond to areas with prior disturbance or along creek banks (Figure 7). Ground surface visibility throughout the project area was generally less than 10 percent depending on leaf litter and grasses. Large pasture areas toward the eastern end of the project area provided better ground visibility with sparse trees (mainly mesquite) and areas of short to medium grasses (Figure 8).

Disturbances within the project area have resulted from both natural and artificial impacts. Artificial impacts included multiple two-track roads along fence lines within the project area, two pipelines traversing the project area (Figure 9), a pond (Figure 10), multiple push piles, and evidence of large swaths of fill deposits. In addition, there are various piles of debris across the project area including modern building material and modern household trash dumps.

As discussed in the historic map review section, a portion in the southwestern corner of the project area appears to have been mined during the 1970s. No evidence of this was encountered during the current survey effort, though one shovel test within site 41BX2185 was excavated in the vicinity of the
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Figure 6. Vegetation in western end of project area, camera facing south.

Figure 7. Example of large rag weed in disturbed area, camera facing northeast.
Figure 8. General vegetation and ground visibility in eastern pastures, camera facing north.

Figure 9. SAWS sewer line man hole west of the pond, camera facing north.
pit visible on the 1973 aerial (NETR Online 2017). A roughly 13.7-acre (5.5-ha) area near the center of the project area shows signs of fill and clearing events as evidenced by push piles and soils containing gravels mixed with asphalt, concrete, ceramic pipe, and plastic (Figure 11, Figure 12, and Figure 13). In addition, a large, deep ditch traverses this disturbed section, running east to west from the pond to the east. Visible on modern aerial imagery, the ditch first appears in a December 2006 aerial photograph (Google Earth 2017).

Within the northern section along Comanche Creek, an area roughly 6.7 acres (2.7 ha) in size along both the west and east banks of the creek showed evidence of fill episodes. The west bank rises up above the surrounding area, while the east bank has been filled and leveled in preparation of the construction of more houses associated with the adjacent development (Figure 14). In the eastern end of the project area, multiple push piles and trash pits were documented. During the archaeological survey, a section of what would be designated site 41BX2186 was bull dozed in preparation for the construction of the proposed housing development (Figure 15). Natural impacts include erosion and bioturbation caused primarily by erosion along Leon and Comanche Creeks, tree fall, animal burrowing, cattle and hog wallows, and numerous game and cattle trails crisscrossing the project area.

**Shovel Tests**
Archaeologists walked the entire project area at transects spaced 98 ft (30 m) apart visually inspecting the ground surface for artifacts and features. Shovel tests were placed in areas with the perceived potential for intact soils and with low ground surface visibility. During the survey effort, a total of 60 shovel tests
Figure 11. Large excavated area with push piles in central disturbed area, camera facing northeast.

Figure 12. Large push pile with concrete boulders and PVC piping.
Figure 13. Asphalt and concrete chunks observed on the surface within disturbed area.

Figure 14. Northern section with dammed Comanche Creek and filled western bank, camera facing northwest.
Figure 15. Bulldozed area in the eastern end of the project area, camera facing southeast.

were excavated with an average depth of 17 inches (in) (42 cm) below surface. Of those, seven shovel tests were positive for cultural material (Appendix A).

Shovel test excavations revealed that the soils varied across the development area from shallow gravely soils to deeper alluvial clayey soils. Those excavated on the upper terrace above Leon Creek typically exposed brown to dark-yellowish-brown silty clay loams with a max depth of 24 inches (60 cm) below surface before encountering compact Marl (Figure 16). This generally corresponded to the Atco clay loam, 3 to 5 percent slopes, eroded mapped in the area. Three shovel test excavated on a lower terrace of Leon Creek encountered very dark brown clay loam soils to a depth of 31 inches (80 cm) below surface more typical of Frio soils (Figure 17).
Figure 16. Shovel test profile along the upper terrace of Leon Creek within the Atco soil series.

Figure 17. Shovel test profile on lower terrace of Leon Creek.
Within the central portions of the project area, soils varied greatly in color. In the areas with little to no disturbance the soils generally modeled those of the Lewisville soil series, with the areas between the upper terrace of Leon Creek and Comanche Creek encountering dark grayish brown to brown silty clay, and brown to dark yellowish brown silty clay soils (Figure 18). In the highly disturbed areas, soils were extensively mottled and ranged from white, to black with gravel and modern debris often mixed in (Figure 19). Along Comanche Creek shovel tests generally encountered black clay corresponding to the Tinn series soils mapped in the area.

Along the eastern third of the project area, archaeologists encountered some pockets of disturbed soils around the historic foundations at site 41BX2185. These soils generally contained dense impassable gravels some of which could be associated with historic driveways (Figure 20) while the remainder were black to dark grayish brown clay to clay loam consistent with the Houston Black soil series (Figure 21).

Figure 18. Shovel test profile within the Houston soil series.
Figure 19. Example of disturbed soils encountered in the center of the project area.

Figure 20. Shovel test profile in the eastern end of the project area encountering gravels.
Backhoe Trenches
A total of four trenches was mechanically excavated within the project area along stream terraces (see Figure 5, Appendix B). No trenches were excavated across the northern stream terraces as shovel tests placed within this area encountered disturbed soils as evidenced by the presence of mixed soil strata down to a meter. Trenches 1 and 2 were excavated across the Comanche Creek stream terrace within Tinn and Frio series soils. Trenches 3 and 4 were excavated above Leon Creek in Atco series soils. Three trenches were negative for cultural material and cultural features while Trench 3 was positive for historic and prehistoric materials. Profile descriptions for each trench are presented in Appendix B.

Trench 1 was excavated approximately 82 ft (25 m) east of Comanche Creek. With its long axis oriented northeast to southwest, the trench was 21.3 ft (6.5 m)-long by 4.9 ft (1.5 m)-wide reaching a maximum depth of 4.3 ft (1.3 m). Three stratigraphic zones consisting of black clay to pale brown clay marl were recorded. The trench was terminated when the marl was encountered.

Trench 2 was located roughly 82 ft (25 m) west of the pond on Comanche Creek and 335 ft (102 m) southwest of Trench 1. The trench was 16.4 ft (5 m)-long by 4.6 ft (1.4 m)-wide with its long axis oriented northeast to southwest. A total of two zones consisting of black clay, and dark-yellowish-brown silty clay was recorded. The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 5.9 ft (1.8 m) and was terminated after pre-Holocene age soils were encountered.

Figure 21. Shovel test profile in eastern half of project area typical of the Houston soil series.
Trench 3 was excavated around 656 ft (200 m) east of Leon Creek and 52 ft (16 m) south of the northern edge of the project boundary. With its long axis oriented northeast to southwest, the trench was 16.4 ft (5 m) long by 4.6 ft (1.4 m) wide with a maximum depth of 4.3 ft (1.3 m). Two stratigraphic zones consisting of dark brown silty clay loam, and yellowish brown loam were recorded. The trench was terminated at pre-Holocene-age marl. One flake was documented at 1.2 inches (3 cm) below surface in the profile, and some historic and prehistoric material was noted in the backdirt during excavation.

Trench 4 was excavated toward the southwestern end of the project area roughly 115 ft (35 m) north of the pipeline corridor. The trench was 19.7 ft (6 m) long by 4.3 ft (1.3 m) wide and was oriented northwest to southeast. A total of two zones consisting of brown silty loam, and yellowish brown loam were recorded. The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 3.9 ft (1.2 m) and was terminated after encountering marl.

**Site 41BX2185**

*Setting and Description*

Site 41BX2185 is situated on a mostly level upper terrace overlooking Leon Creek to the west (Figure 22). The site is in the western portion of the project area, just east of the floodplain of Leon Creek. Vegetation consists of seasonal grasses and weeds, dense scrub brush, and oak, mesquite, and huisache trees. Site 41BX2185 includes a portion of a mid-nineteenth to twentieth-century farmstead and prehistoric site. The historic component at the site consists of collapsed historic-age buildings and a scatter of historic-age debris associated with several trash dumps. The collapsed buildings at the site include a barn and a historic truck converted into a shed. The prehistoric component consists of a scatter of non-diagnostic lithic debitage and tools.

*Work Performed and Recommendation*

The site was initially identified by a scatter of historic and prehistoric debris along a two-track road in the western portion of the project area (Figure 23). As archaeologists walked the area, it became apparent that sections of this area had been used to dump trash for decades, as four separate trash piles were encountered along the western end of the project area with materials ranging in age from the mid-nineteenth to twentieth century with modern debris mixed in. These included colorless bottle shards, milk glass shards, solarized glass shards, white earthenware, stoneware, lithic debitage, stone tools, cores, and fire-cracked rock (FCR) observed on the ground surface. Fifteen shovel tests and two trenches were excavated to define the site within the project area. Of these, six shovel tests and one trench were positive for cultural material.

Archaeologists encountered two collapsed structures located along the edge of the upper terrace. The larger barn (Figure 24) was enclosed by a fence with a gate leading to the area with the smaller shed. The smaller shed was a converted, mid-twentieth-century Hormel delivery truck (Figure 25). Both historic and prehistoric material was noted on the surface in this area. In addition, a shovel test was placed near each structure, both of which were positive for historic and prehistoric artifacts to a maximum depth of 23.6 inches (60 cm) below surface.
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Figure 23. General overview of site 41BX2185 from two-track, camera facing north.

Figure 24. Collapsed barn in 41BX2185, camera facing southwest.
Of note is that the prehistoric items were isolated to the upper levels with the historic extending to the maximum depth of the shovel tests. The deeper historic materials (two creamware sherds) appear to be mid-nineteenth century. The soil, similar to those expected with Atco series soils, was brown compact clay loam with calcium carbonate inclusions that increased with depth. Trench 3 was excavated just east of these shovel tests and encountered similar soils. Along the northern fence line, archaeologists encountered an early-twentieth-century trash dump. A number of milk glass Pond’s Cold Cream jars, aqua and amber bottle glass sherds, and colorless medicinal and beverage bottles were observed in the area (Figure 26). These artifacts are likely associated with a mid-nineteenth- to early-twentieth-century residence and artesian spring (converted into a pond) located on the property adjacent to the north, just north of the fence line that forms the boundary of the project area. The artesian well is still flowing today, creating a small stream that runs south from the pond, across the project area, and into Leon Creek (Figure 27).

Closer to Leon Creek, two shovel tests encountered buried prehistoric deposits that extended to at least 23.6 inches (60 cm) below surface. Soils along Leon Creeks lower terrace were very different from those encountered on the upper terrace and hint at the possibility of intact buried deposits in this area. In addition, archaeologists observed that the surficial prehistoric material increased along the north edge of the project area near the location of the artesian spring located just north of the property boundary. Looking across the fence line, it was obvious that the site extends into the adjacent property as stone tools, cores, debitage, and FCR were observed north of the fence. As a spring is directly adjacent to the property boundary, it is no surprise that both prehistoric and historic settlers chose to occupy this location.
Figure 26. Portion of the northern trash dump with colorless and milk glass bottles on surface, camera facing north.

Figure 27. Small creek running from artesian well north of the project area, camera facing north.
South of the collapsed barn was the largest trash pile documented at the site. It contained a variety of mid-twentieth century to modern materials including glass bottles, metal cans, wire, pipes, siding, tires, and various large household items scattered across an area roughly 216 ft (66 m) east to west by 82 ft (25 m) north to south (Figure 28). Downslope and west of the barn and improvised shed is a modern trash pile containing primarily structural material (Figure 29). Along the southern end of the site, a pressurized gas pipeline crosses diagonally through the project area. A large amount of prehistoric material was observed within the cleared pipeline easement. As this was obviously disturbed, archaeologists investigated the surface to the north, looking for open patches to see if material extended beyond the disturbed area. This closer inspection revealed the presence of stone tools (choppers, biface fragments, modified flakes) and FCR scattered across the surface; thus, the surficial scatter was much more extensive than could be observed through the dense vegetation. On the southern side of the pipeline, with ground visibility just as limited, and only a historic trash dump was documented. This contained a number of glass soda and beer bottles, a cathode-ray television, metal scrap and cans, tires and plastic items (Figure 30). One shovel test (KH02) in this area was positive for historic material at 3.9 inches (10 cm) below surface. All other shovel tests and the trench in the area were negative for cultural material.
Figure 29. Overview of modern debris west of the barns, camera facing east.

Figure 30. View of southern most trash dump at 41BX2185, camera facing west.
Artsfacts

Pape-Dawson archaeologists observed a scatter of mid-nineteenth to twentieth-century artifacts with concentrations at three different trash dumps documented at the site. The northernmost dump contains the some of the oldest material with nineteenth to early-twentieth century artifacts observed on the surface. In addition, a scatter of prehistoric artifacts extended across the surface of site 41BX2185. A handful of both historic and prehistoric artifacts were recovered from excavations within the site. However, based on the distribution of the artifacts and the profile of the soils, it appears that some of these are in a disturbed context. Only the shovel tests excavated along the western edge of the project area that are on the terraces above Leon Creek appeared to contain intact subsurface deposits. Historic artifacts were initially divided by material into three broad categories. The material categories for the site assemblage consist of ceramic, glass, and metal. Additional attributes such as material, surface treatment, decorative element, maker’s mark, morphological characteristics, technological variables, form, color, size, and condition were evaluated as warranted. Prehistoric artifacts were divided by type.

The historic-age artifacts included glass fragments, ceramic sherds, and ferrous metal fragments. More specifically, the historic-age artifact assemblage included colorless glass body shards and bottles, aqua-colored body shards, solarized “amethyst” glass shards, amber glass shards and bottles, green glass shards and bottles, milk glass jars and jar fragments, cobalt glass bottles, a number of whiteware sherds, porcelain sherds, and Albany-slipped stoneware body fragments, along with wire nails, wire, and unidentifiable metal fragments (Figure 31). The diagnostic historic artifacts present suggest the historic component at the site dates primarily to the mid- to late-twentieth century with an older mid-nineteenth to early-twentieth century component present in the northern end of the site.

The representative sample of glass shards (n= 45) recovered from the site appear to come from a variety of vessel types such as canning jars, medicinal bottles, and food and beverage bottles, mixed with a few window glass fragments. Of the 42 glass artifacts, eight were recovered from shovel tests down to a maximum depth of 12 inches (30 cm), and three were recovered from the backdirt of BHT 3. The remainder was all surface deposits. Two solarized glass (amethyst) sherds were collected from the site (Figure 31). One has a star pattern with a scalloped rim typical of pressed glass bowls. Solarized amethyst glass was most commonly used from 1870 to 1930 (Lindsey 2016).

Twenty-one bottles were collected from the surface of the site. These include a cobalt glass Noxzema jar and a Genuine Phillips bottle, both of which appear to date to the mid-twentieth century (Lindsey 2016). Three perfume/cologne/aftershave bottles were collected. Of these, one is a colorless bottle with a maker’s mark. All three appear to be mid-late twentieth century. One colorless medicinal bottle collected from the northern most trash pile has an offset suction scar and “BOTTLE MADE IN U.S.A.” on the base. It is embossed on the front panel with “CHAMBERLAIN” and has beveled edges (Figure 32). Research indicates that the bottle was a Chamberlain’s Cough Remedy medicinal bottle. Chamberlain Medicine Company manufactured the cough remedy from 1908 to 1919 (Griffin 2013).

One brown snuff bottle was collected from the large dump site. The base contained two embossed dots and no other marks (Figure 33). While there is still debate about what these dots mean, the general
Figure 31. Example of historic artifact fragments recovered from the surface at 41BX2185.

Figure 32. Chamberlain’s bottle from northern trash pile at site 41BX2185.
consensus is that they either indicate the strength of the snuff in each bottle, or represent glass maker marks. The number of dots observed on snuff bottles seems to be between 1 and 6 with the theory that the larger the number the stronger the snuff. In general, snuff bottles with these dots date to the late-nineteenth to mid-twentieth centuries (Lindsey 2016).

Archaeologists collected a sampling of the different types of beverage bottles observed in the trash piles. Of the these, seven were soda and two were beer bottles. These include Dr Pepper, Coca-Cola, 7-Up, Fanta, Orange Crush, Sun Tang, Dixie Brand, and two unmarked beer bottles (Figure 34). Most of the soda bottles appear to date from the 1960s to 1970s based on manufacture and production codes on the bases (Lindsey 2017). However, the Dixie Brand soda bottle dates to the early-twentieth century (Figure 35). Research indicates that the manufacturer changed its name to “Chic Chic Bottling Works” around 1920 (Lindsey 2017). Additional bottles noted at the trash dumps included a Folgers coffee bottle, a brown McCormick’s bottle, a colorless syrup-like bottle, a possible ketchup bottle, and an unmarked clear jar. Table 1 lists the ten bottles with maker’s marks collected from the surface at 41BX2185 (Lindsey 2017).

A representative sample of 17 ceramic sherds was collected from the site, three of which were from subsurface deposits. Ceramics include creamware, whiteware, semi-porcelain, and stoneware (Figure 31). Two molded sherds with green and yellow exterior glaze were collected from shovel test MV01 near the collapsed barn (Figure 36). While the first sherd was encountered between 11.8 and 15.7 inches (30 to 40 cm) and the second from 15.7 to 20.5 inches (40 to 52 cm), the two conjoining pieces’ refit. Based on the color and hardness of the paste, the sherds appear to be creamware (possibly Annular ware) with a
Figure 34. Example of bottles collected from site 41BX2185.
Figure 35. Dixie Brand soda bottle found in northern portion of 41BX2185.

Figure 36. Two conjoining creamware sherds recovered from levels 4 and 5 in shovel test MV01.
production range from 1785–1840 (FLMH 2008). White ware artifacts collected at the site are primarily undecorated (n=5), with one hand-painted body sherd present (Figure 31). Hand-painted white wares appear in Texas around the 1820s and are still produced today (THC 2015). Six porcelain fragments were collected from the site (Figure 31). One plate fragment with a partial foot ring was recovered from the backdirt of Trench 3. Semi-porcelain sherds collected from the surface include one possible cup or pitcher fragment with molded dots running vertically to the rim, a small section of a handle, and two blue transfer-printed vessel fragments. Production of blue transfer print dates to between 1826–1831 (Stelle 2001).

Three stoneware sherds were collected from the surface. These have an Albany-like slip on the interior and a salt glaze on the exterior (Figure 31). While stoneware is still produced today, it was a very common utility ware in the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries (Ketchum 1991). Albany-like slip glazes ceased in commercial production around 1940 based on the general public disapproval of dark colors for food storage, as it was perceived as unhygienic (Greer 1981).

A total of 86 prehistoric artifacts were collected from the surface and subsurface. This number is only a representative fraction of the material observed at the site. The lithic material collected from the surface includes 4 bifaces, 3 biface fragments, 2 butted hand axes, 14 modified flakes, 2 cores, 21 tertiary flakes, 8 secondary flakes, 4 pieces of shatter, and 7 FCR (Figure 37, Figure 38, Figure 39, and Figure 40). These artifacts were scattered across the entire site, but found in a higher density along the northern end. Of the 86 total artifacts, 23 were recovered from shovel tests to a max depth of 19.7 inches (50 cm) below surface, and one modified flake was recovered from Trench 3 at 1 inch (3 cm) below surface (Table 2).

Table 1. Diagnostic maker’s marks on bottles from site 41BX2185.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Makers Mark</th>
<th>Manufacture</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owens-Illinois Glass Co.</td>
<td>1 Sun Tang Beverages bottle, 1 Orange Crush bottle, 1 Fanata bottle, 1 McCormick bottle, 2 brown beer bottles</td>
<td>1954-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owens-Illinois Glass Co.</td>
<td>7up bottle</td>
<td>1940-1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hazel-Atlas Glass Co.</td>
<td>Perfume bottle</td>
<td>1923-ca. 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXIE</td>
<td>Dixie Glass Works, Chic Chic Bottling Works</td>
<td>Dixie Brand soda bottle</td>
<td>1898-ca. 1907, 1922-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anchor Hocking Glass Corp.</td>
<td>Possible syrup bottle</td>
<td>1938-ca. 1980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 37. Example of bifaces from the surface of the site.

Figure 38. Example of biface fragments on the surface at 41BX2185.
Figure 39. Example of butted axes observed on the surface at 41BX2185.

Figure 40. Example of modified flakes observed within the site.
Table 2. Type and depth of lithics recovered from shovel tests at 41BX2185.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth Below Surface</th>
<th>Modified Flake</th>
<th>Tertiary Flake</th>
<th>Primary Flake</th>
<th>Shatter</th>
<th>FCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 (0-10 cm)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 (10-20 cm)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 (20-30 cm)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4 (30-40 cm)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5 (40-50 cm)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions and Recommendations

The additional archival research indicates that site 41BX2186 is within a tract of land owned by E.H. Acord, and possibly associated with the “the Acord Dairy”. Elmer Acord registered his brand in Bexar County in 1928, which was the letter “J” on the left shoulder (BCDR V:146). The 1930 Census lists Elmer, his wife Emma, their son George, uncle Henry, and a lodger living on the eastern portion of the property. In 1933 he sold the dairy and farm equipment and livestock that constitute Acord Dairy to his step-son Lawrence W. Maurice. However, based on the Stoner map, it is possible that the older artifacts are associated with a historic home located just north of the fence line on property owned by Mary Graham (1915-1930). In addition, the two collapsed structures located within the site do not appear on aerals until the 1960s and thus are more likely associated with the Schoellmanns who owned the land between 1943 and 2002.

Based on temporally diagnostic manufacturing techniques of the observed artifacts and results of the archival research, the historic component of site 41BX2185 likely dates as early as the mid-nineteenth century up to the present. The prehistoric component lacks temporally diagnostic artifacts or cultural features. Subsurface deposits observed in the former agricultural field were encountered within the plow zone and appear to be in a mixed context. Based on the paucity of subsurface artifacts and prevalence of artifacts located in mixed contexts, site 41BX2185 is not likely to yield additional information beneficial to the history or prehistory of the area. Therefore, the archaeological deposit at site 41BX2185 is recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP or for designation as an SAL, and no further archaeological work is recommended. However, the site likely extends to the north, and archaeologists observed that the surficial prehistoric material increased along the north edge of the project area near the location of the artesian spring located just north of the property boundary. Looking north across the fence line, archeologists observed stone tools, cores, debitage, and FCR associated with the spring. Thus, the NRHP and SAL eligibility of the site beyond the current project area remains unknown.

Site 41BX2186

Setting and Description

Site 41BX2186 is an early- to mid-twentieth-century farmstead situated on mostly level uplands east of Comanche Creek. Located in the eastern end of the project area, just west of Palo Alto Road/SH 16, the site consists of a scatter of debris associated with several historic-age features. Soils are mapped as Houston Black gravelly clay with 1 to 3 percent slopes. Vegetation consists of mature oak, mesquite, and persimmon trees, dense scrub brush, cacti, and seasonal grasses and weeds that limited surface visibility to less than 10 percent. During the current survey effort, a portion of the site was bulldozed in preparation for construction of the housing development (Figure 41 and Figure 42).
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General view of bulldozed area in site 41BX2186, looking south.

Work Performed and Recommendation

Eight features were defined at site 41BX2186, including five concrete slabs (Features A1, A2, A5, A7, and A8), three sets of concrete steps associated with sidewalks and concrete footing piers (Feature A6), six concrete footing piers (Feature A4), and a wooden fence associated with a small animal pen and coop (Feature A3). As defined by the extent of the historic features, the site measures roughly 361 ft (110 m) east to west and extends both to the north and south boundaries of the project area, roughly 686 ft (209 m). The site was initially identified when a large concrete foundation was observed from a gravel road that extends to a large modern barn just west of the site. Modern trash was ubiquitous across the site surface, consisting of colorless and amber glass bottles, metal cans and buckets, a plastic doll, rubber tires, ceramic tiles, aluminum siding, a ceramic bath tub and cathode ray tube television. Seven shovel tests were excavated, encountering black to dark grayish brown clay and clay loam soils. Of these, only one shovel test was positive for cultural material (KH18), yielding one shard of colorless bottle glass at depths ranging from 0 to 3.9 inches (0 to 10 cm) below surface.

A number of historic-age foundations and other features associated with the site were observed within the eastern end of the project area. From north to south, Feature A1 is a small concrete foundation just south of Palo Alto Road and paralleling the northern fence line (Figure 43). The slab is roughly 10 ft (3 m) by 15 ft (4.6 m) with rotting lumber, gravels, and trash dumped on it. Just south and east of the slab are two large push piles full of concrete chunks, beer bottles, bricks, plastic items, and other material. Roughly 210 ft (64 m) southeast of these was a large concrete foundation (Feature A2) roughly 80 ft (24 m) north to south and 30 ft (9 m) east to west with multiple rooms still identifiable (Figure 44). Of note was a room
Figure 43. Feature A1, concrete slab at north end of 41BX2186, camera facing southwest.

Figure 44. Foundation A2 at site 41BX2186, camera facing at the southern half.
located on the northeast end of the structure which appeared to have been insulated as there were two layers of concrete with some type of foam insulation in between (Figure 45). The entire foundation was overgrown with trees, grasses, and cacti (Figure 46). The concrete that is visible appears to have large chucks of red brick incorporated as temper (Figure 47). Southwest of the foundation is a wooden fence that extended toward a large pen and a possible chicken coop (Feature A3) made of cedar posts and a tin roof (Figure 48). Due north of the pen and coop is a large trash pit full of modern trash and brush. Luckily the foundation was encountered early in the day on the first transects, as the area was being cleared when archaeologist returned later in the day (see Figure 15).

Figure 45. Room with double concrete wall with insulation in north portion of Feature A2.
Figure 46. Southern most room in Feature A2, camera facing southwest.

Figure 47. Close-up of concrete in Feature A2.
Six additional features were encountered south of the large historic barn foundation (Feature A2). Southeast of the large foundation and south of an old fence, roughly six concrete footings were documented (Feature A4). While two are still in place the remained are no longer in situ and thus the potential size and shape of the previous structure is unknown (Figure 49). Situated to the west past a large pile of tires and other debris (Figure 50), the third concrete slab (Feature A5) measures about 10 ft (3 m) north to south by 25 ft (7.6 m) east to west (Figure 51). Approximately 40 ft (12 m) southeast of this are three sets of concrete steps (Feature A6) with associated sidewalks (Figure 52), multiple concrete piers, and remnants of a sewage pipe covering an area roughly 1,225 ft² (114 m²) (Figure 53). Feature A7 is around 40 ft (12 m) southwest of the steps and is an L-shaped slab roughly 20 ft (6 m) north to south by 25 ft (7.6 m) east to west (Figure 54). About 7 feet south of Feature A7 is another slab (Feature A8) that measures 10 ft (3 m) north to south by 20 ft (6 m) east to west with a sidewalk extending to the southeast (Figure 55). This sidewalk is around 17 ft (5.2 m) long and ends at a line of posts aligned north to south (Figure 56). A few pipes were documented in and adjacent to these piers and sidewalk (Figure 57). No other piers were identified at site 41BX2186. Southwest of this group of features and along the southern end of the project area were a few large chunks of broken concrete. Historic debris was observed scattered around all of the features including beer bottles, plastic dolls, televisions, tires, and sheet metal (Figure 58).
Figure 49. Example of concrete pier/block at Feature A4.

Figure 50. Tire and trash pile between Features A4 and A5, camera facing southwest.
Figure 51. Feature A5, camera facing northeast.

Figure 52. Stairs and piers (Feature 6), camera facing southwest.
Figure 53. Closer view of piers at Feature A6, camera facing northeast.

Figure 54. Concrete slab (Feature A7), camera facing south east.
Figure 55. Overview of Feature A8, camera facing east.

Figure 56. Sidewalk running off of Feature A8, camera facing southeast.
Figure 57. Cedar piers running off of the sidewalk, camera facing north.

Figure 58. Example television and tire on the surface at the site, camera facing south.
The concrete observed in each of the foundations appear to post-date the turn of the twentieth century based on its composition. All the bottles and other household items observed on the surface within the site dated from the late-twentieth century to contemporary times. Historic aerials show the large barn with a few other structures (possibly including the northernmost foundation) as early as circa 1930 (Stoner System Map Sheet 1107). On the 1955 aerial photograph, the barn is visible with an additional house situated to the south (NETR Online 2017). This house appears to be in the same location as the six concrete piers (Feature A4) that are no longer in situ. A small outbuilding is visible to the southwest, possibly Feature A5. By 1963, another structure is visible where there are now steps and concrete piers (Feature A6) (NETR Online 2017). Though not clearly visible on this aerial photograph, an adjacent driveway appears to lead to another structure to the south. If so, this would correspond to the two slabs with a sidewalk and wooden piers, Features A7 and A8. By 1986, all of the structures within the site were demolished with only driveways and some slabs visible on the aerial photograph (NETR Online 2017).

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

The archival research indicates that site 41BX2186 is within a tract of land owned by Elmer H. Acord, and possibly associated with the Acord Dairy. Elmer Acord registered his brand in Bexar County in 1928 (BCDR V:146). The 1930 U.S. Census lists Elmer, his wife Emma, their son George, uncle Henry, and a lodger living on the eastern portion of the property along Palo Alto Road. In 1933 he sold the dairy and farm equipment and livestock that constitute Acord Dairy to his step-son Lawrence W. Maurice. In 1943 the property was conveyed to the Schoellmans who owned the land till 2002.

Based the results of the archival research, site 41BX2186 likely dates from the early-twentieth century to the present. No historic artifacts were observed on the surface; rather, the site was recorded based on a number of historic-age features. Besides locational value, the site lacks integrity and subsurface deposits, suggesting it is not likely to yield additional information beneficial to the history or prehistory of the area. Therefore, the archaeological deposit at site 41BX2186 is recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP or for designation as an SAL. Likewise, no further archaeological work is recommended.

**Isolated Finds**

Archaeologists located one isolated find during the survey of the 75.03-acre (30.36-ha) project area (see Figure 5). Isolated Find 1 (IF 1) was noted in the southern portion of the project area south of the pond on Comanche Creek. The find consists of a handful of historic glass shards and two ceramic sherds observed on the surface between two century oak trees (circumferences measured 4.92 m and 3.93 m) (**Figure 59**). The initial shovel test contained a modern .22-bullet, which initiated the excavation of four additional shovel tests all of which were negative for historic cultural materials. After consultation with an ammunition expert (Sam Hill personal communication 2017), the bullet proved modern. Historic material observed on the surface around the shovel tests is comprised of two colorless, thick window glass shards; five solarized glass shards, two green bottle fragments (Coca-Cola), one pink and one milk glass sherd. In addition, there were two undecorated white ware sherds. One piece of the solarized glass is pressed glass typical of depression glass popular between 1920 and 1940 (Stelle 2001). The milk glass is a fragment of a large jar with a geometric design. Based on the lack of additional cultural material in the area, these artifacts were considered an isolated find (**Figure 60**).
Figure 59. Overview of location of IF 1 south of pond beside two century oak trees, camera facing south. See Trimble at base of the tree for scale.

Figure 60. Artifacts collected from IF 1.
Summary and Recommendations

On behalf of KB Home, Pape-Dawson conducted an intensive archaeological survey with shovel testing and mechanical trenching of the 75.03-acre (30.36-ha) project area in San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas. The irregularly shaped project area is bounded to the east by Palo Alto Road/SH 16. Loop 410 is about 0.25 mile (0.40 km) to the north, and the project area is primarily surrounded by undeveloped land, although a small residential development is adjacent to the north, and another larger residential development is south of the property. The project area is maximally 1,291 ft (393.5 m) north to south and 4,422 ft (1,348 m) east west. While depth of impacts for all improvements will vary and have yet to be determined, average depth of vertical impact is considered to be up to 3 ft (0.9 m) below the ground surface throughout the project area and up to 8 ft (2.4 m) below the ground surface for utility installations.

The project is situated in the San Antonio city limits, requiring compliance with the Historic Preservation and Design Section of the COSA UDC. As no federal funding or permitting is anticipated for this project, and it is situated on private property, compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA and the ACT were not necessary. All work was done in accordance with the archaeological survey standards and guidelines as developed by the CTA and adopted by the THC.

Pape Dawson’s investigations included an extensive background records and literature review, followed by an intensive pedestrian survey with shovel testing and backhoe trenching. The presence of intact alluvial soils necessitated the use of mechanical excavation in those areas. The background review determined that the project area had not been previously surveyed and that no previously recorded archaeological sites were located within or adjacent to its boundary. Four archaeological sites (41BX599, 41BX704, 41BX1690, and 41BX1916) were identified within 0.62 mile (1 km) of the project area. One archaeological survey was previously conducted adjacent to the project area along Palo Alto Road/SH 16, and seven archaeological surveys were previously conducted within the study area.

Pape-Dawson archaeologists Virginia Moore, Katie Hill, Jacob I. Sullivan, and Megan Veltri conducted the field work on June 14, 15, 20, 22, and 28, 2017. Archaeologists excavated 60 shovel tests and four backhoe trenches within the project area, recording two sites (41BX2185 and 41BX2186) and one isolated find.

Site 41BX2185 is a multicomponent, prehistoric lithic scatter and mid-nineteenth- to late-twentieth-century farmstead, based on the artifact assemblage. The site includes structural remains, a scatter of historic-age debris, and a scatter of non-diagnostic lithic debitage. Archival research indicates the site is associated with Mary Graham who owned the property adjacent to the north in the early-twentieth century and the Schoellmans who owned the project area from 1943 to 2002.

Site 41BX2186 is an early- to late-twentieth-century dairy with associated historic-age foundations and material. Archival research revealed that the site was owned by Elmer H. Acord (1930-1932) and J. J. Strickland (1928-1930 and 1930-1943). It was associated with the Acord Dairy between 1930 and 1943, and owned by the Schoellmans between 1943 and 2002.

Sites 41BX2185 and 41BX2186 were evaluated according to the criteria in 36 CFR 60.4 and in 13 TAC 26.10. Based on these criteria, both sites are recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or for
designation as an SAL, considering the lack of integrity and the paucity of subsurface deposits. However, site 41BX2185 potentially extends outside of the project area, and could include an artesian well. If archaeological deposits exist outside the project area, their NRHP and SAL eligibility is unknown.

Consequently, Pape-Dawson recommends no further archaeological work at sites 41BX2185 and 41BX2186 or within the project area. Project records and photographs will be curated at the Center for Archaeological Research at the University of Texas at San Antonio. Collected artifacts will be returned to the landowner or discarded with landowner permission.
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Appendix A

Shovel Test Table
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Field Shovel Test #</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Depth (cm)</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Munsell Soil Color</th>
<th>Soil Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>JS 05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR lighter than 4/3</td>
<td>clay loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>10-30</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Light reddish brown</td>
<td>loam; terminated at marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>JS02</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR4/3 Brown</td>
<td>silty clay; terminated at impenetrable limestone cobbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>KH02</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>0-60</td>
<td><strong>Rusty sanitary can (at 10 cmbs)</strong></td>
<td>10YR4/3 Brown</td>
<td>silty clay with small pebbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>KH03</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR4/3 Brown</td>
<td>silty clay with small pebbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>KH05</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR4/3 Brown</td>
<td>silty clay; many bottles in area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>KH20</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR3/3 Dark Brown</td>
<td>clay loam; terminated at compact clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>KH21</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>0-35</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR4/3 Brown</td>
<td>clay loam with calcium carbonate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>35-60</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR5/4 Yellow Brown</td>
<td>clay loam; terminated at sub soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>KH22</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>0-60</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR3/3 Dark Brown</td>
<td>clay loam; terminated at sterile soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>MV01</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0-52</td>
<td><strong>Fabric fragment, ferrous metal, nail, glass fragments, shatter, flakes, ceramic fragments</strong></td>
<td>10YR4/4 Dark Yellowish Brown</td>
<td>clay loam with many cobbles and burned rock throughout; terminated at degraded limestone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>MV02</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>0-60</td>
<td><strong>Shatter</strong></td>
<td>10YR4/4 Dark Yellowish Brown</td>
<td>clay loam; terminated at sterile soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinomial</td>
<td>Field Shovel Test #</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Depth (cm)</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>Munsell Soil Color</td>
<td>Soil Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>MV03</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>7.5YR4/1 Dark Gray</td>
<td>clay loam; terminated at level 5 due to fire ants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>VM01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>4 FCR, 2 debitage, 2 metal, 1 plastic, 2 glass</td>
<td>10YR4/4 Dark Yellowish Brown</td>
<td>clay loam with cobbles and gravels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>VM01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>2 FCR, 2 debitage, 4 metal, and 1 glass</td>
<td>10YR4/4 Dark Yellowish Brown</td>
<td>clay loam with cobbles and gravels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>VM01</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>3 metal and 1 FCR</td>
<td>10YR4/6 Dark Yellowish Brown</td>
<td>clay loam with cobbles and gravels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>VM01</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>30-58</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR4/6 Dark Yellowish Brown</td>
<td>compact clay loam with common degrading limestone gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>VM02</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>0-80</td>
<td>1 FCR (at 60 cmbs)</td>
<td>10YR2/2 Very Dark Brown</td>
<td>clay loam with rounded pebbles throughout; terminated at maximum depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>VM03</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR2/2 Very Dark Brown</td>
<td>loamy clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>VM03</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR4/4 Dark Yellowish Brown</td>
<td>mottled compact clay loam with small gravels in the bottom; terminated at sterile soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>VM18</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>0-62</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR4/4 Dark Yellowish Brown</td>
<td>compact clay loam; terminated at sterile soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>VM19</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>0-65</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR2/2 Very Dark Brown</td>
<td>clay loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2185</td>
<td>VM19</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>65-80</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR2/2 Very Dark Brown</td>
<td>compact clay loam with calcium carbonate flecks; terminated at sterile soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinomial</td>
<td>Field Shovel Test #</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Depth (cm)</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>Munsell Soil Color</td>
<td>Soil Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2186</td>
<td>KH18</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>3 glass fragments (2 colorless, 1 green, 1 might be window glass)</td>
<td>10YR3/2 Very Dark Gray Brown</td>
<td>clay loam; pipes at 20 cmbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2186</td>
<td>KH19</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>0-40</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR3/2 Very Dark Gray Brown</td>
<td>clay loam; terminated at impenetrable cobbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2186</td>
<td>MV08</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>0-20</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>7.5YR4/1 Dark Gray</td>
<td>clay loam; terminated due to metal pipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2186</td>
<td>VM14</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR3/2 Very Dark Gray Brown</td>
<td>compact, gravely, clay loam; terminated at impassable cobbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2186</td>
<td>VM15</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>0-20</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR3/2 Very Dark Gray Brown</td>
<td>clay loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2186</td>
<td>VM15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR4/4 Dark Yellowish Brown</td>
<td>cobbly loam or caliche; terminated due to impassable cobbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2186</td>
<td>VM16</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>0-40</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR2/1 Black</td>
<td>clay loam with some cobbles; terminated at sterile soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2186</td>
<td>VM17</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR2/1 Black</td>
<td>clay loam with some cobbles; terminated at sterile soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS 01</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>0-60</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR3/1 Very Dark Gray &amp; 10YR4/6 Dark Yellowish Brown</td>
<td>clay with clay mottles; terminated at very compact sterile clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS03</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>0-55</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR4/3 Brown</td>
<td>silty clay; terminated due to roots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinomial</td>
<td>Field Shovel Test #</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Depth (cm)</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>Munsell Soil Color</td>
<td>Soil Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS04</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR4/3 Brown</td>
<td>silty clay; terminated at sterile clay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR4/3 Brown</td>
<td>loam with stream rolled gravel fill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH01</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>0-70</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR3/1 Very Dark Gray</td>
<td>clay with mottles, many pebbles and some limestone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>70-80</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR7/2 Light Gray</td>
<td>clay with mottles, many pebbles and some limestone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH01</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR3/1 Black</td>
<td>clay loam with small pebbles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH04</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>0-60</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR4/3 Brown</td>
<td>silty clay; McDonald's straw at 10 cmbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH06</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>0-40</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR4/3 Brown</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH07</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR3/2 Very Dark Gray Brown</td>
<td>silty clay with lots of gravel; terminated at compact clay; disturbed-asphalt at 30 cmbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR4/3 Brown</td>
<td>sand but mostly gravel; gravel from pond and fill areas-disturbed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR5/4 Yellow Brown</td>
<td>silty clay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR8/1 White</td>
<td>marl soil; terminated at marl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR3/2 Very Dark Gray Brown</td>
<td>silty clay but with more gravel and cobbles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR7/6 Yellow</td>
<td>terminated at impenetrable cobbles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinomial</td>
<td>Field Shovel Test #</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Depth (cm)</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>Munsell Soil Color</td>
<td>Soil Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR3/2 Very Dark Gray Brown</td>
<td>silty clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>15-40</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.5YR4/4 Red Brown</td>
<td>clay; terminated at impenetrable cobbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR2/1 Black</td>
<td>clay; terminated at compact clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR2/1 Black</td>
<td>clay; terminated at compact clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH13.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>Modern bullet between 0-10 cmbs</td>
<td>10YR2/1 Black</td>
<td>clay with chert cobbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR2/1 Black</td>
<td>clay with chert cobbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH15</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>0-40</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR2/1 Black</td>
<td>clay with chert cobbles; terminated at compact clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH16</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>0-40</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR2/1 Black</td>
<td>clay with chert cobbles; terminated at compact clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH17</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR2/1 Black</td>
<td>clay with chert cobbles; terminated at compact clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV04</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>7.5YR4/1 Dark Gray</td>
<td>clay loam; terminated at sterile soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV05</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>7.5YR4/1 Dark Gray</td>
<td>clay loam; terminated due to impenetrable cobbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV06</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>7.5YR4/1 Dark Gray</td>
<td>clay loam; asphalt fragments found on ground surface, many cobbles; terminated at degraded limestone and cobbles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>10-30</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>7.5YR4/1 Dark Gray</td>
<td>clay loam; terminated at degraded limestone and cobbles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinomial</td>
<td>Field Shovel Test #</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Depth (cm)</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>Munsell Soil Color</td>
<td>Soil Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR4/1 Dark Gray</td>
<td>silty loam with many cobbles throughout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR8/1 White</td>
<td>chalky, silty loam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>20-50</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR8/1 White</td>
<td>chalky, silty loam; terminated at sterile soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>7.5YR4/1 Dark Gray</td>
<td>clay loam; terminated due to impenetrable cobbles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV10</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>7.5YR4/1 Dark Gray</td>
<td>clay loam; terminated at sterile soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV11</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>7.5YR4/1 Dark Gray</td>
<td>clay loam; terminated at sterile soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV12</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>7.5YR4/1 Dark Gray</td>
<td>clay loam; terminated at sterile soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM04</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>0-37</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR2/2 Very Dark Brown</td>
<td>loamy clay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37-42</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR4/4 Dark Yellowish Brown</td>
<td>mottled, very compact clay loam with few angular limestone fragments; terminated at sterile soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM05</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>0-40</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR6/2 Light Brownish Gray with 10YR8/1 White</td>
<td>gravely, sandy loam with rounded/smooth gravels and a chunk of black concretion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR6/2 Light Brownish Gray with 10YR8/2 Very Pale Brown</td>
<td>gravely, loose sandy loam with more pebbles; terminated at sterile soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinomial</td>
<td>Field Shovel Test #</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Depth (cm)</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>Munsell Soil Color</td>
<td>Soil Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM06</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR2/1 Black</td>
<td>clay with homogenous soils all the way down with common stream rolled pebbles; terminated at sterile soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM07</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>0-64</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR2/1 Black</td>
<td>compact clay loam with few river pebbles throughout; terminated at sterile soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM08</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR2/1 Black</td>
<td>gravely; terminated from impassable gravels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR2/1 Black</td>
<td>clay loam; terminated from impassable gravels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM10</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>0-34</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR2/1 Black</td>
<td>compact clay; terminated at sterile soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM11</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR2/2 Very Dark Brown</td>
<td>compact, cobbly clay; terminated at impassable cobbles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM12</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>0-60</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR2/1 Black</td>
<td>compact clay loam with few river pebbles observed mixed throughout; terminated at sterile soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM13</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>0-18</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10YR3/2 Very Dark Gray Brown</td>
<td>compact gravelly clay; terminated at impassable gravels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Backhoe Trench Profile Descriptions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Other (inclusions, etc.)</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Texture</th>
<th>Motiles</th>
<th>Munsell</th>
<th>Horizon (lower)</th>
<th>Bedding (upper)</th>
<th>Strata (cm)</th>
<th>Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Filmy</td>
<td>Angular</td>
<td>Clayish</td>
<td>Coarse</td>
<td>Cream</td>
<td>10% Black</td>
<td>0-12 cm</td>
<td>Gradual</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Filmy</td>
<td>Angular</td>
<td>Clayish</td>
<td>Coarse</td>
<td>Cream</td>
<td>10% Black</td>
<td>0-12 cm</td>
<td>Gradual</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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