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Abstract

On January 20 and February 11, 2015, Pape-Dawson archaeologists conducted an intensive pedestrian survey of City of San Antonio (COSA)-owned property adjacent to the Botanical Gardens and immediately southeast of Mahncke Park. This property is included as part of the proposed improvements to the Botanical Gardens that will include construction of a Discovery Center, an open-air pavilion, culinary gardens, a parking lot, and utilities (Phase I), as well as renovations within the existing Botanical Gardens (Phase II). As some of the Phase I and all of the Phase II improvements will occur in areas where previous ground disturbance has occurred, Pape-Dawson coordinated with the COSA archaeologist and the Texas Historical Commission (THC) to identify the area where archaeological investigations would be necessary.

The resulting project area consists of approximately 6 acres (3 hectares) of land bordered by Pinckney Street, Old Austin Avenue, Funston Place, and New Braunfels Avenue. Archaeologists performed a 100% pedestrian survey of the project area supplemented by 18 judgmentally placed shovel tests. Fourteen shovel tests were positive for cultural material and resulted in archaeologists recording one archaeological site, 41BX2073, within the project area. This work was performed in compliance with the Antiquities Code of Texas under Antiquities Permit #7127. No federal funding or permitting is anticipated for this project, so compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act will not be necessary.

Site 41BX2073 consists of a twentieth century artifact scatter that is both shallowly buried and on the surface. No features were observed at this site, and no artifacts were collected in association with this work. Archival research reveals the project area was platted as Hilltop Terraces in 1942 and that residential development and occupation subsequently occurred. Artifacts recovered are primarily associated with architectural materials, with a small amount of material associated with domestic occupation. Together, the archival and archaeology suggest the site is associated with construction and occupation of the structures in this subdivision. Due to the lack of artifacts associated with domestic occupation and the copious amount of information available about twentieth century occupation, the principal investigator recommends this site not eligible as a State Antiquities Landmark (SAL) and that no further archaeological work is necessary within the project area.
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Management Summary

COSA proposes to construct improvements within the existing Botanical Gardens property as well as within a COSA-owned parcel adjoining the gardens to the south. The project area consists of an approximately 6-acre (3 hectare) tract of land near downtown San Antonio. Depth of vertical impacts are currently unknown, but as soils within the project area are mapped as upland soils, archaeologists anticipated archaeological deposits would be shallowly buried or found on the surface.

Since the project is located on lands owned by the City of San Antonio, compliance with the Antiquities Code of Texas (ACT) is necessary. Pape-Dawson obtained Antiquities Permit #7127 prior to initiating fieldwork. No federal permitting or funding is attached to this project, so compliance with Section 106 of the National Register of Historic Places is not necessary.

A Secretary of the Interior qualified archaeologist led an intensive pedestrian survey on January 20 and February 11, 2015. Fieldwork resulted in one archaeological site (41BX2073) being recorded within the boundaries of the project area. Twentieth century artifacts were observed during the course of this work, and archival research indicates the project area was platted as a residential subdivision in 1942. Due to the lack of intact features, artifacts related to domestic occupation, and the abundance of existing information about twentieth century life and architecture that already exists, the principal investigator recommends the site is not eligible as a State Antiquities Landmark.
Introduction
The City of San Antonio (COSA) contracted Pape-Dawson to conduct an archaeological investigation for proposed improvements within COSA’s Botanical Gardens in San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas (Figure 1). While the vertical depth of disturbance is unknown, these improvements will require subsurface ground disturbance to construct a Discovery Center, an open-air pavilion, culinary gardens, a parking lot, and utilities (Phase I), as well as renovations within the existing Botanical Gardens (Phase II). Some of the Phase I improvements and all of the Phase II improvements will be undertaken in areas where previous construction has occurred and has likely disturbed archaeological deposits that may exist in these areas. As a result, Pape-Dawson archaeologists coordinated with the COSA archaeologist and the Texas Historical Commission (THC) to define the project area prior to fieldwork.

The project area consists of a tract of land bordered by Pinckney Street, Old Austin Avenue, Funston Place, and New Braunfels Avenue. The project area comprises approximately 6 acres (3 hectares) of land. As this project is located on COSA-owned property, compliance with the Antiquities Code of Texas is necessary. No federal funding or permitting is anticipated for this project, so compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act will not be necessary. Pape-Dawson archaeologists obtained Antiquities Permit #7127 prior to initiating the field effort.

A Secretary of the Interior qualified archaeologist supervised fieldwork, which occurred on January 20 and February 11, 2015. Fieldwork resulted in one archaeological site (41BX2073) being recorded within the boundaries of the project area. While temporally diagnostic artifacts were observed at the site, they included wire nails, ceramic tile, and part of a leather boot, all dating to the twentieth century. None of these artifacts were collected. Archival research supports the assessment that this site was a mid-twentieth century occupation, and the site has been recommended ineligible for SAL status.

Project Setting
The project area is located along the southern edge of the existing developed Botanical Gardens north of downtown San Antonio. Mahncke Park is adjacent to the project area on the northwest. The areas west, south, and east of the project area primarily consist of residential development, with scattered commercial properties mixed in. The project area itself is currently undeveloped and is very level and cleared of vegetation, suggesting it may have been graded at some point.

Soils
The project area is geologically mapped as Pliocene or Pleistocene-age Uvalde Gravel (Bureau of Economic Geology 1983). Soils within the project area are predominantly mapped as severely eroded Heiden-Ferris complex, 5 to 10 percent slopes. The easternmost section of the project area (approximately 19% of the total project area) is mapped as Houston Black clay, 1 to 3 percent slopes, and the very edge of the southwestern corner of the project area is mapped as Houston Black gravelly clay, 3 to 5 percent slopes. Heiden series soils are well drained, deep, sloping clay soils that occur on uplands (Huckabee et al. 1977: 29-30). Often found with Heiden soils, Ferris series soils are deep, well drained, clay soils found on uplands (Batte 1984:71). Houston Black clay is a very deep, moderately well
Figure 1: Project Location
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drained, very slowly permeable soil found on uplands (USDA 2014). Given the upland soils mapped within the project area, archaeologists expected that any archaeological deposits present would be at or near the ground surface.

**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 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 animals (Collins 1995: 381; Bousman et al. 2004: 75). Projectile points characteristic of the Paleoindian period in Central Texas are lanceolate-shaped and include Clovis, Plainview, and Folsom (Turner and Hester 1993). In Texas, most Paleoindian 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 (Henderson 1980), have produced burials in context (Collins 1995: 383). Other Paleoindian sites discovered within Bexar County include site 41BX47 on Leon Creek (Tennis 1996), the Richard Beene site (41BX831) (Thoms et al. 2005), and the St. Mary’s Hall site (41BX229), which has provided insight into a more diverse diet for Paleoindian groups (Hester 1978).

As the climate warmed, the Paleoindian 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 1993; 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 1993; 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 1993; 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) (Nickels 2011), the Higgins site (41BX184), and the Panther Springs site (41BX228) (McNatt et al. 2000). 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, 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)

While there is an overlap between the prehistoric and historic periods (sometimes called the protohistoric), Europeans did not begin exploration in the area until the 17th century. Alonso de Leon’s 1689 and 1690 expeditions and de los Rios’ 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 2010). 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 Béxar (de la Teja 1995). However, by 1722 the Marqués de San Miguel de Aguayo had moved the presidio and villa to the west side of the San Antonio River (Clark et al. 1975). 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 1718 to 1731 (Wright 2010). Most of the Native American groups 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 2014).

In 1731, Spain sent 16 families from the Canary Islands to the villa de Bexar 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 Bexar Presidio was named the capital of Spanish Texas, and the settlement including mission Indians had a population of about 2000 by 1778 (Fehrenbach 2010).

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 the 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; this would change following the Civil War (Fehrenbach 2010).

Following the Civil War, San Antonio prospered as a commercial and military center and continued to grow as one of Texas largest cities. The city was the southern hub of several major cattle trail drives including the Chisholm Trail and Western Trail. The importation of merino sheep to the adjacent Hill County led to the development of an important San Antonio-based wool market. With the arrival of the Galveston, Harrisburg and San Antonio Railway in 1877, San Antonio reached a new height in economic and population growth. This time, the new settlers were overwhelmingly native-born Anglos, largely from Southern states. By the end of the 19th-century, the city of San Antonio became the confluence of three distinct cultures (Hispanic, German, and Southern Anglo-American (Fehrenbach 2014).

Despite the city’s continued growth and development, the city did not expand beyond its original Spanish land grant until 1940. The current project area is situated within the Fecundo Ortega land grant, which was never patented, but absorbed into the city and platted into lots for city settlement and development.
Methods

Records Review
A Pape-Dawson archaeologist reviewed data from the THC’s online Texas Historic Sites Atlas and Texas Archeological Sites Atlas and the City of San Antonio’s list of Local Historic Landmarks to locate previously recorded cultural resources, including those listed in the National Register of Historic Places, (NRHP), National Historic Landmarks (NHLs), SALs, State Historic Sites, Official State of Texas Historical Markers (OTHMs), Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks (RTHLs), cemeteries, and local historic landmarks. In addition, an archaeologist consulted the THC’s online Restricted Archeological Sites Atlas and the files at the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory (TARL) to locate previously recorded archaeological sites within 1 kilometer (km) of the project area.

Fieldwork
On January 20 and February 11, 2015, Pape-Dawson archaeologists conducted field investigations within the project area. The crew, including the principal investigator and archaeologist Jacob Sullivan, walked transects spaced 30 m apart over the entire project area to visually inspect the ground surface for cultural material. In addition, archaeologists judgmentally placed shovel tests throughout the project area to locate subsurface deposits. Shovel tests measured 30 cm by 30 cm and were terminated when sterile clay subsoil was reached or in one instance, when subsurface material prevented deeper excavation. Soils from shovel tests were screened through ¼” hardware mesh when possible, and hand sorted when clay content was high.

Sites have been recorded on TexSite forms and submitted to the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory (TARL) to obtain trinomials. Diagnostic artifacts would have been collected in the field if any had been observed. Paperwork will be curated at The University of Texas San Antonio’s Center for Archaeological Research (CAR).

Archival
Pape-Dawson archaeologists reviewed deed records available online at the Bexar County Clerk’s website to develop a chain of title for the property. In addition, they consulted plat records at COSA’s municipal archives to learn about the land history and performed limited census research to determine whether any of the property owners could have been associated with Site 41BX2073.

Results

Previously recorded sites
The results of the cultural resources background review identified no previously recorded archaeological sites or cultural resources within the project area. Within 1 km of the project footprint, there are three NRHP listed districts, one NRHP listed property, one OTHM, two RTHLs, and nine COSA local historic landmarks (Table 1, Figures 2 and 3). In addition, sixteen previous archaeological projects have taken...
place within 1 km of the project area, and six previously recorded archaeological sites (Figure 4) fall into this radius as well (Table 2).

### Table 1 Historic Resources found within 1 kilometer of the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acequia Madre</td>
<td>COSA Local Historic Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brackenridge Park</td>
<td>NRHP District, COSA Local Historic Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Sam Houston</td>
<td>NRHP District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House at 115 Davis Court</td>
<td>COSA Local Historic Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House at 310 Elmhurst</td>
<td>COSA Local Historic Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House at 2147 Hildebrand</td>
<td>COSA Local Historic Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludwig Mahncke</td>
<td>OTHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Chapel, Fort Sam Houston</td>
<td>NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miraflores Park</td>
<td>NRHP District, COSA Local Historic Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruiz House</td>
<td>RTHL, COSA Local Historic Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan Carriage House</td>
<td>COSA Local Historic Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twohig House</td>
<td>RTHL, COSA Local Historic Landmark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2 Archaeological Sites found within 1 kilometer of the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeological Site</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Depth of Deposits (cmbs)</th>
<th>Distance and Direction From Project Area</th>
<th>Determination of Eligibility per THC Atlas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41BX323</td>
<td>Prehistoric campsite</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>0.61 miles (0.99 km) northwest</td>
<td>SAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX625</td>
<td>Historic reservoir</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>0.07 miles (0.11 km) north</td>
<td>Unknown/Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1425</td>
<td>Historic/prehistoric scatter</td>
<td>0-75</td>
<td>0.61 miles (0.98 km) northwest</td>
<td>Ineligible within ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1773</td>
<td>Prehistoric scatter</td>
<td>20-100</td>
<td>0.25 miles (0.40 km) northwest</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1754</td>
<td>Historic/unknown prehistoric</td>
<td>150-240</td>
<td>0.60 miles (0.96 km) northwest</td>
<td>SAL Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the archaeological surveys near the project area have been conducted within Brackenridge Park. The earliest of these occurred in 1979 when both Texas Parks and Wildlife Department and the Fort Worth District of the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) conducted large-scale surveys within the park. Subsequent work within the park that falls within the 1 km radius occurred in 2000, when SWCA did a survey within the park and the Center for Archaeological Research at the University of Texas San Antonio (CAR) did a testing project within the park. CAR undertook a survey of Miraflores Park in 2007. In 2010, Geomarine did a linear survey for SAWS at the west edge of the park, and CAR also did a survey in the western park area that resulted in finding the Alamo Dam and acequia. CAR continued working in the park in 2011, monitoring excavations at the Witte museum and for another project just east of the park. In 2012, Geomarine conducted survey and testing for SAWS. In 2013 CAR returned to do some trenching and SWCA monitored a CPS line near Broadway and Hildebrand Streets.

In addition to the work in Brackenridge Park, CAR surveyed a good portion of San Antonio’s Botanical Gardens north of the project area in 1976. USACE sponsored a survey adjacent to the east side of the project area in 1978.

Archaeological sites near the project area include both prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, many of which are significant. Most of these resources are located within Brackenridge Park, with the exception of site 41BX625, a historic reservoir located within the already developed portion of Botanical Gardens, and 41BX2007, a prehistoric campsite close to Brackenridge Park. The reservoir, recorded in 1981, had an unknown eligibility, but may have been incorporated into the gardens’ overall design.

In addition to reviewing previously recorded cultural resources in the project area, Pape-Dawson archaeologists reviewed historic aerial photographs and topographic maps of the project area. Although all the topographic maps consulted (1992, 1985, 1975, 1969, and 1959) mapped the land as urban and did not show any structures, the aerial photographs show structures within the project area (NETR 2014). With the exception of the 2004 aerial, all the aerial photographs reviewed (1995, 1986, 1973, 1966, 1963, and 1955) show houses throughout the project area (NETR 2014). The presence of these houses in historic-age photographs suggests there is a potential to find archaeological deposits associated with these houses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>41BX2007</th>
<th>Occupation/ lithic scatter</th>
<th>0-150</th>
<th>0.40 miles (0.65 km) northwest</th>
<th>Ineligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Figure 2: Historic Resources within 1 km of the Project Area
Figure 3: COSA Local Historic Landmarks within 1 km of the Project Area
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Fieldwork
Ground cover in the project area consists of short, mowed grass, with ground surface visibility at approximately 40% (Figures 5 and 6). The project area contains several concrete driveway and sidewalk remnants along its northern border, suggesting the area once contained housing (Figure 7). Archival research, discussed more thoroughly later in the report, confirms this land was platted as the Hilltop Terraces in 1942 (Bexar County Plat Records, Vol.1625, p.163).

Figure 5 Project Area facing west
Figure 6 View of ground surface

Figure 7 Driveways and sidewalks within the project area facing northwest
The field crew walked the project area in transects spaced 30 m apart, visually inspecting the ground surface for artifacts or features. The crew also excavated 18 shovel tests which were judgmentally placed within the project area; many shovel tests were placed near driveway remnants in an attempt to locate archaeological deposits associated with previously standing structures. Pape-Dawson archaeologists excavated shovel tests in arbitrary 10 cm levels; shovel tests ranged in depth from 30-50 centimeters below ground surface (cmbs). In some areas where obvious ground disturbance had occurred, such as areas where previous construction and/or vehicle parking has disturbed soils, archaeologists walked the area, but did not excavate shovel tests (Figure 8). Archaeological survey of the project area resulted in the recordation of one archaeological site, 41BX2073. This site encompasses nearly the entire project area (Figure 9).

Figure 8 Northeast corner of the project area facing southeast

Site Description
Archaeologists recorded one site, 41BX2073, within the project area. This site covers almost the entire 6-acre project area, and extends from New Braunfels Avenue east to Old Austin Road, south to Pinkney Road, and north to Funston Place. Funston Place forms most of the northern site boundary; at one time Funston Place extended from New Braunfels Avenue to Old Austin Road, but now ends 64 m west of Old Austin Road. The land within the eastern two-thirds of the site is very level, then gently slopes down to the western third of the project area, which is also flat, suggesting parts of the site may have been previously graded.
This page has been redacted as it contains restricted information
Site 41BX2073 measures approximately 60 m by 460 m, and consists of a twentieth century surface artifact scatter with a subsurface component. Although no standing structures or foundations are present, concrete driveway and walkway remnants (Figure 7) are present throughout the northern half of the site. A review of historic-age and modern aerial photographs shows that houses were located within the project area as early as 1955, and remained standing through at least 1995. The structures were demolished sometime between 1995 and 2004, and the current land surface suggests the site or parts of the site may have been graded, perhaps during demolition. Other evidence of disturbance, including a dirt drive/parking area in the middle of the site, utility poles, and evidence of underground utilities, suggest the site has been impacted previously (Figures 10 – 11). According to a Parks employee, housing on the site was associated with Fort Sam Houston; however, archival research found no direct evidence of this specific association.

Figure 10 Parking area within Site 41BX2073 facing west
Twentieth century artifacts, including ceramic tile, concrete, and container glass, were scattered on the ground surface that was visible; many of these artifacts were visible within the drive/parking area near the middle of the site. In addition, fourteen of the eighteen shovel tests were positive for cultural material to a maximum depth of 30 centimeters below surface (cmbs) (Table 3). The only portion of the project area where cultural materials were not observed was in the northeastern spur, where Funston Place used to intersect Old Austin Road.

Artifacts Observed
Archaeologists observed a variety of artifacts, most non-diagnostic, within the project area. These artifacts include wire nails, thin, ridged concrete; saw blade fragments, thick chunks of porcelain, and ceramic tile. Subsurface excavations yielded wire nails, concrete, asphalt shingle fragments, a saw blade from a small band handsaw, a shotgun shell, ferrous metal, clear glass, ceramic tile frags, one piece of ironstone, metal letters, a brick fragment, and a leather boot (Figures 12-15, Table 3). All observed material dates to the twentieth century with the exception of one possible cut nail fragment.
Figure 12 Boot fragments, metal letters, tack, and earthenware from ST 9

Figure 13 Boot in shovel test 9
Figure 14 Wire nail and concrete from ST 11

Figure 15 Concrete, cinder block, glass, and weed control fabric from ST6
Table 3 Shovel Tests in the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shovel Test Number</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Cultural Material Observed</th>
<th>Depth of Deposit</th>
<th>Reason for Termination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30 cmbs</td>
<td>10YR 2/1 black clay with common chert gravels</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Sterile Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30 cmbs</td>
<td>10YR 2/1 black clay</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Sterile Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40 cmbs</td>
<td>10YR 2/1 black silty clay loam</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Sterile Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30 cmbs</td>
<td>10YR 2/1 black silty clay loam</td>
<td>2 pcs thin ridged concrete</td>
<td>0-10 cmbs</td>
<td>Sterile Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 pcs thin saw blade from hand saw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 pc asphalt shingle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30 cmbs</td>
<td>10YR 2/1 black clay with few chert gravels</td>
<td>6 wire nails</td>
<td>0-10 cmbs</td>
<td>Sterile Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30 cmbs</td>
<td>10YR 2/1 black clay with few chert gravels</td>
<td>1 cinderblock frag</td>
<td>0-10 cmbs</td>
<td>Sterile Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 concrete frag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 glass shards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 pc weed control fabric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>40 cmbs</td>
<td>10YR 4/3 brown clay with rocks (0-20 cm), 10YR 2/1 black clay with heavier rock concentration (20-40 cm)</td>
<td>2 wire nails</td>
<td>0-10 cmbs</td>
<td>Sterile Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 nail frag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 brick chip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 possible cut nail frag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>50 cmbs</td>
<td>10YR 5/3 brown clay loam (0-10 cm), 10YR 2/1 black clay with few to common chert gravels (10-50 cm)</td>
<td>1 pc undecorated ironstone</td>
<td>20-30 cmbs</td>
<td>Chert Cobbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30 cmbs</td>
<td>10YR 4/3 brown clay (0-20 cm), 10YR 2/1 black clay loam (20-30 cm)</td>
<td>1 pc red earthenware</td>
<td>10-20 cmbs</td>
<td>Boot was too big to get around and couldn’t punch through sole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 metal letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 tack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 leather Red Wing boot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30 cmbs</td>
<td>10YR 2/1 black clay</td>
<td>1 glass shard</td>
<td>0-10 cmbs</td>
<td>Sterile Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>45 cmbs</td>
<td>10YR 4/3 brown silty clay (0-20 cm), 10YR 2/1 black clay with common chert gravels (20-45 cm)</td>
<td>1 wire cut nail</td>
<td>0-10 cmbs</td>
<td>Sterile Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 thin ridged concrete frag</td>
<td>20-30 cmbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>45 cmbs</td>
<td>10YR 5/3 brown silty clay loam with common chert gravels and cobbles (0-40 cm), 10YR 4/2 dark grayish brown sandy loam with many chert gravels and cobbles (40-45 cm)</td>
<td>1 glass shard</td>
<td>10-20 cmbs</td>
<td>Chert Gravels and Cobbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>40 cmbs</td>
<td>10YR 5/3 brown clay with few chert gravels (0-20 cm), 10YR 3/3 dark brown silty clay with few to common chert gravels and cobbles (20-40 cm)</td>
<td>3 tile frags</td>
<td>20-30 cmbs</td>
<td>Chert Cobbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>35 cmbs</td>
<td>10YR 4/3 brown clay loam, 10YR 5/6 yellowish brown sandy mottles (throughout)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Chert Cobbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>45 cmbs</td>
<td>10YR 4/3 brown clay (0-12 cm), 10YR 2/1 black</td>
<td>1 clear glass shard</td>
<td>0-10 cmbs</td>
<td>Sterile Clay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Artifacts at this site are shallowly buried or on the surface, and provide a mix of materials, most associated with architecture. The lack of domestic materials at this site, which contained houses in the mid-late twentieth century, suggests that the site may have been graded or bulldozed when the houses were demolished. In addition, although the archaeological deposits at this site are historic-age, the material observed at this site does not pre-date the twentieth century, a time that is well documented in the historic record. These factors suggest there is little potential to gain additional information or insight into the archaeological record from the archaeological deposits themselves.

Archival Research
Archival research associated with site 41BX2073 indicates this property was originally part of a 1/3 league of land granted to Fecundo Ortega in 1838 (City of San Antonio Plats Book 2, p.74; Texas General Land Office Clerk Returns). Ortega never patented the land, nor did anyone else, and it became part of the city property which was platted sometime between 1840 and 1884. A plat of land adjacent to the subject tract appears in the Plat Book 2 in which Francois Giraud, City Surveyor, shows the tract of land containing the project area has been platted as City Lot 4 in Range 2, District 2 (City of San Antonio Plats Book 2, p.74).

In 1852, the mayor, acting on behalf of the city, sold Lot 4 to John B. Conrad with a special vendor’s lien that guaranteed the city would receive interest on the property for 50 years or until Conrad paid his lien. Interest was due to the city twice per year (Bexar County Deed Records, Vol.K2, p.502). Conrad did not wait 50 years to divest himself of the property, selling it eight months after he purchased the tract. He sold the property to Charles Goubault on July 27, 1853, noting the same vendor’s lien continued to apply to the property (Bexar County Deed Records, Vol.L1, p.212).

While it is probable that Conrad never lived on the land given his brief ownership, Goubault retained the land for six years before selling it to F. Guilbeau in 1859 (Bexar County Deed Records, Vol.R1, p.201). A search of the 1860 and 1870 Texas census records did not reveal a Charles Goubault living in the state; it is possible he left the state before 1860 and/or that a variation in spelling of his name (although several variations were tried) caused the archaeologist to miss a record of his residence. He could have lived on the property during his ownership, but there is no archaeological evidence to suggest such an occupation occurred.
Although F. Guilbeau retained the property for 20 years before selling it to George W. Brackenridge in 1879 (Bexar County Deed Records, Vol.11, p.358), he owned significantly more property elsewhere within the city. Guilbeau was living in San Antonio by 1850, when he appears as a 37-year old dry goods merchant heading a household with relatives Rosario (18), Annetta (11 months), Augustine (28), six German-born male clerks, two French-born gardeners and one French-born woman with no occupation listed. Guilbeau owned $15,000 in real estate at the time. Guilbeau became the French consul by 1855, and lived in an extravagant house on what is now Main Avenue through his tenure, which ended after the Civil War (Klier 2010). While Guilbeau was certainly a significant contributor to San Antonio society, he did not live on the subject tract.

Like Guilbeau, George W. Brackenridge owned a significant quantity of real estate in San Antonio, and was a well-known figure in the state. Brackenridge was the Jackson County, Texas surveyor in 1860, when census records show him as a 27-year old man living in planter H.B. Davenport’s household. He moved out of Texas during the Civil War, and returned to found the San Antonio National Bank and to become president of the San Antonio Water Works Company from 1883 to 1906. The Water Works property adjoins the project area to the north, and Brackenridge’s residence was nearby on what is now the Incarnate Word campus (Anonymous, 2010). Although Brackenridge is associated with the property where Site 41BX2073 is located, he did not live on the subject tract.

In 1909, Brackenridge conveyed the subject tract to W.L. Evans, H.Y. Evans, and J.K. Burr (Bexar County Deed Records, Vol.316, p.596). The transaction was for 237.782 acres (including the subject tract), and cost $109,445.50. A stipulation prohibiting alcohol was included in the deed. Within six months, the Evanses had deeded their interest over to J.K. Burr (Bexar County Deed Records, Vol.333, p.390). Brackenridge’s restrictions continued with this deed.

Burr retained the property until 1917, when he sold the 6.5-acre subject tract to Alexander Joske for $6,500. The low value of the land suggests there were no improvements on it at the time of sale. Although J.K. Burr does not appear to be in the Texas census records, deed records indicate he lived in Bexar County (Bexar County Deed Records, Vol.515, p.370). Brackenridge’s prohibition against alcohol carried forward, and Joske added a stipulation that the property was not to be sold or leased to persons of color.

Although Joske does not appear in the census records, he was a resident of Bexar County according to deed records. He died prior to 1926, when his heirs conveyed the land to W.B. Willim, also of Bexar County (Bexar County Deed Records, Vol.939, p.237). Willim immediately took out a vendor’s lien and set up trustees for the property (Bexar County Deed Records, Vol.893, p.504). Less than a year later, in 1927, Joske conveyed the property to B.G. Irish, and in the conveyance there is an implication the property may contain improvements by that time (Bexar County Deed Records, Vol.939, p.232). It is doubtful that Willim lived on the property given his short ownership, but it is possible that he or Joske could have constructed improvements on the property.

However, subsequent transactions suggest the contrary, as it becomes evident that buyers are trying to develop the land. Deed records indicate B.G. Irish seems to be a land speculator, and in 1930 when he
conveyed the property back to F.G. Oppenheimer, one of the executors for Joske’s estate, he had not paid more than a minimal amount on the outstanding lien he took over from Wililim (Bexar County Deed Records, Vol.1207, p.428). This suggests it was an investment property rather than a tract he intended to develop for his own residence. Oppenheimer held the land until 1942 when he sold it to Hilltop Terraces (Bexar County Deed Records, Vol. 1903, p.442). Hilltop Terraces platted the property into 28 lots the same year (Bexar County Plat Records, Vol.1625, p.163).

There are numerous other transactions after 1962 for the individual lots associated with Hilltop Terraces. These transactions conveyed the lots to individual owners, and some lots changed hands several times. Ultimately, all 28 lots were conveyed to the City of San Antonio and the Botanical Gardens.

The archival research indicates that although the city platted the land in the mid-nineteenth century, records suggest no one lived on the property until it had been platted as residential in 1942. Subsequent records indicate people lived on the property in the mid-to-late twentieth century. The archaeological deposits at Site 41BX2073 support this interpretation, as they date to the twentieth century.

Summary and Recommendations
Archaeological investigations within the project area located one previously unrecorded archaeological site, site 41BX2073. This site consists of twentieth century artifacts, mainly associated with architecture. Archival research indicates the property was associated with a post-war development, suggesting the artifacts are associated with this development and occupation. However, the lack of domestic artifacts and site topography suggest the site may have been graded during the demolition of the buildings.

The soils in the project area indicate that most archaeological sites would be at or near the surface, and a visual inspection and shovel testing confirmed that deposits were surficial or shallowly buried throughout the site. No previously recorded archaeological sites are within the project area, and only one new site, 41BX2073, is within the project area. Archaeologists mapped, photographed and recorded the site, and filed a site form on TexSite. No artifacts were collected. Due to the site’s association with a twentieth century occupation, which is well documented in the historical record, the previous disturbance at the site, and the lack of intact features, the principal investigator recommends the site as not eligible as a State Antiquities Landmark. Further work at this site is unnecessary, and construction should be allowed to proceed. Upon acceptance of the final report, all paperwork will be curated at CAR.
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