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Abstract

The City of San Antonio (COSA) Public Works Department retained Pape-Dawson Engineers, Inc. to conduct cultural resource investigations for proposed road improvements along Mission Road and Acequia Road (i.e., the Project) within San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas. The Project consists of the installation of brick pavers and continuous illumination assemblies, electrical service, and underground infrastructure along both sides of Mission Road from SE Military Drive to the San Antonio River and along Acequia Road from Mission Road to Ashley Road. The added alternate to the Project includes the construction of a shared-use path along the east side of Mission Road from SE Military Drive through Stinson Airport, sidewalk along both sides of Mission Road from Cadmus Street (99th Street) to Acequia Road, sidewalk along the east side of Mission Road from Acequia Road to the San Antonio River, and sidewalk along the west side of Acequia Road from Mission Road to Ashley Road. A culvert system located mid-block along Mission Road will be removed, widened and extended, and replaced within the existing right-of-way (ROW). Existing underground utilities (water and sewer) will require surface adjustments to meter boxes, valve boxes, and manholes. One sewer cleanout may require both horizontal and vertical adjustments due to movement over time. As a result of the proposed improvements described above, modifications to surface drainage ditches and driveways will be required to maintain proper movement of surface runoff.

As the Project is located within the COSA city limits and River Improvement Overlay District 6, the Project requires compliance with local regulations. At the municipal level, the Project must comply with Article 6, Historic Preservation and Urban Design, of the Unified Development Code (§ 35-630 to 35-634) as implemented by the COSA Office of Historic Preservation (COSA OHP). In addition, the proposed Project is within ROW owned by the City, a political subdivision of the state of Texas, which requires compliance with the Antiquities Code of Texas as implemented by the Texas Historical Commission (THC). No federal permitting or funding is anticipated for the Project; therefore, compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act is not necessary. Should any human remains and/or an abandoned or unknown cemetery be encountered during the Project, the Project will also comply with Chapters 711 and 715 of the Texas Health and Safety Code.

All proposed improvements will be located within existing Mission Road and Acequia Road ROWs measuring 18 acres (7.3 hectares [ha]) (Project Area). The Project Area includes a total of 2.1 miles (3.4 kilometers) of existing Mission Road and Acequia Road ROWs. Depths of impact are anticipated to vary across the Project Area, ranging from approximately 1 to 3 feet (0.3 to 0.9 meter [m]) apart from the extension of the culvert mid-block along Mission Road, where the depth of impact is not anticipated to exceed 6 feet (1.8 m). In consultation with the COSA OHP and THC, a portion of the Project Area located between two historic-age cemeteries was targeted for the field investigation (Field Investigation Area). The total Field Investigation Area measures 2.4 ac (1 ha) along 1,777 feet (541.6 linear meters) of the Mission Road corridor, specifically between San Jose Burial Park and Mission Burial Park. Cultural resources investigations consisted of a program of archaeological trenching along the eastern and western sides of the ROW within an area proposed for decorative pavers and sidewalk/shared-used pathways. No archaeological investigations were conducted for proposed driveway improvements, utility surface adjustments, or the culvert box location within the Field Investigation Area, as this construction will be located within areas extensively disturbed by past improvements below the level of anticipated discovery. Additionally, the proposed improvements will have limited vertical impacts at this location.
Archaeological trenching of the Project Area occurred between March 18 and 19, 2019, (east side of Mission Road), and again between May 4 and 6, 2020, (west side of Mission Road). Nesta Anderson and Zachary Overfield served as the Principal Investigators for the respective fieldwork dates and were assisted by archaeologists Jacob Sullivan, James Moore, Melanie Nichols, and Lily Camara. A total of 16 trenches were excavated during fieldwork in accordance with a research design initially approved by the COSA OHP on January 28, 2019 and by the THC on January 29, 2019, under Texas Antiquities Permit 8748. Amendments to the permit were approved by the COSA OHP April 28, 2020 and by the THC on May 4, 2020.

The trenching investigations did not result in the documentation of any archaeological sites, nor evidence of human remains or graves within the Field Investigation Area. Based on the results of these investigations, no historic properties will be affected by the Project and no further work is recommended. All records associated with the Project will be curated at the University of Texas at San Antonio Center for Archaeological Research (UTSA-CAR).
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The City of San Antonio (COSA) Public Works Department retained Pape-Dawson Engineers, Inc. (Pape-Dawson) to conduct cultural resource investigations for proposed road improvements along Mission Road and Acequia Road (i.e., the Project) within San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas (Figure 1). The Project consists of the installation of brick pavers and continuous illumination assemblies, electrical service, and underground infrastructure within existing utility trenches along both sides of Mission Road from SE Military Drive to the San Antonio River and along Acequia Road from Mission Road to Ashley Road. The added alternate to the Project includes the construction of a shared-use path along the east side of Mission Road from SE Military Drive through Stinson Airport, sidewalk along both sides of Mission Road from Cadmus Street (99th Street) to Acequia Road, sidewalk along the east side of Mission Road from Acequia Road to the San Antonio River, and sidewalk along the west side of Acequia Road from Mission Road to Ashley Road. A culvert system located mid-block along Mission Road will be removed, widened and extended, and replaced within the existing right-of-way (ROW) (Appendix A: Map 6). Additionally, guardrail posts will be installed at select locations along Mission and Acequia roads (Appendix A: Maps 6, 13-14, 16). Existing underground utilities (water and sewer) will require surface adjustments to meter boxes, valve boxes, and manholes. One sewer cleanout may require both horizontal and vertical adjustments due to movement over time. As a result of the proposed improvements described above, modifications to surface drainage ditches and driveways will be required to maintain proper movement of surface runoff.

As the Project is located within COSA city limits and the River Improvement Overlay (RIO) District 6, the Project requires compliance with local regulations. At the municipal level, the Project must comply with Article 6, Historic Preservation and Urban Design, of the Unified Development Code (UDC) (§ 35-630 to 35-634) as implemented by the COSA Office of Historic Preservation (COSA OHP). In addition, the proposed Project is within ROW owned by the City, a political subdivision of the state of Texas. As such, the Project requires compliance with the Antiquities Code of Texas (ACT) as implemented by the Texas Historical Commission (THC). No federal permitting or funding is anticipated for the Project; therefore, compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act is not necessary. Should any human remains and/or an abandoned or unknown cemetery be encountered during the Project, the Project will also comply with Chapters 711 and 715 of the Texas Health and Safety Code.

Consistent with municipal and state regulatory review, the proposed Project must make a reasonable and good faith effort to identify cultural resource sites within the Project Area and assess any potential impacts the proposed undertaking could have on resources listed or considered eligible for listing as State Antiquities Landmarks (SALs) or National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) properties.
Figure 1. Project Location Map.
All proposed improvements will be located within existing Mission Road and Acequia Road ROWs measuring 18 acres (ac; 7.3 hectares [ha]) (Project Area) (Figure 2). The Project Area includes a total of 2.1 miles (3.4 kilometers [km]) of existing Mission Road and Acequia Road ROWs. Depths of impact will vary across the Project Area, ranging from approximately 1 to 3 feet (0.3 to 0.9 meter [m]) for sidewalk/shared-use pathways and approximately 6 feet (1.8 m) for the extension of the culvert mid-block along Mission Road.

In consultation with the COSA OHP and THC, a portion of the Project Area located between two historic-age cemeteries was targeted for the field investigation (Field Investigation Area). The total Field Investigation Area measures 2.4 ac (1 ha) along 541.6 linear meters (m) (1,777 ft) located along the Mission Road corridor, specifically between San Jose Burial Park and Mission Burial Park. Cultural resource investigations consisted of a program of archaeological trenching along the eastern and western sides of the ROW within an area proposed for decorative pavers and sidewalk/shared-used pathways. No archaeological investigations were conducted for proposed driveway improvements, utility surface adjustments, or the culvert box location within the Field Investigation Area, as this construction will be located within areas extensively disturbed by past improvements below the level of anticipated discovery. Additionally, the proposed improvements will have limited vertical impacts at this location.

Archaeological trenching of the Project Area occurred between March 18 and 19, 2019, (east side of Mission Road), and again between May 4 and 6, 2020, (west side of Mission Road). Nesta Anderson and Zachary Overfield served as the Principal Investigators for the respective fieldwork dates and were assisted by archaeologists Jacob Sullivan, James Moore, Melanie Nichols, and Lily Camara. A total of 16 trenches were excavated during fieldwork in accordance with a research design initially approved by the COSA OHP on January 28, 2019 and by the THC on January 29, 2019, under Texas Antiquities Permit 8748. Amendments to the permit were approved by the COSA OHP April 28, 2020 and by the THC on May 4, 2020.

The trenching investigations did not result in the documentation of any archaeological sites, nor evidence of human remains or graves within the Field Investigation Area. Based on the results of this investigation, no historic properties will be affected by the Project and no further work is recommended. All records associated with the Project will be curated at the University of Texas at San Antonio Center for Archaeological Research (CAR UTSA).

Pape-Dawson prepared the following report, which outlines the environmental and cultural setting of the Project, field methods employed, results of a background study focused archival research of the Project Area, field investigation results, and a summary and management recommendations for the Project. The report is followed by Appendix B, which details trench descriptions and soil profile data.
Figure 2. Project Area Overview Map.
CHAPTER 2: ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Project is situated along Mission Road and Acequia Road within the city limits of San Antonio, Texas. The Project Area is mapped within the Southeron (2998-132) United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute quadrangle map. The Project Area is largely surrounded by developed land; although, wooded rangeland is present along portions of the Project Area, as well. Developed land along the Project Area includes San Jose Burial Park (located south of March Avenue on the west side of Mission Road), Mission Burial Park (also referred to as Mission Funeral Park; located south of Southeast Military Drive on the east side of Mission Road), and Stinson Municipal Airport (located south of Cadmus Street on the west sides of both Mission Road and Acequia Road). The Project Area itself consists of maintained road ROWs with short, dense native grasses lining both sides of a paved roadway. Much of the greenspace within the Project Area has been impacted by the installation of buried utilities, including water, sewer, gas, and telecommunication lines. Portions of the Project Area impacted by the installation of utility poles supporting extant overhead electric lines.

The Project landscape is largely characterized by gently sloping upper and lower stream terraces of the San Antonio River. However, portions of the Project Area occupy gently sloping to moderately steep upland landforms elevated above the stream terraces. The Project Area is in proximity to several natural water sources. An unnamed tributary to the San Antonio River crosses the Project Area just north of Cadmus Street. In addition, Sixmile Creek approaches and then parallels the southernmost portion of the Project Area before converging with the San Antonio River. Furthermore, the main channel of the San Antonio River, meandering as its flows south, is situated to the east of the Project Area at a distance varying between 164 feet (50 m) and 0.7 mile (1.2 km).

ENVIRONMENT

The Project is located within the Northern Blackland Prairie of the Texas Blackland Prairies ecoregion. The Northern Blackland Prairie consists of rolling to nearly level plains ranging from 1083 to 1247 feet (330 to 380 m) in elevation (Wermund 1996). The Northern Blackland Prairie contains thermic soils and has an annual precipitation ranging from 28 inches (71 centimeters [cm]) in the south to 42 inches (107 cm) in the north.

Historically, the Northern Blackland Prairies were vegetated in tall prairie grasses consisting predominantly of little (Schizachyrium scoparium) and big bluestem (Andropogon gerardii), tall dropseed (Sporobolus asper), and yellow indiangrass (Sorghastrum nutans) (Griffith et al. 2007; Natural Resources Conservation Service [NRCS] 2006). Additional vegetation common to the prairie included silver bluestem (Bothriochloa laguroides), switchgrass (Panicum virgatum), sideoats grama (Bouteloua curtipendula), eastern gamagrass (Tripsacum dactyloides), and vine mesquite (Hopia obtusa) (NRCS 2006). Some bottomland forests occupied riparian areas in the northern portion of the ecoregion, which were vegetated with Shumard oak (Quercus shumardii) bur oak (Q. macrocarpa), sugar hackberry (Celtis laevigata), ash (Fraxinus spp.), elm (Ulmus spp.), pecan (Carya illinoinensis), and eastern cottonwood (Populus deltoides).

This historic vegetation supported diverse wildlife, including bison (Bovidae spp.), wolves (Canis lupus), greater prairie chickens (Tympanuchus cupido), and pronghorns (Antilocapra americana).
However, in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, farming replaced ranching as the predominant commercial activity in the ecoregion, which led to the clearing of tall prairie grasslands and bottomland forests. During this period, non-native grasses, such as Bermuda grass (*Cynodon dactylon*), Johnson grass (*Sorghum halepense*), and King Ranch bluestem (*Bothriochloa ischaemum*), were introduced (Griffith et al. 2007).

Today, the majority of the Northern Blackland Prairie has an extended history of modification and the majority of the prairie has been converted to cropland, non-native pasture, or for urban use, especially within the San Antonio area (Griffith et al. 2007).

**GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

Geologically, the Project Area is underlain by a single formation type of Pleistocene to Holocene-age terrace deposits (Qt) (Bureau of Economic Geology [BEG] 2020). Terrace deposits consist of sand, silt, clay, and gravel in various proportions, with gravel deposited by the San Antonio River more predominant in older, higher terrace deposits (BEG 2020).

Soil survey data for the Project was derived from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) NRCS Web Soil Survey. According to NRCS (2020) data, a total of six soil units are mapped within the Project Area (**Table 1** and **Figure 3**). The Rock outcrop-Olmos complex is composed of clayey soils occupying gently sloping to moderately steep undulating upland rises within the Project Area, with slopes ranging from 5 to 25 percent. If present, cultural materials in these upland settings would likely be encountered at or near the ground surface. Lewisville and Patrick series soils are located on the treads and slopes of stream terraces along the San Antonio River. These soil series developed within Quaternary-period alluvial sediments and therefore have the potential to contain buried archaeological material. Buried material within these soils is typically reachable by shovel test. Loire soils are situated within the Project Area where along an unnamed tributary to the San Antonio River. Loire soils developed within alluvial sediments, and therefore have a higher potential to contain deeply buried archaeological material.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Series</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Parent Material</th>
<th>Landform</th>
<th>Thickness of A-Horizon (cm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rock outcrop-Olmos complex, 5 to 25 percent slopes (HgD)</td>
<td>Very shallow upland clay loam</td>
<td>Ancient loamy alluvium</td>
<td>Undulating upland terrain</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loire clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes (Fr)</td>
<td>Silty clay loam</td>
<td>Loamy alluvial sediments</td>
<td>Floodplains or low terraces bordering floodplains of the San Antonio River or its chief tributaries</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisville silty clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes (LvA)</td>
<td>Silty clay</td>
<td>Ancient loamy and clayey calcareous sediments</td>
<td>Level, broad terraces along rivers and creeks</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisville silty clay, 1 to 3 percent slopes (LvB)</td>
<td>Silty clay</td>
<td>Ancient loamy and clayey calcareous sediments</td>
<td>Slopes that separate nearly level terraces from uplands</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick soils, 3 to 5 percent slopes (PaC)</td>
<td>Clay loam</td>
<td>Clayey over gravelly alluvium derived from shale, claystone, or siltstone of Cretaceous age</td>
<td>Escarpments that separate first- and second-level terraces</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pits and Quarries (Pt)</td>
<td>Gravel, clay, and sand pits, as well as limestone and chalk quarries</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3. Project Soils Map.
CHAPTER 3: CULTURAL BACKGROUND

Bexar County is located within Central and Southern Planning Region of Texas 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 are primarily defined by changes in material culture and subsistence strategies over time, as evidenced by 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 conducted within the region.

PREHISTORIC PERIOD

PALEOINDIAN PERIOD (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 occupations within the state by 11,500 B.P. Collins (1995) proposed dividing this period into early and late phases, with Dalton, San Patrice, and Plainview projectile points possibly providing the transition between the subperiods. Research indicates that Paleoindians gathered wild plants and hunted large mammals (mammoth, bison, etc.) as well as smaller terrestrial and aquatic animals (Bousman et al. 2004; Collins 1995). Projectile points characteristic of the Paleoindian period in Central Texas are lanceolate-shaped and include Clovis, Plainsview, and Folsom types (Turner and Hester 1993). In Texas, most Paleoindian sites are classified as procurement or consumption sites (Bousman et al. 2004), but a few, such as the Wilson-Leonard site in Williamson County (Collins 1995) and the Pavo Real site in Bexar County (Henderson 1980), contain in situ human burials (Collins 1995). Other Paleoindian sites discovered within Bexar County include site 41BX47 on Leon Creek (Tennis 1996), the Richard Beene site (41BX831) (Thoms and Mandel 2007), and the St. Mary’s Hall site (41BX229), the latter of which provides insight into the diverse diet of Paleoindian groups (Hester 1978).

As the climate warmed and megafauna became extinct, Paleoindian people shifted from hunting large animals to smaller game, including deer and rabbit, as well as gathering edible roots, nuts, and fruits (Black 1989). This change in food supply, as well as the production of a different set of stone tools, mark the transition to the Archaic period.

ARCHAIC PERIOD (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 to a focus on hunting medium and small animals and gathering wild plants, with an eventual transition to agriculture. Beginning with Clear Fork gouges and Guadalupe bifaces in the Early Archaic (8500 B.P. – 6000 B.P.) (Collins 1995; Turner and Hester 1993), Early Archaic people produced a variety of point types. This array of points types and their scattered distributions may indicate smaller groups of people moved over larger territories in the Early Archaic (Prewitt 1981). In Bexar County, sites with Early Archaic components include the Housman Road site (41BX47), the Richard Beene site (41BX831) (Thoms and Mandel 2007), the Higgins site (41BX184) (Black et al. 1998), and the Panther Springs site (41BX228) (Black and McGraw 1985). Point types transitioned to Bell-Andice-Calf Creek, Taylor, and Nolan-
Travis forms in the Middle Archaic (6000 B.P. – 4000 B.P.) (Collins 1995; Turner and Hester 1993) and burned rock middens became more prevalent. Burned rock ovens were constructed to cook a diverse array of plant foods, suggesting a slightly more sedentary subsistence strategy (Black 1989). The Elm Waterhole site (41BX300) is representative of a Middle Archaic site within Bexar County (McNatt et al. 2000). Bulverde, Pedernales, Ensor, Frio, and Marcos points produced during the Late Archaic (4000 B.P. – 1300 B.P.) mirror the diversity of point types found in the Early Archaic (Collins 1995; Turner and Hester 1993). During the Late Archaic, cemeteries (especially associated with rock shelters) become common in Central Texas (Dockall et al. 2006). 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 Period (1,200 B.P. – 250 B.P.)**

As the Archaic transitions into the Late Prehistoric period, several technological changes become apparent in the archaeological record. The most notable change is the use of the bow and arrow rather than the spear and atlatl, as evidenced by the production of smaller points for fastening to arrow shafts. Another significant innovation is the creation and use of ceramic vessels. There is some evidence that peoples in Central Texas may have incorporated agriculture into their lives at this time; however, they primarily remained hunter gatherers (Collins 1995). Also, during this period, there are indications of potentially 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 phase.

**Historic Period (1600s -1950)**

San Antonio was the site of many occupations by prehistoric peoples, 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 in the region (de la Teja 1995). 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 (1718) on the west bank of 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 moved the presidio and villa downstream to a second location along San Pedro Creek (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 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 of documented names. The missions used this native labor force to construct acequias, or irrigation ditches, which helped the missionaries 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 a 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). 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 continued to expand to serve irrigation and drinking water needs. The *acequia* system influenced the street layout in the city (Cox 2005) 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 (1836). The Siege of Bexar (1835) and the Battle of the Alamo (1836) were both located within San Antonio, demonstrating 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 county 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.

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 (1861 to 1865), San Antonio continued to grow, spurred on by the arrival of the railroad in 1877 (Fehrenbach 2010). Industries, such as cattle, distribution, ranching, mercantile, gas, oil, and military centers, prospered in San Antonio. 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 1890s compared to the rest of the United States. Civic government, utilities, electric lights, street railways, 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 and led by Theodore Roosevelt during the Spanish-American War (1898). San Antonio continued to be an important military center for the U.S. Army and Air Force during both world wars (1914–1918; 1939–1945). Its five military bases provided an important economic base and contributed to the evolution of the city’s military and private medical research industry.
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

CULTURAL BACKGROUND STUDY METHODS

Prior to fieldwork, Pape-Dawson archaeologists conducted a background literature and records search of the proposed Project Area. This research included a review of data from the THC’s online Texas Archeological Sites Atlas (Atlas) to identify any previously recorded cultural resources located within a 0.6-mile (1-km) radius of the Project Area. Such resources include historic properties and districts listed on the NRHP, SALs, Official State of Texas Historical Markers (OTHMs), Recorded Historic Texas Landmarks (RHTLs), cemeteries, and archaeological sites. Pape-Dawson archaeologists also consulted the COSA geodatabase of Local Historic Landmarks to identify local historic landmarks within the review radius. As there are numerous NRHP-listed properties, OTHMs, RTHLs, Local Historic Landmarks, and archaeological sites within 0.6 mile (1 km) of the Project Area, archaeologists narrowed their focus to previously recorded cultural resources within 0.3 mile (0.5 km) of the Project Area to determine the types of resources that may be present within the Field Investigation Area.

Pape-Dawson archaeologists also examined recent and historic-age maps and aerial photographs available online (Google Earth Pro; NETR Online 2020) to identify historic high probability areas (HHPAs) where historic-age structures (45 years or older) or historic archaeological sites may exist. This included a review of relevant, historic maps of San Antonio, including nineteenth- to twentieth-century Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, and the COSA OHP’s online Acequia Maps (COSA OHP Map Explorer 2020). In addition, archaeologists sought to identify previous impacts visible in aerial imagery that may have occurred within the Project Area.

ARCHIVAL RESEARCH METHODS

Due to the proximity of the Project Area to San Jose Burial Park and Mission Burial Park, Project historians conducted additional limited archival research on these cemeteries’ boundaries. Historians consulted the San Antonio Municipal Archives online and the Bexar County Clerk’s plat records available online to search for the original boundaries of San Jose Burial Park and Mission Burial Park to determine whether the cemetery boundaries have changed over time.

FIELD METHODS

Pape-Dawson archaeologists, Zachary Overfield and Nesta Anderson, oversaw all tasks and served as the Principal Investigators for the Project. A Project Archaeologist and/or Archaeological Technician assisted in conducting fieldwork, which consisted of archaeological trenching. The field crew recorded the investigation area, any archaeological sites encountered, and associated feature locations (if present) using a handheld GPS device. The crew was equipped with topographic maps, aerial photographs, and historic map overlays of the Project Area, as well as a digital camera. Each archaeologist was also equipped with a compass, appropriate excavation forms, photographic logs, daily journal forms, and appropriate state site forms. Laboratory staff completed the analysis and curation preparation of any collected artifacts. A lab-based Illustrator/GIS Specialist supported the fieldwork, analysis, and preparation of maps and illustrations for the report.
Based on coordination with the COSA OHP and the THC, Pape-Dawson archaeologists targeted the portions of the Project Area located in the ROW of Mission Road next to San Jose Burial Park to the west and Mission Burial Park to the east. The objectives of the cultural investigations were four-fold: (1) identify cultural resource sites within the Project Area, specifically human remains or evidence of graves (2) document the vertical and horizontal extents of any identified sites within the Project Area; (3) provide a preliminary evaluation of each site’s eligibility for listing as a SAL and NRHP property; and (4) assess any potential for the Project to affect to historic properties or other sensitive cultural resources. As such, the fieldwork consisted of archaeological trenching within select locations across the Project Area.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRENCHING METHODS

Pape-Dawson archaeologists conducted archaeological trenching within the Project Area to identify any extant human remains, graves, archaeological deposits, or features present. Archaeologists completed daily written documentation of all observed activities in the form of a daily log supplemented by digital photography, as appropriate. Archaeologists also maintained a photographic log and subsequently downloaded and archived photographic data. Archaeologists documented locations of excavations and finds with, a handheld Trimble Global Positioning System (GPS) unit with sub-meter accuracy. For each trench, Pape-Dawson recorded the following information on standardized trench forms: location, maximum depth, and the number of soil strata. For each soil stratum, detailed soil descriptions including, thickness, texture, Munsell color, bioturbation, disturbance, and the presence/absence and nature of cultural materials (if present). The exposed profile of each backhoe trench was photographically documented. Upon completion, each trench was backfilled, and the ground surface was re-contoured to match the surrounding ground surface as best as possible.

To avoid disturbing potential archaeological deposits, Pape-Dawson required that mechanical excavations be performed with a smooth bucket rather than a bucket with teeth. At a minimum, trenches were excavated at a width of approximately 24 inches (60 cm) wide by 19.7 feet (6 m) long where access permitted. Trenches extended to a depth of approximately 6 feet (1.8 m) below the current ground surface. If grave shafts had been noted during the trenching effort, work in the immediate vicinity of the discovery would have ceased, and the COSA Archaeologist and the THC would have been contacted. Grave shaft locations would have been documented and mapped with a sub-meter accurate, handheld Trimble GPS unit with sub-meter accuracy. All trenches were excavated in compliance with Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA) Standards for Trenching and Excavation Safety.

Trenches were mechanically dug in approximately 4-inch (10.2-cm) thick levels and continuously monitored by a professional archaeologist. Direct observation of soil profiles and descriptions of exposed trench walls were limited to the upper 4 feet (1.2 m). Trenches with depths greater than 4 feet (1.2 m) were inspected from the ground surface for evidence of soil anomalies, cultural features, artifacts, or ecofacts.

HUMAN REMAINS PROTOCOL

If human remains were uncovered during the field investigation, all work would have immediately ceased in the vicinity of the discovery and the COSA Archaeologists and THC would have been contacted. In order to limit exposure, remains would have been reburied with a shallow layer of
soil and covered with plastic sheeting. If necessary, the area would have been enclosed within fencing with security to protect against damage or vandalism until final plans are implemented to avoid or relocate the burial remains.

If discovered, archaeologists were to document the position and location of the human remains and may have needed to perform limited exploratory investigation around the discovery site to determine whether other remains and/or burials were clustered nearby. However, human remains were not to be removed from the field and would have remained protected in place until COSA determined whether it was necessary to exhume and relocate remains. If remains were to be exhumed, COSA and Pape-Dawson archaeologists would have followed the exhumation requirements outlined in Chapter 711 and 715 of the Texas Health and Safety Code. An amended human remains protocol would have been submitted as part of any future work associated with this or another TAP associated with the Project.

**COLLECTION POLICY**

Pape-Dawson maintained a selective collection strategy for artifacts not associated with possible burials, collecting a representative sample of diagnostic historic and prehistoric artifacts observed during trenching. Non-diagnostic artifacts were documented and photographed in the field. All collected material, recorded with associated provenience information, was transported to the Pape-Dawson laboratory for processing, analysis, and curation pursuant to requirements in the TAP.

**CURATION**

All paperwork and collected artifacts were transported to Pape-Dawson Laboratory when fieldwork was complete. Artifacts were analyzed and prepared for curation along with documentation. Pape-Dawson will curate both paperwork and diagnostic artifacts once the draft report has been accepted by the regulatory agencies.
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS

CULTURAL BACKGROUND STUDY

PREVIOUSLY CONDUCTED CULTURAL RESOURCE INVESTIGATIONS

The cultural background study revealed that the entirety of the Project Area and entirety of the Field Investigation Area were previously surveyed for cultural resources. In total, three previous cultural resource investigations overlap the Field Investigation Area, and 23 additional previous investigations were conducted within the Study Area (Table 2 and Figure 4). However, two overlapping investigations within the Field Investigation Area were completed before 1980 and may not have been conducted in accordance with current THC and Council of Texas Archeologists survey standards (THC 2020).

In 1976 and 1980, cultural resource investigations were conducted within the Field Investigation Area on behalf of the THC and National Park Service (NPS), respectively; however, no further information is provided in the Atlas (THC 2020).

From 2010 to 2016, UTSA-CAR monitored tree planting activities in Brackenridge Park Lambert Beach, City Cemetery No. 1, No. 3, No. 6, and the Independent Order of Odd Fellows Cemetery including San Jose Burial Park on behalf of COSA. During this phase, 145 auger bores were excavated. No intact historic or prehistoric deposits were identified during the excavations, and no temporally diagnostic artifacts were recovered during monitoring. UTSA-CAR recommended no additional work with the potential for monitoring of additional excavations in high probability areas. While the Atlas plots this investigation within the current Field Investigation Area, this investigation did not likely occur within the Mission Road ROW.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigation Date</th>
<th>Atlas Number</th>
<th>Investigation Type</th>
<th>Agency Sponsor</th>
<th>Investigator</th>
<th>Distance from Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>8500014062</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>THC</td>
<td>OSA</td>
<td>0.4 km (0.2 mi) southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>8500013863</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>THC</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>Overlapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>8500003081</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>0.5 km (0.3 mi) south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>8500003078</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>HCRS</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>0.4 km (0.2 mi) east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>8500013862</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>Overlapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>Overlapping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>8500009702</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>0.2 km (0.1 mi) south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>8500013859</td>
<td>Survey, Testing</td>
<td>San Antonio River Authority</td>
<td>UTSA-CAR</td>
<td>0.4 km (0.3 mi) east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>8500000286</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>0.1 km (0.1 mi) south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>8400010617</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration / Texas Department of Transportation</td>
<td>UTSA-CARUTSA-CAR</td>
<td>31 m (101 ft) north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>8400000777</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>San Antonio Water System (SAWS)</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>0.4 km (0.3 mi) east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>8500013397</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>COSA</td>
<td>Paul Price and Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>Overlapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>8500013618</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>COSA</td>
<td>Paul Price and Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>0.2 km (0.1 mi) west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>8500011449</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Geo-Marine</td>
<td>Overlapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8500014777</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>SAWS</td>
<td>UTSA-CARUTSA-CAR</td>
<td>25 m (81 ft) north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>8500015202</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>SAWS</td>
<td>Geo-Marine</td>
<td>Overlapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>8500019343</td>
<td>Data Recovery</td>
<td>COSA</td>
<td>UTSA-CARUTSA-CAR</td>
<td>0.4 km (0.2 mi) southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>8500020327</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Archdiocese of San Antonio</td>
<td>UTSA-CARUTSA-CAR</td>
<td>0.4 km (0.2 mi) southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8500060089</td>
<td>Data Recovery</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>UTSA-CARUTSA-CAR</td>
<td>0.4 km (0.2 mi) southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8500079906</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>COSA</td>
<td>Atkins</td>
<td>Overlapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>8500080943</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>COSA</td>
<td>UTSA-CARUTSA-CAR</td>
<td>Overlapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8500080741</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>COSA</td>
<td>UTSA-CARUTSA-CAR</td>
<td>Overlapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8500081288</td>
<td>Survey, Monitoring</td>
<td>SAWS</td>
<td>Terracon Consultants, Inc.</td>
<td>0.5 km (0.3 mi) west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>8500080742</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>40 m (131 ft) southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>8400002971</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>Overlapping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4. Previous Investigations Mapped within Review Area.
PREVIOUSLY RECORDED CULTURAL RESOURCES

Based upon the background literature review on the Atlas and COSA database, there are 36 cultural resources located within the review area, including 21 archaeological sites and 15 historic resources (some of which have multiple designations). Of these 36 cultural resources, there are three NRHP-listed historic districts, one SAL, four OTHMs, four known cemeteries, six COSA Local Historic Landmarks, one COSA Local Historic District, and one NPS Historic Trail (THC 2020; COSA OHP Map Explorer 2020). A total of seven of these 36 cultural resources are located directly adjacent to or within the Project Area.

The Project Area lies within both the Mission Parkway National Register Historic District (NRHD) and the COSA Mission Historic District. The review also indicates segments of El Camino Real de Los Tejas cross the Project Area at three locations (THC 2020). Situated directly adjacent to the Project Area are two cemeteries (San Jose Burial Park and Mission Burial Park), one NRHD (Espada Aqueduct), one COSA Local Historic Landmark (Espada Aqueduct), one OTHM (Stinson Airport), and one archaeological site (41BX267). Additional historic resources within the Study Area include one NRHP District, one SAL, three OTHMs, five COSA Local Historic Landmarks, two additional cemeteries, and 20 archaeological sites.

Archaeological Sites

A total of 21 previously recorded archaeological sites are within the Study Area, none of which are mapped within the limits of the Project Area (Table 3 and Figure 5). However, site 41BX267, representing the second location of the San Jose acequia built circa 1730 is situated directly adjacent to the Project Area. The acequia, which was originally constructed on the east side of the San Antonio River to provide water to Mission San Jose, was reconstructed at this location when the mission was moved to the west bank of the river (Clark et al. 1975). In 1986, while monitoring construction activities associated with the installation of a new sewer line, UTSA-CAR recorded the acequia at three separate locations. At all three locations, the San Jose acequia was represented by an unlined ditch (THC 2020).

The remaining 20 archaeological sites within the Study Area are situated over 300 feet (91.4 m) away from the Project Area and will not be impacted by Project activities. These previously recorded archaeological sites comprised 16 historic sites and four prehistoric sites. Most of these sites are in proximity to the San Antonio River and were documented as a result of numerous archaeological projects conducted within the area. The historic sites within the Study Area include a Spanish Colonial mission (San Juan Capistrano) and associated aqueducts and irrigation ditches, nineteenth and twentieth century homesteads, a mid-twentieth century U.S. Army Air Base, and a twentieth century paupers’ cemetery. The prehistoric sites within the Study Area include both surficial and deeply buried lithic scatters and possible campsites.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeological Site No.</th>
<th>Site Name / Type</th>
<th>Landform</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>41BX5</td>
<td>Mission San Juan Capistrano</td>
<td>East Bank of San Antonio River</td>
<td>0-50 cmbs for midden; deeper for human burials</td>
<td>0.4 km (0.3 mi) southeast</td>
<td>NRHP listed/SAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX242</td>
<td>Old James House</td>
<td>Upper terrace on west side of San Antonio River</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.2 km (0.1 mi) northeast</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX244</td>
<td>Three Historic-age Structures</td>
<td>Upper terrace on west side of San Antonio River</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.1 km (0.04 mi) north</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX245</td>
<td>Kuntz Store</td>
<td>East Bank of San Antonio River</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.5 km (0.3 mi) east</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX246</td>
<td>Berg’s Mill</td>
<td>East Bank of San Antonio River</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.2 km (0.1 mi) east</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX247</td>
<td>Bazan Store and House</td>
<td>East Bank of San Antonio River</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.3 km (0.2 mi) east-southeast</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX248</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>East Bank of San Antonio River</td>
<td>0-30 cmbs</td>
<td>0.3 km (0.2 mi) southeast</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX249</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Stream terrace on east side of Sixmile Creek</td>
<td>0-60 cmbs</td>
<td>0.2 km (0.1 mi) south</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX250</td>
<td>Huron House Foundations</td>
<td>Stream terrace on west side of Sixmile Creek</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.2 km (0.1 mi) south</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX253</td>
<td>Minnie Ashley Beck House</td>
<td>Upper terrace on east side of San Antonio River</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.2 km (0.1 mi) east-southeast</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX260</td>
<td>Historic-age adobe house</td>
<td>Upper terrace on east side of Sixmile Creek</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.2 km (0.1 mi) south</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX265</td>
<td>Late 19th-century site</td>
<td>Upper terrace on east side of San Antonio River</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.4 km (0.3 mi) southeast</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX267</td>
<td>San Jose Acequia</td>
<td>Stream terraces on west side of San Antonio River</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX268</td>
<td>San Juan Acequia/Ditch</td>
<td>Upper terrace on east side of San Antonio River</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.5 km (0.3 mi) northeast</td>
<td>Eligible for NRHP listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Site No.</td>
<td>Site Name / Type</td>
<td>Landform</td>
<td>Depth of Deposits (cmbs)</td>
<td>Distance and Direction from Project Area</td>
<td>Determination of Eligibility per THC Atlas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX279</td>
<td>Pyron Homestead</td>
<td>Stream terraces on west side of San Antonio River</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.2 km (0.1 mi) northwest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX281</td>
<td>Espada Aqueduct</td>
<td>Upper terrace on west side of Sixmile Creek</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.2 km (0.1 mi) east</td>
<td>NRHP listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX789</td>
<td>Early 20th-century San Jose Burial Park’s Paupers’ Cemetery</td>
<td>Upper terrace on east side of Sixmile Creek</td>
<td>0-105 cmbs</td>
<td>0.5 km (0.3 mi) southwest</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2020</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Upland rise</td>
<td>0-30 cmbs</td>
<td>0.3 km (0.2 mi) northeast</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2021</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter and possible hearth</td>
<td>Upper terrace on west side of San Antonio River</td>
<td>0-250 cmbs</td>
<td>0.3 km (0.21 mi) northeast</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2138</td>
<td>Early 20th-century trash pit</td>
<td>Upper terrace on west side of Sixmile Creek</td>
<td>200-500 cmbs</td>
<td>0.4 km (0.3 mi) southwest</td>
<td>Ineligible for NRHP listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX2221</td>
<td>20th-century Camp Stinson Site</td>
<td>Upper terrace on east side of Sixmile Creek</td>
<td>0-105 cmbs</td>
<td>0.4 km (0.3 mi) west-southwest</td>
<td>Ineligible within ROW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This page has been redacted as it contains restricted information
Historic Resources

Of the 15 historic resources located within the Study Area, there are two resources mapped within the Project Area, including the Mission Parkway NRHD and portions of the historical El Camino Real de los Tejas Trail. Four additional resources are adjacent to the Project Area, including the Espada Aqueduct, Stinson Airport, San Jose Burial Park, and Mission Burial Park (Table 4 and Figure 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name</th>
<th>Historic Designation</th>
<th>Within Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Parkway</td>
<td>NRHP District and Local Historic District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espada Aqueduct</td>
<td>NRHP District, Local Historic Landmark and OTHM</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission San Juan Capistrano</td>
<td>NRHP District, Local Historic Landmark, OTHM, SAL</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stinson Airport</td>
<td>OTHM</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission San Francisco de la Espada Dam, Ditch, and Aqueduct</td>
<td>OTHM</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espada Dam</td>
<td>Local Historic Landmark</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acequia Park</td>
<td>Local Historic Landmark</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergs Mill Ruins</td>
<td>Local Historic Landmark</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geigenmiller House</td>
<td>Local Historic Landmark</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Burial Park</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Burial Park</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stinson #1</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stinson #2</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real de los Tejas</td>
<td>National Historic Trail</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Mission Parkway NRHD, listed in 1975, is mapped as straddling the San Antonio River from the Alamo to Mission Espada, and is associated with the Mission Espada Aqueduct (41BX269) and the Mission San Jose NRHD. Among the significant aspects of the NRHD are the neighborhoods around Berg’s Mill, Mission San Juan, and Mission Espada (Clark et al. 1975). These neighborhoods relate to the historic mission and nineteenth-century occupations of the area by representing descendants of the original occupants. The boundaries of the NRHD are designed primarily to include the lower four missions in the San Antonio area, their acequias and fields, and secondarily the significant, preserved historic and prehistoric sites in the area (Clark et al. 1975). One archaeological site (41BX267) located directly adjacent to the Project Area is a contributing element of the Mission Parkway NRHD discussed above.

The COSA Mission Historic District boundaries closely mimic those of the Mission Parkway NRHD and were designed to include the lower four missions with their acequias and fields, as well as significant historic and prehistoric archaeological sites (COSA OHP 2020). The boundaries of the historic district are located along the San Antonio River in the southern section of the city and are intended to include areas that have been less impacted by urban development.
El Camino Real de los Tejas, also known as the King’s Road or Royal Road, was a designated National Historic Trail by the NPS in 2004. The approximately 2,580 miles (4,152 km) of trail extending across Texas from the Rio Grande Valley through San Antonio to Natchitoches, Louisiana, once connected Mexico City to eastern provinces of New Spain. Even though the trail was used through the nineteenth century and portions of the route have been incorporated into today’s state highway system, the period of historic significance for El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail dates from 1680 to 1845, which spans Spanish, Mexican, and early American use (NPS 2011). El Camino Real is projected to cross the Project Area at three locations, including near the intersection of Mission Road and Acequia Road; and crossing the northern portion of Mission Road south of the intersection with SE Military Drive.

The historic San Jose Burial Park and Mission Burial Park cemeteries abut the Project Area to the west and east, respectively, within the Field Investigation Area. Although the cemetery boundaries derived from the TASA extend into Mission Road, it should be noted that the archival research and field reconnaissance conducted by Pape-Dawson indicate neither cemetery extends into Mission Road. Both San Jose Burial Park and Mission Burial Park are discussed at length under the results of the Map and Aerial Photograph Review and Archival Research sections below.
Figure 6. Historic Resources within 0.5 km of the Project Area.
Two HHPAs were identified directly adjacent to the Project Area that had the potential to extend into the Project Area. These two HHPAs were identified as San Jose Burial Park, which abuts a portion of the western Project boundary, and Mission Burial Park, which abuts a portion of the eastern Project boundary (see Figure 6).

The 1959 USGS topographic map shows San Jose Burial Park in its current location, bounded by Cemetery Road (later changed to March Avenue) to the north, Mission Road to the east, Cadmus Street to the south, and Echo Street to the west. All the subsequent maps and photographs reviewed for this study show that the San Jose Burial Park boundaries have remained relatively unchanged since that time (NETR Online 2020).

The 1959 topographic map shows Mission Burial Park labeled as the San Jose Mission Cemetery. While the San Jose Mission Cemetery’s eastern, southern, and western boundaries are depicted as corresponding to the current boundaries of Mission Burial Park, the cemetery’s northern boundary on the 1959 topographic map appears to be marked by a two-track road running east-west. The two-track extends east of Mission Road toward the San Antonio River and is situated between Southeast Military Drive and Cemetery Road (March Avenue). Access to the cemetery appears to be from Cemetery Road (March Avenue), which connects with a network of roads within the cemetery that extend to near the cemetery’s southern boundary. The property to the north of the two-track road contains three structures situated along a road or driveway that runs northeast to southwest and connects Mission Road to Southeast Military Drive.

The layout of the cemetery and the property north of the two-track road shows no change on the 1963 aerial photograph, which also illustrates that much of the area between the two-track road and Southeast Military Drive was undeveloped farmland at that time. However, by 1966 the three structures had been removed and the area appears to have been developed as part of the cemetery. A large parking lot and a building that seems to be the Mission Park Funeral Chapel South (still on the property today) were constructed in that area along with a divided boulevard oriented north-south and connecting Southeast Military Drive with the inner network of existing cemetery roads. This configuration, labeled as Mission Burial Park on the 1969 topographic map, persisted on all subsequent maps and photographs reviewed as part of this study (NETR Online 2020).

The historic aerials and maps also show that a few changes have been made to Mission Road and Acequia Road over time. Mission Road within the southern portion of the Project Area used to extend farther south towards Sixmile Creek, and as a result, Acequia Road did not extend as far north. The current Mission Road and Acequia Road alignments within the southern portion of the Project Area appear to have been constructed at some point between 1973 and 1986 (NETR Online 2020).

**Archival Research**

Due to the identification of HHPAs associated with San Jose Burial Park and Mission Burial Park, Project historians conducted additional limited archival research on the cemetery boundaries. Historians consulted the San Antonio Municipal Archives online and the Bexar County Clerk’s plat records available online to search for the original boundaries of the San Jose Burial Park and
Mission Burial Park. This research sought to find documents that might provide information about whether the cemetery boundaries changed over time.

**San Jose Burial Park**

A review of the City Council Ordinance Records and Meeting Minutes available online first mentions the land comprising San Jose Burial Park in 1923, when meeting minutes from January 11 indicate an ordinance was passed to change the name of City Cemetery No.8 to San Jose Burial Park. The record states that “the cemetery belonging to the city south of town is now known as City Cemetery No.8, and with such designation does not indicate where it is, or what purpose it is now or thereafter to be used for” (City Council Meeting Minutes 1/11/1923:330). This statement suggests that a cemetery may have been established on the land by that time and perhaps as early as 1905; however, historians did not find records of City Cemetery No.8 at this location in the other records available online. Intensive level archival research would be necessary to determine whether additional records exist.

Within a few months, the City Council passed another Ordinance Creating the San Jose Burial Park on 130 ac (52.6 ha) of land fronting on San Juan Road. Details of this ordinance included identifying prices for plots in different sections, setting allocations of profits from sale of plots, rules for marker materials and number of family monuments per plot, directions to establish a separate section and pricing for African American burials, and establishing a separate section for pauper burials (City Council Ordinance Book G:58-61). Interestingly, the record mentions that A. Marbach had created a plat for the cemetery and specifies that the superintendent of the burial park would be responsible for keeping “correct records” (City Council Ordinance Book G:58-61). While this may be standard language, it could also suggest that other city cemeteries may have had issues with accurate record keeping.

Although historians did consult both the records online at the City Archives and the Bexar County Plat Records, they did not find a record of a plat for San Jose Burial Park that might assist in establishing cemetery boundaries or in identifying areas where plots may have been established for different groups as noted in the ordinance. However, later records note that the pauper’s field was south of San Jose Burial Park (City of San Antonio Land Lease 1/15/1926; City Council Ordinance Records Book K:51 and 216), which has been verified archaeologically (THC 2020).

**Mission Burial Park**

Research revealed that Mission Burial Park is privately-owned and that plat records for the cemetery are available through the Bexar County Clerk. The earliest plat on file dates to 1909 and shows individual plot divisions in and around the interior drive within the cemetery (Bexar County Plat Records Book 105:236). As the plat does not include the roads bordering the cemetery, it does not show burial plots near Mission Road at that time. However, a 1938 plat shows three burial plots adjacent to the east side of Mission Road (lots 563, 564, and 592), which are in the southwest corner of Mission Burial Park, indicating burial plots were placed within the cemetery along the roadway by that time (Figure 7).
Figure 7. Burial plots in the southwest corner of Mission Burial Park along Mission Road (Extracted from Plat on file at Bexar County Clerk’s office.)

The 1938 plat appears to have been filed in conjunction with improvements within the Mission Road ROW. The document notes that with the exception of an area 11.25 feet (3.4 m) wide and 20 inches (50.8 cm) deep in Block 3, lot 564, the plot has been vacated (Bexar County Plat Records Book 1625:7). The following page notes that all three lots can be resurveyed, resized, and/or reshaped as long as any remains are not disturbed (Bexar County Plat Records Book 1625:8). It is possible that other plots could have been impacted during subsequent roadway or utility improvements; intensive level archival research would be necessary to determine whether additional plats may have been filed.

**SUMMARY**

The results of the cultural background study indicated a high potential for historic-age resources to exist within the Project Area; although, several utilities appear to have been installed within the existing greenspace. In addition, a 1938 plat for Mission Burial Park indicates its boundaries were modified to accommodate roadway changes, and no plat is available for San Jose Burial Park, suggesting there was a potential for unmarked burials to exist in the Project ROW.
FIELDWORK RESULTS

Improvements for the Project are proposed along a total of 2.1 miles (3.4 km) of existing Mission Road and Acequia Road ROWs measuring a total of 18 acres (7.3 ha). Depths of impact will range from 1 to 6 feet (0.3 to 1.8 m) below ground surface. In consultation with the COSA OHP and THC, a Field Investigation Area was targeted between two historic-age cemeteries (San Jose Burial Park and Mission Burial Park) considered HHPA adjacent to the Project Area along the Mission Road corridor. Pape-Dawson archeologists conducted subsurface cultural resource investigations within the Field Investigation Area, which measured 2.4 acres (1 ha) along 1,777 feet (541.6 linear m) of ROW. Cultural resource investigations consisted of a program of archaeological trenching along the eastern and western sides of the ROW within an area proposed for brick pavers and sidewalk/shared-used pathways. No archaeological investigations were conducted for proposed driveway improvements, utility surface adjustments, or the culvert box location within the field investigation area, as this construction will be located within existing areas of disturbance with limited vertical impact.

Investigations occurred between March 18 and 19, 2019 (east side of Mission Road), and again between May 4 and 6, 2020 (west side of Mission Road). Nesta Anderson and Zachary Overfield served as the Principal Investigators for the respective fieldwork dates. Field efforts were led by Jacob Sullivan and Melanie Nichols with assistance from James Moore and Lily Camara.

A total of 16 trenches were excavated during fieldwork in accordance with a research design initially approved by the COSA OHP on January 28, 2019 and by the THC on January 29, 2019, under TAP 8748. Amendments to the permit were approved by the COSA OHP April 28, 2020 and by the THC on May 4, 2020.

The survey investigations did not result in the documentation of any archaeological sites, nor evidence of human remains or graves within the Field Investigation Area. Based on the results of these investigations, no cemeteries or historic properties will be affected by the Project and no further work is recommended. A summary of the mechanical investigations is presented below. Appendix B presents a table of trench descriptions, including soil data and cultural materials encountered.

SETTING AND DESCRIPTION

The Field Investigation Area itself consists of maintained ROW with short, dense native grasses lining both sides of a paved roadway. Much of the greenspace within the Field Investigation Area was previously impacted by the installation of buried utility lines, including water, sewer, and gas. Portions of the Field Investigation Area were also previously impacted by the installation of overhead electrical utility poles (Figure 8 and Figure 9).
Figure 8. Overview of north side of Field Investigation Area illustrating ROW east and west of Mission Road and San Jose Burial Park in background facing southwest.

Figure 9. Overview of south side of Field Investigation Area on eastern side of Mission Road ROW near intersection with Cadmus Street illustrating existing utilities with Stinson Municipal Airport facing south.
**Work Performed**

A HHPA with the potential for human remains or graves associated with San Jose Burial Park to the west and Mission Burial Park to the east was identified along the Mission Road ROW from March Avenue south to Cadmus Street. This Field Investigation Area was subject to a total of 16 mechanically excavated trenches (Figure 10). A series of eight trenches were excavated along the western side of Mission Road and another series of eight trenches were excavated along the eastern side of Mission Road parallel to the current boundaries of Mission Burial Park and San Jose Burial Park, respectively. Trenches were roughly conducted every 656.17 feet (200 m) with judgmental positioning to accommodate terrain, vegetation, and modern cultural features, and also to maximize probability within the given workspace. Although a 1938 plat of Mission Burial Park (see Figure 7) illustrates individual plot divisions adjacent to a southeastern inflection of Mission Road that likely correlates to the current intersection with Cadmus Street, trenching of this portion of the Project Area (south of Trench 15) was precluded by the density of buried utilities present, as well as the narrow width of the ROW (see Figure 9).

Backhoe trenches measured approximately 14.7 to 34.5 feet (4.5 to 10.5 m) in length by 2.5 to 3.6 feet (0.8 to 1.1 m) in width with depths ranging from to 1.9 to 6.2 feet (0.6 to 1.9 m). Trenches were mechanically dug in approximately 0 to 1.8-inch (0 to 5-cm) thick levels and continuously monitored by a professional archaeologist. Trenches were excavated to a depth of 6 feet (1.8 m) below surface or to bedrock/pre-Holocene deposits, wherein evidence of a burial shaft would have been apparent. All trenches were negative for human remains and evidence of burials. In addition, no archaeological sites were encountered. However, historic, twentieth century to modern period cultural materials and a single possible prehistoric artifact were observed within fill deposits and disturbances associated with roadside debris, road construction, and utility installation in 12 of the 16 total trenches. A table of the trench profile soil description data is presented in Appendix B. Trenching activities were monitored continuously and every third excavator bucket load of dirt was screened for cultural materials. Cultural materials dating from the prehistoric to modern period were observed within the first stratigraphic zones ranging from the surface to 11 to 17.7 inches (28 to 45 cm) below surface. Trenches 1 to 5, 7, to 10, and 12 to 14 contained mixed non-burial related materials, while the four remaining trenches (Trenches 6, 11, 15, and 16) contained only modern materials. Encountered materials consisted of mostly marginally historic to modern materials, including colorless, amber, aquamarine, and green bottle glass; pull tabs, crown caps, screw caps, a rubber tire, asphalt, concrete, and ferrous wires. In addition, several isolated occurrences of prehistoric and early to mid-twentieth century historic artifacts were observed, including a potentially tested cobble (Trench 13) and historic glass vessel fragments (Trenches 1, 9, 10, and 13). However, none of the observed materials constituted intact deposits or were identified in association with archaeological features.

**West Side of Mission Road ROW near San Jose Burial Park (Trenches 1 to 8)**

Eight backhoe trenches (Trenches 1 to 8) were excavated within the proposed brick pavers and sidewalk/shared-use pathway locations along the west side of the Mission Road ROW and parallel to the boundary of San Jose Burial Park. All trenches were centered roughly within the proposed workspace, and most trenches were positioned approximately 125 feet (38 m) apart, but as far as 300 feet (91 m) due to offsets from existing utilities. Trenches on the western side of the Mission Road ROW revealed differing soil profiles, which were noted to be mostly consistent
with the NRCS (2020) soil series data, specifically, the Lewisville silty clay with 1 to 3 percent slopes, Patrick series, Loire clay loam, and Lewisville silty clay with 0 to 1 percent slopes.
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Trench 1

Trench 1, excavated within the mapped soil series Lewisville silty clay with 1 to 3 percent slopes, exhibited a moderately deep, clay loam A-horizon with evidence of disturbance and fill to a depth of approximately 16.9 inches (43 cm) below surface (cmbs). This stratum was underlain by culturally sterile soils with some mottling of strong brown clay to termination. Limestone gravels, cobbles, and calcium carbonate concretions increased with greater depths (Figure 11). Excavation of Trench 1 terminated at 60.2 inches (153 cmbs). A single, isolated, historic artifact was recovered from the fill of the first 16.9 inches (43 cm) of the trench consisting of a tooled, aquamarine double ring bottle finish manufactured in the late nineteenth to early twentieth century (Figure 12) (Lindsey 2020). No evidence of human remains or graves were observed within Trench 1.

Figure 11. Trench 1 west wall profile, facing southwest.
Figure 12. Late nineteenth to early twentieth century bottle finish recovered from Trench 1.

Trench 2

Trench 2, excavated within the mapped soil series Lewisville silty clay with 1 to 3 percent slopes, exhibited a moderately deep, clay loam A-horizon with evidence of disturbance and fill to a depth of approximately 20.9 inches (53 cmbs). This stratum was underlain by culturally sterile dark brown loam to a depth of 40.2 inches (102 cmbs) (Figure 13). Following this stratum, a pale brown and strong brown silty/sandy clay with dark brown loam mottles was encountered to a termination depth of 70.9 inches (180 cmbs). Limestone gravels, cobbles, and calcium carbonate concretions were very common throughout the stratum and increased with depth. Trench 2 contained modern to marginally historic debris within the first 22 inches (56 cmbs), including a pull tab, amber glass shards, and a large fragment of concrete (Figure 14 and Figure 15). No evidence of human remains or graves were observed within Trench 2.
Figure 13. Trench 2 east wall profile, facing southeast.

Figure 14. Concrete fragment observed within Trench 2.
Trench 3

Trench 3, mapped within Loire clay loam, contained soils more consistent with the Patrick series. Trench 3 exhibited a moderately deep very dark brown clay loam A-horizon with evidence of disturbance and fill to a depth of 15.7 inches (40 cmbs) (Figure 16 and Figure 17). This stratum was underlain by a culturally sterile stratum of degraded limestone bedrock with pockets of loam to a termination depth of 42.9 inches (109 cmbs). Few calcium carbonate concretions and limestone cobbles were noted throughout the stratum. Marginally historic to modern cultural materials observed within the first 15.7 inches (40 cm) of Trench 3 include a shard of aqua-tinted vessel glass and a shard of olive vessel glass (Figure 18). No evidence of human remains or graves were observed within Trench 3.
Figure 16. Trench 3 west wall profile, facing southwest.

Figure 17. Overview of Trench 3 location, facing northeast.
Figure 18. Glass shards observed within Trench 3.

Trench 4

Trench 4, mapped within the Patrick soil series, exhibited a relatively shallow, very dark grayish brown clay loam A-horizon with evidence of disturbance and fill to a depth of 13 inches (33 cmbs) (Figure 19). This stratum was underlain by culturally sterile pink to light brown degraded bedrock to a termination depth of 51.2 inches (130 cmbs). No artifactual material was observed within the natural soil strata; however, within the east wall of Trench 4, a previously excavated utility installation trench exhibiting brown to dark brown silty clay loam and a mix of marginally historic to modern cultural material was observed to a depth of 40.2 inches (102 cmbs). Cultural materials observed within the disturbance include asphalt fragments, cobalt glass vessel shards, a ferrous metal crown cap, a ferrous metal wire, and a pull tab (Figure 20). No evidence of human remains or graves were observed within Trench 4.
Figure 19. Trench 4 east wall profile with utility installation trench disturbance, facing east.

Figure 20. Cultural materials observed within Trench 4 disturbance.
Trench 5

Trench 5, mapped within the Patrick soil series, exhibited a relatively shallow, very dark grey clay loam A-horizon with evidence of mostly modern debris and marginally historic material within fill and disturbance deposits to a depth of 11 inches (28 cmbs). This stratum was underlain by a culturally sterile dark grayish brown sandy loam with mottles of very dark grey clay loam to a depth of 20.5 inches (52 cmbs). Below this stratum, a gravely, very dark loam extending to 35.4 inches (90 cmbs) interfaced with degraded limestone bedrock. Limestone gravels and cobbles were noted throughout the first four strata (Figure 21). Trench excavation was terminated at 52 inches (132 cmbs). Cultural materials observed within the first stratum of the trench consisted of fragments of rubber tire; a pull tab; green, amber, and colorless glass shards; ferrous metal wire; an aluminum screw cap; and a machine-made amber glass crown cap bottle finish (Figure 22). However, no evidence of human remains or graves was encountered.

![Figure 21. Trench 5 east wall profile, facing northeast.](image)
Trench 6

Trench 6, excavated within the mapped soil series Lewisville silty clay with 0 to 1 percent slopes, exhibited a moderately deep, clay loam A-horizon with evidence of disturbance and fill to a depth of approximately 17.7 to 35.4 inches (45 to 90 cmbs) (Figure 23 and Figure 24). This stratum was underlain by a wavy boundary of culturally sterile dark grayish brown silty clay loam to a depth of 21.7 to 39.4 inches (55 to 100 cmbs). Following this stratum, light brown degraded limestone bedrock was encountered until trench excavation was terminated at 39.4 to 49.2 inches (100 to 125 cmbs). Few limestone gravels and cobbles were noted. Trench 6 exhibited modern debris on the ground surface consisting of colorless, amber, and green vessel glass; and a canvas textile fragment (Figure 25). The green vessel glass also exhibited evidence of an applied color label, which indicates manufacture after circa 1930, and the colorless glass shard is knurled along the base suggesting manufacture after circa 1940 (Lindsey 2020). Both artifacts were likely manufactured later due to context. No evidence of human remains or graves were observed within Trench 6.
Figure 23. Trench 6 location overview towards San Jose Burial Park, facing northwest.

Figure 24. Trench 6 east wall profile, facing east.
Figure 25. Modern cultural materials observed within Trench 6.

Trench 7

Trench 7, excavated within the mapped soil series Lewisville silty clay with 0 to 1 percent slopes, exhibited a moderately deep, very dark clay loam A-horizon with evidence of disturbance and fill to a depth of approximately 20.5 inches (52 cm) below surface (Figure 26). This stratum was underlain by a dark grayish brown silty clay loam to 31.5 inches (80 cmbs), followed by a brown silty loam to 47.2 inches (120 cmbs). The trench was excavated another 2 inches (5 cm) through a cemented calcium carbonate and chalky marl and terminated at 49.2 inches (125 cmbs). Limestone gravels, cobbles, and calcium carbonate increased at greater depths. Trench 7 exhibited modern to marginally historic materials consisting of amber, colorless, olive, and green glass shards; black plastic; porcelain tile; a yellow and black glazed refined white earthenware sherd; and an unidentified ferrous metal mechanical object (Figure 27). The green vessel glass also exhibited evidence of knurling along the base, suggesting manufacture after circa 1940 (Lindsey 2020). No evidence of human remains or graves were observed within Trench 7.
Figure 26. Trench 7 east wall profile, facing east northeast.

Figure 27. Cultural materials identified within Trench 7.
Trench 8

Trench 8, excavated within the mapped soil series Loire clay loam, exhibited a relatively shallow, brown sandy clay loam A-horizon with evidence of modern to marginally historic debris within the upper layer (Figure 28). The first observed stratum extended to a depth of 11.8 inches (30 cmbs), which was underlain by a very dark gray silty clay loam with more common limestone gravels and cobbles to a depth of 17.7 inches (45 cmbs). This stratum was followed by a brown silty clay loam to 27.6 inches (70 cmbs), a pink to brown silty clay with brown mottles to 53.1 inches (135 cmbs), and a very pale brown silty clay with many calcium carbonate concretions and nodules to 63 inches (160 cmbs), respectively. Cultural materials observed within Trench 8 consist of green, aquamarine, amber, and colorless vessel glass; a pull tab; plastic fragments; and an unidentified flat, ferrous metal fragment (Figure 29). The amber glass includes two shards of bottle glass consisting of a machine-made crown cap finish and a knurled base. The green shards include two body fragments of an unidentified green flask-style bottle embossed with the lowercase letters “obeh…” along the shoulder. The mark was not identified but belongs to a machine-made bottle. No evidence of human remains or graves were observed within Trench 8.

![Figure 28. Trench 8 east wall profile, facing southeast.](image-url)
East Side of Mission Road ROW near Mission Burial Park (Trenches 9 to 16)

Eight backhoe trenches (Trenches 9 to 16) were excavated within the proposed brick pavers and sidewalk/shared-use pathway locations along the east side of the Mission Road ROW and parallel to the boundary of Mission Burial Park. All trenches were centered roughly within the proposed workspace, and most trenches were positioned approximately 125 feet (38 m) apart, but as far as 300 feet (91 m) due to offsets from existing utilities. Trenches on the eastern side of the Mission Road ROW revealed differing soil profiles, which were noted to be mostly consistent with the NRCS (2020) soil series data.

Trench 9

Trench 9 is mapped within the Lewisville silty clay series with 1 to 3 percent slopes. Soil strata observed during mechanical excavation include a relatively shallow A-horizon exhibiting disturbances related to an unmapped buried utility installation trench at 7.1 inches (18 cmbs). Subsequently, trenching activities were slightly offset to avoid disturbance of the utility. The first stratum consisted of a very dark gray brown loamy silt with increasing density of limestone pebbles, gravels, and calcium carbonate concretions to a depth of 12.6 inches (32 cmbs) (Figure 30). This stratum was underlain by a zone of brown silty clay with flecks of calcium carbonate and very few limestone pebbles to a depth of 29.1 inches (74 cmbs), followed by a layer of yellowish-brown loamy silt with a higher density of inclusions to a termination depth of 74.8 inches (190 cmbs).
Cultural materials observed within Trench 9 were limited to a layer of fill below the utility installation trench between 7.1 and 12.6 inches (18 to 32 cmbs) (Figure 31). Historic to modern materials observed within Trench 9 include asphalt fragments; one undecorated, refined white earthenware sherd; amber, colorless, and green glass shards; an intact machine-made green glass bottle with external continuous thread finish and remnants of an applied color label, and a rubber fragment. The amber glass fragments exhibited a machine-made crown cap finish and knurled bases. One of the two amber bottle bases was manufactured with an Owens Illinois Glass Company Duraglas logo dating from circa 1940 to 1960 (Figure 32) (Lindsey 2020). In addition, two other fragments of green glass exhibited remnants of an applied color label and a fully machine-made diamond maker’s mark without lettering, which may be attributed to the Diamond Glass Company, Royersford, Pennsylvania (1885 to 1990) (Whitten 2020). No evidence of human remains or graves were observed within Trench 9.

Figure 30. Trench 9 west wall profile, facing west.
Figure 31. Cultural materials observed within Trench 9.

Figure 32. Owens Illinois Duraglas logo on bottle base recovered from Trench 9.
Trench 10

Trench 10, excavated within the mapped soil series Lewisville silty clay with 1 to 3 percent slopes, exhibited a relatively shallow, dark brown silty loam A-horizon with evidence of disturbance and fill to a depth of approximately 10.6 inches (27 cmbs) (Figure 33 and Figure 34). This stratum was underlain by a smooth boundary of culturally sterile dark reddish-brown silty clay to a depth of 30.3 inches (77 cmbs). Following this stratum, a light brown silty clay to 61.8 inches (157 cmbs) and white silt to a depth of 74 inches (188 cmbs) were encountered. Trench excavation was terminated at 74 inches (188 cmbs). Few limestone gravels and cobbles were noted throughout the trench and calcium carbonate nodules were more common within the last stratum.

Trench 10 exhibited historic to modern debris within the first zone consisting of colorless, amber, and green vessel glass; asphalt fragments, and a rubber fragment (Figure 35). The modern, green bottle base was marked with the number “40” inside concentric rings with knurling along the outer edge, while the colorless glass consisted of an external discontinuous thread finish, as well as a colorless glass vessel base marked “CO…,” which was not identified. No evidence of human remains or graves were observed within Trench 10.

Figure 33. Trench 10 overview, facing south.
Figure 34. Trench 10 west wall profile, facing west.

Figure 35. Cultural materials observed within Trench 10.
Trench 11

Trench 11 was consistent with the Patrick soil series and exhibited a moderately deep dark brown silty loam A-horizon to a depth of 22.4 inches (57 cmbs). Evidence of disturbance and fill was observed at depths up to 9.1 inches (23 cmbs), consisting of modern debris (Figure 36). This stratum was underlain by white, degraded limestone bedrock to a depth of 29.9 inches (76 cmbs). Few calcium carbonate concretions and limestone pebbles were noted throughout the stratum. Modern cultural materials observed within the first 9.1 inches (23 cm) of Trench 11 include colorless, amber, and green vessel glass shards; a plastic shot gun cartridge case; a plastic fragment; and a rubber fragment. (Figure 37). Glass fragments include a discontinuous external thread amber bottle finish, a foil label on colorless glass, and a green bottle base with knurling. No evidence of human remains or graves were observed within Trench 11.

![Figure 36. Trench 11 closeup of west wall profile, facing west.](image_url)
Trench 12

Trench 12, excavated within the mapped soil series Loire clay loam, was more consistent with the Patrick soil series (Figure 38). Trench 12 exhibited a relatively shallow, very dark brown silty loam A-horizon with evidence of cultural materials within the upper 9.4 inches (24 cm) of the trench. The first observed stratum extended to a depth of 9.4 inches (24 cmbs), which was underlain by a brown silty loam with more common limestone gravels and cobbles to a depth of 37 inches (94 cmbs) when a limestone marl was encountered (Figure 39). The trench was excavated another 4.7 inches (12 cm) through the marl to a terminal depth of 41.7 inches (106 cmbs). Cultural materials observed within Trench 12 consisted of historic to modern materials, including a decalcomania sherd, green and aquamarine glass shards, a rubber automotive ring, beer can, and slate fragment (Figure 40). The amber bottle glass fragment is marked with concentric rings and a knurled base. No evidence of human remains or graves were observed within Trench 12.
Figure 38. Trench 12 location overview, facing southwest.

Figure 39. Trench 12 east wall profile, facing east.
Figure 40. Cultural materials identified within Trench 12.

Trench 13

Trench 13, mapped within the soil series Lewisville silty clay with 1 to 3 percent slopes, exhibited a relatively deep, dark brown silty loam A-horizon with evidence of disturbance and fill to a depth of approximately 24.4 inches (62 cmbs) (Figure 41). This stratum was underlain by a clear, even boundary of culturally sterile very dark grayish brown silty clay loam with dark brown mottles to a depth of 42.9 inches (109 cmbs). Subsequently, a dark grayish brown silty clay loam was observed to 48 inches (122 cmbs), followed by a black loamy clay to a depth of 61 inches (155 cmbs). Trench excavation was terminated at 61 inches (155 cmbs). Very few to many limestone gravels and cobbles, as well as calcium carbonate concretions, were noted within the first two strata.

Trench 13 exhibited historic and modern debris, as well as a potentially isolated prehistoric artifact within the first stratum. Materials observed consisted of colorless, amber, and green vessel glass; a possible tested chert cobbles; metal screw cap; rubber fragment; one cut faunal bone; an unidentified ferrous metal object; asphalt fragments; and a rubber fragment (Figure 42). The amber glass bottle exhibits a post-mold base marked with the letters “W F & S / 39” along the base, indicating production by the William Franzen and Son of Milwaukee, or possibly its later iteration as the Northern Glass Works after 1896 and 1900 (Lindsey 2020; Whitten 2020). In addition, the colorless glass vessel shard was embossed with a linear leaf-like border around a stippled base, and the green glass vessel base was marked with “28-S,” which likely represents a mold number during the glass production process. No evidence of human remains or graves were observed within Trench 13.
Figure 41. Trench 13 east wall profile, facing northeast.

Figure 42. Cultural materials observed within Trench 13.
Trench 14

Trench 14, excavated within the mapped soil series Loire clay loam, exhibited a relatively shallow, very dark grayish brown clay loam A-horizon with evidence of cultural material to a depth of 18.5 inches (47 cmbs) (Figure 43). Disturbance from a buried utility line was identified up to 42.5 inches (108 cmbs) within the eastern wall of the trench. The second stratum consisted of a very pale brown silty sand extending to a depth of 70.9 inches (180 cmbs), at which point excavation of the trench was terminated (Figure 44). Limestone pebbles and gravels were common throughout the trench and increased with depth. Cultural materials observed within Trench 14 consisted of marginally historic to modern materials, including a concrete tile fragment, colorless and amber vessel glass shards, a plastic fragment, and a fragment of bright yellow sandy concrete. No evidence of human remains or graves were observed within Trench 14.

Figure 43. Trench 14 west wall profile, facing west.
Figure 44. Cultural materials recovered from Trench 14.

Trench 15

Trench 15 was excavated within the soil series Lewisville silty clay with 0 to 1 percent slopes and exhibited a relatively shallow dark brown silty loam A-horizon with evidence of disturbance and fill to a depth of approximately 13.8 inches (35 cmbs) (Figure 45 and Figure 46). This stratum was underlain by a clear, wavy boundary of degraded limestone bedrock to a depth of 22.4 inches (57 cmbs). Few limestone gravels and pebbles were noted. Trench 15 exhibited modern debris on the ground surface, consisting of colorless, amber, and green vessel glass; and a fragment of the reinforced concrete fence post (Figure 47). No evidence of human remains or graves were observed within Trench 15.
Figure 45. Overview of Trench 15, facing southeast.

Figure 46. Trench 15 east wall profile, facing east.
Trench 16

Trench 16 was excavated within the mapped soil series of Loire clay loam and exhibited a moderately deep black silty loam A-horizon with evidence of disturbance and fill to a depth of 19.7 inches (50 cmbs) (Figure 48. Trench 16 overview, facing southeast). This stratum was underlain by a culturally sterile stratum of limestone gravel mixed with brown silt to a depth of 47.6 inches (121 cmbs) where a very pale brown sandy loam was present until a terminal depth of 73.6 inches (187 cmbs) as gravels decreased. Mostly modern cultural materials observed within the first 19.7 inches (50 cm) include amber, colorless, and aqua-tint glass shards; a ferrous pulley and ferrous can fragment; pull tab; PVC pipe fragment; plastic tail light fragment; and rubber fragment (Figure 50). No evidence of human remains or graves were observed within Trench 16.
Figure 48. Trench 16 overview, facing southeast.

Figure 49. Trench 16 east wall profile, facing east.
SUMMARY

A total of 16 trenches were excavated during fieldwork in accordance with the research design. A series of eight trenches were excavated along the western side of Mission Road and another series of eight trenches were excavated along the eastern side of Mission Road parallel to the current boundaries of Mission Burial Park and San Jose Burial Park, respectively.

The trenching investigations did not result in the documentation of any archaeological sites, nor evidence of human remains or graves within the Field Investigation Area. The Field Investigation Area itself consists of maintained ROW with short, dense native grasses lining both sides of a paved roadway. Much of the greenspace within the Field Investigation Area was impacted by the installation of buried utility lines prior to the Project, including water, sewer, and gas. Portions of the Field Investigation Area were also impacted by prior installation of overhead electrical utility poles.

While all trenches were negative for human remains and burials and no archaeological sites were encountered, marginally historic, twentieth-century cultural materials and modern materials were observed within disturbance and fill deposits associated with roadside debris, road construction, and utility installation in 12 of the 16 trenches (Trenches 1 to 5, 7, to 10, 12 to 14). The remaining four trenches contained only modern materials (Trenches 6, 11, 15, and 16). Observed materials consisted of mostly marginally historic to modern fragments including colorless, amber, cobalt, aquamarine, and green glass; pull tabs, crown caps, screw caps, a rubber tire, asphalt, concrete, and ferrous wire. In addition, several isolated occurrences of prehistoric and early to mid-
twentieth century historic artifacts were observed, including a potentially tested cobble (Trench 13) and historic glass vessel fragments (Trenches 1, 9, 10, and 13). However, none of the observed materials constituted intact deposits or were identified in association with archaeological features.
CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COSA retained Pape-Dawson to conduct cultural resource investigations for proposed road improvements along Mission Road and Acequia Road Project within San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas. The proposed Project consists of the construction of brick pavers and continuous illumination assemblies, electrical service, and underground infrastructure along both sides of Mission Road from SE Military Drive to the San Antonio River and along Acequia Road from Mission Road to Ashley Road. The added alternate to the Project includes the construction of a shared-use path along the east side of Mission Road from SE Military Drive through Stinson Airport, sidewalk along both sides of Mission Road from Cadmus Street (99th Street) to Acequia Road, sidewalk along the east side of Mission Road from Acequia Road to the San Antonio River, and sidewalk along the west side of Acequia Road from Mission Road to Ashley Road. A culvert system located mid-block along Mission Road will be removed, widened and extended, and replaced within the existing ROW. Existing underground utilities (water and sewer) will require surface adjustments to meter boxes, valve boxes, and manholes. One sewer cleanout may require both horizontal and vertical adjustments due to movement over time. As a result of the proposed improvements described above, modifications to surface drainage ditches and driveways will be required to maintain proper movement of surface runoff.

As the Project is located within COSA city limits, RIO District 6, and the COSA ROW, the Project requires compliance with Article 6, Historic Preservation and Urban Design, of the UDC (§ 35-630 to 35-634) the Antiquities Code of Texas. No federal permitting or funding is anticipated for this Project; therefore, compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act was not necessary. If any human remains and/or abandoned or unknown cemeteries were encountered, the Project would have also complied with Chapters 711 and 715 of the Texas Health and Safety Code.

Consistent with municipal and state regulatory review, the proposed Project made a reasonable and good faith effort to identify cultural resource sites within the Project Area and assess the potential impacts the proposed undertaking could have on properties listed or considered eligible for listing as SALs or NRHP properties.

In consultation with the COSA OHP and THC, a Field Investigation Area measuring 2.4 acres (1 ha) along 1,777 feet (541.6 m) of Mission Road was targeted between two historic-age cemeteries (San Jose Burial Park and Mission Burial Park). Cultural resource investigations consisted of a program of archaeological trenching along the eastern and western sides of the ROW within an area proposed for brick pavers and sidewalk/shared-used pathways. No archaeological investigations were conducted for proposed driveway improvements, utility surface adjustments, or the culvert box location within the Field Investigation Area, as this construction will cause limited vertical impact and will be located within areas of documented disturbance below the level of anticipated discovery.

Archaeological trenching of the Project Area occurred between March 18 and 19, 2019 (east side of Mission Road), and again between May 4 and 6, 2020 (west side of Mission Road) in accordance with a research design initially approved by the COSA OHP on January 28, 2019 and by the THC on January 29, 2019, under TAP 8748. Amendments to the permit were approved by the COSA OHP April 28, 2020 and by the THC on May 4, 2020.
The survey investigations did not result in the documentation of any evidence of human remains or graves, nor archaeological sites within the Field Investigation Area. The absence of burials and lack of any associated burial-related materials within the 16 archaeological trenches excavated within the existing Mission Road ROW suggests the historic boundaries of the Mission Burial Park and San Jose Burial Park do not overlap with the Project Area. This conclusion is supported by a review of historic topographic maps illustrating the Project Area beginning in 1959. It is the professional opinion of the Principal Investigator that archaeological trenching conducted during this Project provides sufficient coverage to demonstrate that the proposed Project will not encroach upon the limits of Mission Burial Park or San Jose Burial Park, and no historic properties will be affected by the Project. As such, no further work is recommended.
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APPENDIX B: TRENCH DESCRIPTIONS AND SOIL PROFILE DATA
## Appendix B: Trench Profile Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Depth (cmbs)</th>
<th>Boundary</th>
<th>Munsell</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Texture</th>
<th>Inclusions</th>
<th>Depositional Integrity</th>
<th>Cultural Material</th>
<th>Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHT 1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0-43</td>
<td>abrupt</td>
<td>10YR 3/2</td>
<td>very dark grayish brown</td>
<td>clay loam</td>
<td>very few CaCO3</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>Historic - 1 aqua bottleneck</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>43-76</td>
<td>abrupt</td>
<td>7.5YR 4/4</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>very few limestone gravels</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>76-110</td>
<td>abrupt</td>
<td>7.5YR 5/6 with 7.5YR 4/4 mottles</td>
<td>strong brown</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>common CaCO3; very few limestone gravels</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>110-153</td>
<td>unobserved</td>
<td>7.5YR 5/4 with frequent 7.5YR 5/6 mottles</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>very common CaCO3; few to common limestone gravels</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0-56</td>
<td>abrupt</td>
<td>10YR 3/2</td>
<td>very dark grayish brown</td>
<td>clay loam</td>
<td>very few limestones cobbles</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>Modern - pull tab and amber glass shard, concrete conglomerate</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>56-102</td>
<td>abrupt</td>
<td>10YR 3/3</td>
<td>dark brown</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>many limestone cobbles</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>102-180</td>
<td>unobserved</td>
<td>7.5YR 4/6 and 10YR 3/3 mottles</td>
<td>brown and very pale brown with dark brown</td>
<td>silty/sandy clay with loam mottles</td>
<td>many limestone cobbles</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0-40</td>
<td>abrupt</td>
<td>10YR 2/2</td>
<td>very dark grayish brown</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>few CaCO3; few limestone cobbles</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>40-109</td>
<td>unobserved</td>
<td>7.5YR 7/4 with 10YR 2/2</td>
<td>dark brown</td>
<td>degraded limestone bedrock with pockets of loam</td>
<td>few CaCO3; few limestone gravels</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHT 3</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0-33</td>
<td>smooth, abrupt</td>
<td>10YR 3/2</td>
<td>very dark grayish brown</td>
<td>clay loam</td>
<td>common CaCO3</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>33-130</td>
<td>unobserved</td>
<td>7.5YR 7/4 to 7.5YR 6/4</td>
<td>pink to light brown</td>
<td>degraded limestone bedrock</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHT 4</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0-102</td>
<td>abrupt</td>
<td>7.5YR 5/4 with 7.5YR 3/2</td>
<td>brown with dark brown</td>
<td>silty clay loam</td>
<td>few CaCO3; few to common limestone gravels</td>
<td>disturbance within trench</td>
<td>Historic to Modern - Asphalt Fragments, cobalt glass shards, FE crown cap, FE wire, metal pull tab</td>
<td>Represents disturbance bisecting northeast wall of Trench 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0-28</td>
<td>smooth, abrupt</td>
<td>10YR 3/1</td>
<td>very dark gray</td>
<td>clay loam</td>
<td>common limestone gravels and cobbles</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>Modern - rubber tire; metal pull tab, green, amber, colorless glass shards, FE wire, metal cap, amber bottle rim</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>28-32</td>
<td>smooth, abrupt</td>
<td>10YR 4/2 with 10YR 3/1 fine mottles</td>
<td>dark grayish brown with very dark gray mottles</td>
<td>sandy loam with clay loam mottles</td>
<td>few limestone gravels and cobbles</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B: Trench Profile Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Depth (cmbs)</th>
<th>Boundary</th>
<th>Munsell</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Texture</th>
<th>Inclusions</th>
<th>Depositional Integrity</th>
<th>Cultural Material</th>
<th>Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III 32-52</td>
<td>smooth, abrupt</td>
<td>10YR 3/1</td>
<td>very dark gray</td>
<td>clay loam</td>
<td>few limestone cobbles</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 52-90</td>
<td>smooth, abrupt</td>
<td>10YR 2/2</td>
<td>very dark brown</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>many limestone gravels</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 90-132</td>
<td>unobserved</td>
<td>7.5YR 6/4</td>
<td>light brown</td>
<td>degraded limestone bedrock</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 0-45/90</td>
<td>wavy, gradual</td>
<td>10YR 3/1</td>
<td>very dark gray</td>
<td>silty clay loam</td>
<td>common limestone gravels</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>Modern - amber, green, and colorless glass shards; canvas</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II 45/90-55/100</td>
<td>wavy, abrupt to clear</td>
<td>10YR 4/2</td>
<td>dark grayish brown</td>
<td>silty clay loam</td>
<td>few limestone cobbles and gravels</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 55/100-125</td>
<td>unobserved</td>
<td>7.5YR 6/4</td>
<td>light brown</td>
<td>degraded limestone bedrock</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 0-52</td>
<td>smooth, clear</td>
<td>10YR 3/1</td>
<td>very dark gray</td>
<td>silty clay loam</td>
<td>common limestone gravels</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>Historic to modern - amber, colorless, olive, and green glass shards, black plastic, porcelain tile, yellow and black refined white earthenware sherd, and unidentified ferrous metal mechanical object</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II 52-80</td>
<td>wavy, abrupt</td>
<td>10YR 4/2</td>
<td>dark grayish brown</td>
<td>silty clay loam</td>
<td>few limestone gravels</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 80-120</td>
<td>wavy, abrupt</td>
<td>10YR 5/3</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>silty loam</td>
<td>many limestone gravels and CaCO3 nodules</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 120-125</td>
<td>unobserved</td>
<td>10YR 8/1</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>CaCO3 and chalky marl</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II 80-120</td>
<td>smooth, abrupt</td>
<td>10YR 4/3</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>sandy clay loam</td>
<td>few CaCO3 nodules, many small gravels</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>Modern - glass shards on surface</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 0-30</td>
<td>smooth, abrupt</td>
<td>10YR 3/1</td>
<td>very dark gray</td>
<td>silty clay loam</td>
<td>common limestone gravels and cobbles; and snail shells</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 45-70</td>
<td>smooth, clear</td>
<td>7.5YR 5/4</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>silty clay loam</td>
<td>many CaCO3 concretions and nodules</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 70-135</td>
<td>smooth, clear</td>
<td>7.5YR 7/4 to 7.5YR 5/4 with 10YR 7/4 mottles</td>
<td>pink to brown</td>
<td>silty clay</td>
<td>many CaCO3 concretions and nodules, soft and coarse</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 135-160</td>
<td>unobserved</td>
<td>10YR 7/4</td>
<td>very pale brown</td>
<td>silty clay</td>
<td>many CaCO3 concretions and nodules, soft</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix B: Trench Profile Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Depth (cmbs)</th>
<th>Boundary</th>
<th>Munsell</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Texture</th>
<th>Inclusions</th>
<th>Depositional Integrity</th>
<th>Cultural Material</th>
<th>Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHT 9</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0-18</td>
<td>clear, wavy</td>
<td>10YR 3/2</td>
<td>very dark gray brown</td>
<td>loamy silt</td>
<td>many limestone pebbles and gravel</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>unmapped buried utility; some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>18-32</td>
<td>gradual, wavy</td>
<td>10YR 3/2</td>
<td>very dark gray brown</td>
<td>loamy silt</td>
<td>few limestone pebbles and CaCO3 nodules</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>Historic to Modern - asphalt fragments, 1 refined white earthenware sherd, amber, colorless, and green glass shards, 1 rubber fragment</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>32-74</td>
<td>gradual, smooth</td>
<td>10YR 4/3</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>silty clay</td>
<td>few CaCO3 flecks, very few limestone pebbles</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>74-190</td>
<td>unobserved</td>
<td>10YR 5/4</td>
<td>yellowish brown</td>
<td>loamy silt</td>
<td>common CaCO3 flecks and nodules</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHT 10</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0-27</td>
<td>clear, smooth</td>
<td>10YR 3/3</td>
<td>dark brown</td>
<td>silty loam</td>
<td>few limestone pebbles and CaCO3 nodules</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>Historic to Modern - green, colorless, and amber glass shards, asphalt fragments, 1 rubber fragment</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>27-77</td>
<td>gradual, smooth</td>
<td>5YR 3/3</td>
<td>dark reddish brown</td>
<td>silty clay</td>
<td>very few CaCO3 and limestone pebbles</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>77-157</td>
<td>gradual, smooth</td>
<td>7.5YR 6/4</td>
<td>light brown</td>
<td>silty clay</td>
<td>very few limestone pebbles</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>157-188</td>
<td>unobserved</td>
<td>7.5YR 8/1</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>common CaCO3 nodules</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHT 11</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0-23</td>
<td>gradual, smooth</td>
<td>7.5YR 3/2</td>
<td>dark brown</td>
<td>silty loam</td>
<td>few limestone and CaCO3 nodules and pebbles</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>Historic to Modern - green, colorless, and amber glass shards, shotgun cartridge case, plastic fragment, rubber fragment</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>23-57</td>
<td>irregular, abrupt</td>
<td>7.5YR 3/2</td>
<td>dark brown</td>
<td>silty loam</td>
<td>very few CaCO3</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>57-76</td>
<td>unobserved</td>
<td>10YR 8/1</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>degraded limestone bedrock</td>
<td>very common CaCO3 nodules</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHT 12</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0-24</td>
<td>even, clear</td>
<td>10YR 2/2</td>
<td>very dark brown</td>
<td>silty loam</td>
<td>few limestone pebbles and CaCO3 nodules</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>Historic to Modern - decalware sherds, rubber fragment, beer can, slate fragment</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>24-94</td>
<td>clear, wavy</td>
<td>10YR 4/3</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>common limestone and CaCO3</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>94-106</td>
<td>unobserved</td>
<td>10YR 8/1</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>marl</td>
<td>very common limestone and CaCO3</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench</td>
<td>Zone</td>
<td>Depth (cmbs)</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>Munsell</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Texture</td>
<td>Inclusions</td>
<td>Depositional Integrity</td>
<td>Cultural Material</td>
<td>Other Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHT 13</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0-62</td>
<td>clear, even</td>
<td>10YR 3/3</td>
<td>dark brown</td>
<td>silty loam</td>
<td>very few limestone and CaCO3 nodules and pebbles</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>Historic to Modern - colorless, green, and amber glass shards, possible tested cobble, metal twist top bottle cap, rubber fragment, and 1 cut faunal bone</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>62-109</td>
<td>clear, abrupt</td>
<td>SYR 3/2 with 10YR 3/2 mottles</td>
<td>very dark grayish brown with dark brown mottles</td>
<td>silty clay loam</td>
<td>common limetone pebbles and gravel and CaCO3 fill</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>109-122</td>
<td>clear, gradual</td>
<td>SYR 4/2</td>
<td>dark grayish brown</td>
<td>silty clay loam</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>122-155</td>
<td>unobserved</td>
<td>10YR 2/1</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>loamy clay</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHT 14</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0-47</td>
<td>clear, wavy</td>
<td>10YR 3/2</td>
<td>very dark grayish brown</td>
<td>clay loam</td>
<td>common limetone pebbles, gravel</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>Historic to Modern - concrete tile fragment, colorless and amber glass shards, plastic fragment, unidentified yellow material</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>47-180</td>
<td>unobserved</td>
<td>10YR 7/4</td>
<td>very pale brown</td>
<td>silty sand</td>
<td>many limestone pebbles and gravel</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHT 15</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0-35</td>
<td>clear, wavy</td>
<td>7.5YR 3/2</td>
<td>dark brown</td>
<td>silty loam</td>
<td>few limestone pebbles and gravels</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>Modern - amber, colorless, and green glass shards</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>35-57</td>
<td>unobserved</td>
<td>10YR 8/1</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>limestone bedrock</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHT 16</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>clear, wavy</td>
<td>SYR 2.5/1</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>silty loam</td>
<td>limestone gravel and CaCO3 flecks</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>Modern - amber, colorless, and aqua-tint glass shards, FE pulley, FE can fragment, pull tab, PVC pipe fragment, plastic tail light fragment, rubber fragment</td>
<td>unmapped buried utility; some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>50-121</td>
<td>gradual, smooth</td>
<td>10YR 4/4</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>mostly limestone gravels and pebbles</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>some bioturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>121-187</td>
<td>unobserved</td>
<td>10YR 7/4</td>
<td>very pale brown</td>
<td>sand</td>
<td>very common limestone gravels and pebbles</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>