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Abstract:

The Center for Archaeological Research at The University of Texas at San Antonio conducted an intensive pedestrian survey along Walnut Branch in Seguin, Guadalupe County, Texas during the first half of 2008 and in June of 2009. This investigation was associated with the Walnut Branch Hike and Bike Trail project that involves the City of Seguin and Jacobs. The project aims to revitalize a portion of Walnut Branch for community betterment, tourism and the stimulation of commercial development. There are several historical structures in the environs of the creek, including the Sebastopol State Historical Structure. The archaeological investigations associated with this project were conducted under the Texas Antiquities Permit # 4734 with Jennifer L. Thompson serving as the Principal Investigator.

Thirty-nine shovel tests and five backhoe trenches were excavated along the banks of Walnut Branch. During these efforts three new sites were recorded: 41GU113, a multi-component site, was located on a sloping terrace along the western bank of the creek; 41GU114, also a multi-component site, was located on the western descending bank of the creek; and 41GU115 was located on the eastern descending bank of the creek and contained historic material. CAR does not recommend further work on the sites nor does CAR recommend that they are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or formal designation as State Archaeological Landmarks.

All artifacts and records collected during the project are temporarily curated at the Center for Archaeological Research according to Texas Historical Commission guidelines.
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Chapter 1: Introduction and Project Setting

The Center for Archaeological Research (CAR) at The University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA) was contracted by Carter and Burgess, Inc. to conduct an intensive pedestrian survey for the Walnut Branch Hike and Bike Trail Project in Seguin, Texas (Figure 1-1). The Walnut Branch Hike and Bike Trail Project is a combined effort between the City of Seguin and Jacobs to revitalize a portion of Walnut Branch for community betterment, tourism and the stimulation of commercial development. The Walnut Branch Hike and Bike Trail project consists of the development and implementation of a community-based amenities master plan for an approximately 2.5 mile stretch of Walnut Branch. This report presents the results of the intensive pedestrian survey conducted for the project.

The intensive pedestrian survey and shovel testing along the Walnut Branch was completed in short intervals during the winter (February), spring (May) and early summer (June) of 2008. Additional shovel tests and backhoe trenching were conducted in June 2009 when the City of Seguin secured access to and ownership of several additional properties. The proposed depth of impact throughout most of the project area is limited to approximately two feet (60 cm). Areas potentially subjected to deeper impacts of four feet and more were examined using backhoe trenches. In addition to these areas, infrastructure such as street lighting poles and bridge piers will impact depths to 32 feet.

Archival and background research conducted prior to the survey indicated that historic and prehistoric resources are located in the environs of the project area (Ulrich and Figueroa 2007). During the archaeological survey 39 shovel tests and five backhoe trenches were excavated. Three new sites were recorded but CAR does not recommend them eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or for formal designation as State Archeological Landmarks.

Archaeological investigations were conducted under Texas Antiquities Permit # 4734. Antonia L. Figueroa served as the Project Archaeologist and Jennifer L. Thompson served as the Principal Investigator. The investigations consisted of surface inspection and shallow sub-surface shovel testing. During June of 2009, investigations for deep impacts and newly acquired properties were conducted by Eric Oksanen as Project Archaeologist.

This document is divided into six chapters. The remainder of this chapter presents the goals of the Walnut Branch Hike and Bike Trail Project, the project area and the Area of Potential Effect (APE). Chapter 2 discusses the project area environment as well as the culture chronology for the area. The historical properties that are located along the Walnut Branch are presented in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 outlines the methods used in the field and laboratory. The results of the fieldwork are discussed in Chapter 5, followed by conclusions and recommendations in Chapter 6.

The Walnut Branch
Hike and Bike Trail Project

The Walnut Branch Hike and Bike Trail Project is a broad program aimed at addressing problems of flood control, erosion, and restoration of previous improvements, while providing an area of recreation for the community. The improvements will be directed by the principles of hydrology, nature, and society. One of the goals of the project will also be to improve the “structure and function of the riparian corridor, stream riffle-pool complexes, and water quality within Walnut Branch” (City of Seguin 2004). The United States Army Corp of Engineers (USACE 1987) has conducted previous studies along the branch, and though they are not a participant in the
Figure 1-1. Map of the project area on the Seguin, Texas, (2997-392) USGS quadrangle map.
current project, their studies were examined during the course of this project. The USACE has considered plans to reforest areas along the creek to provide improved habitats for local wildlife remove invasive, non-native plants and replace them with native varieties to aid in erosion prevention and stabilization of the creek banks to prevent further bank failures. The City of Seguin Parks and Recreation Department, with assistance from the National Parks Service (NPS), plans to create a Nature/Heritage Trail complete with picnic areas, to be used by pedestrians and bicyclists, and guided economic development that will allow for limited concessions and retail access. The City believes that these improvements will not only enhance the quality of life for its inhabitants, but also promote tourism to the area (City of Seguin 2004).

The majority of the upper reach of Walnut Branch lacks habitat conducive to sustaining the local wildlife due to channelization for flood reduction. The removal of riparian plant life has allowed non-native flora to invade. Developments within the watershed have increased the water velocity within the creek channel. This has lead to bank collapse resulting in the high silt load of the creek. Also, Walnut Branch contains a larger number of pools than desired due to historic dams and utility crossings. A decrease in the number and size of the pools would benefit the aquatic ecosystem.

Based on the review provided by the USACE, several measures are recommended to environmentally restore the area. First, an intensive reforestation process would occur in areas that had been cleared for agricultural purpose. Second, an in-channel wetland may be created by means of re-circulating water pumped from the lower reach or by using wastewater from the chicken processing plant, a wastewater treatment plant or a power plant. Third, the USACE suggested the creation of two off-channel wetlands to be located on parcels of land adjacent to the creek channel. Fourth, the riparian woodland would be restored in areas that were overrun by non-native plants. Fifth the historic dams and low water structures would be modified or removed to decrease the number of pools and allow for the formation of riffles. The sixth measure would entail the re-stabilization of the creek bank, including the use of concrete or stone retaining walls or the re-sloping of the bank to a shallower grade. The last measure would involve the removal of the channel obstructions such as concrete debris and strategic placement of fallen trees and large boulders (City of Seguin 2004). In addition, the creation of the Hike and Bike Trail would require that sections of the west bank of the creek be graded and stabilized for erosion control. A number of these measures would result in subsurface disturbances that could impact potential historic or prehistoric resources along the APE. It should be noted, however, that these recommendations have not been fully accepted for implementation, but are measures that have been recommended by the USACE (1987).

The Project Area and the Area of Potential Effect (APE)

The project area is depicted on the Seguin, Texas 7.5 minute series USGS quadrangle map. The project area for the Walnut Branch Hike and Bike Trail, and therefore the Area of Potential Effect (APE), is represented by a corridor along the Walnut Branch, from its confluence with the Guadalupe River up to the creek’s crossing at West New Braunfels Street. The Walnut Branch watershed is located within the Guadalupe River Basin. The entire length of the project area is approximately 2.5 miles (Figure 1-2). The estimated width of the ROW is 50 m and the overall project area is 50 acres. For most of the APE, the depth of impacts is projected to be shallow, less than two feet (60 cm) in depth. Several areas between West Court Street and West Nolte Street on both banks may be impacted to depths of four feet (120 cm), and as much as 25 to 35 feet for lamp standards and bridge piers.

The proposed hike and bike corridor was divided into northern and southern reaches. The northern reach was from West New Braunfels Street to Court Street. The southern reach spanned from Court Street south to the convergence of Walnut Branch and the Guadalupe River. The northern portion of the APE is owned by the City of Seguin, while the southern portion includes parcels that are privately owned as well as owned by the City of Seguin.

This division of the project area was made because while a clearly defined Right-of-Way (ROW) was available for the northern segment of the project area, the project easement along the southern section was just recently proposed by the design team to the City of Seguin. During the initial pedestrian survey, ROW data from Court Street to Nolte Street of southern section was provided to CAR after the completion of the survey, and the ROW from Nolte Street to South Austin Street was still in the design stage. These areas were surveyed in June 2009.

Prior to the survey of the southern section of the APE (Court Street to the Max Starck Park) CAR attended a meeting with the client to discuss the proposed hike and bike route. Although, the ROW data was not available at that time, preliminary plans were discussed and it was agreed that that route surveyed by CAR would be used as the proposed route. The route surveyed by CAR stayed within 20 to 30 meters of the creek bank and outside property fences.
Figure 1-2. Map of the Walnut Branch APE depicting shovel tests and historical properties.
Chapter 2: Environment and Culture Chronology

Environment

Climate

Seguin, Texas is located along the boundary between the Subtropical Subhumid (west) and Subtropical Humid (east) (Larkin and Bomar 1983). Summers tend to be fairly hot, with temperatures averaging approximately 90°F (32°C). Mild winters are typical in the area, with temperatures averaging 61°F (16°C). The annual average rainfall is approximately 33 inches (USACE 1987, Larkin and Bomar 1983).

Geology

The project area is mostly within quaternary Pleistocene and Holocene age terrace deposits. Towards the confluence of Walnut Branch and the Guadalupe River are outcroppings of the Paleocene age Midway Group. The lower Midway is composed of highly glauconitic sands and sandy clays. The upper Midway consists of interbedded marls and glauconitic limestone (Proctor et al. 1974). The strata dip slightly to the southeast and strike in a northeast to southwest direction. The Midway Group is approximately 25 to 30 feet below surface and in this section consists of intermixed clay and shales. Coring samples in Guadalupe County to the east of the project area show the Midway group thinning out at the surface and exposing the underlying Upper Cretaceous Navarro group marls extend to a depth of approximately 300 feet.

Hydrology

Walnut Branch is a tributary of the Guadalupe River. The stream originates 6.5 miles northwest of Seguin. Flowing in a southeasterly direction from Interstate Highway (IH) 10, it flows for approximately 4.5 miles in a southeasterly direction to its confluence with the Guadalupe River. The total drainage area is approximately 14 square miles, and in the project area, the drainage area is approximately 7.4 square miles (USAE 1987). The elevation at its head is 600 ft. AMSL and drops to 437 ft. AMSL at the confluence with the Guadalupe River. Sections of the channel have been modified and improved; these include an earthen dike to contain outfall from the wastewater treatment plant. Walnut Branch is between two major aquifer systems. North of Walnut Branch is the Edwards Aquifer that parallels the Balcones Escarpment and south of Walnut Branch is the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer.

Soils

Soils encountered along the APE are described as Tinn Clay (TW) that are frequently flooded (WSS 2008). The local Tinn soils formed in stream valleys in deep to very deep fine-grained calcareous Holocene-age alluvium. The typical profile exhibits little variation in the upper 100 cm of the soil column. The clay content by volume is at least 50 percent and the periodic wetting and drying of the soil can cause the formation of raised mound surface features called gilgai. In addition to gilgai, surface cracks that can extend downwards to depths of a meter or more, also can form during the repeated wetting and drying. Typical in the soil profile are sliksides, shiny surfaces on ped faces, caused by friction generated by shrinking and swelling cycles (USDA 1999). Because of these characteristics, cultural deposits may be negatively affected, from increased translocation and increased risk of breakage of artifacts. The Tinn soils extend to depths of up to two meters, below which is a sandy unit of Pleistocene age Quaternary deposits with varying percentages of silt, clay and gravel (USAE 1987).

Flora and Fauna

Guadalupe County is divided into two geographical regions; the Gulf Coastal Plain and the Blackland Prairie. The project area falls within the Gulf Coastal Plain geographical region (Hester et al. 1989). The tall grass prairie was once dominated by big bluestem (Andropogon gerardii), little bluestem (Bothriochloa saccharoides), indiangrass (Sorghastrum nutans), tall dropseed (Sporobolus asper), and Silveus dropseed (Sporobolus sileanus). Due to overgrazing, these species have been overrun by sideoats grama (Bouteloua curtipendula), hairy grama (Bouteloua hirsute), sedge (Carex spp.), Texas wintergrass (Stipa leucotricha), and buffalograss (Buchloe dactyloides). Hardwoods common along the drainages located within this region include oak (Quercus spp.), elm (Ulmus spp.), cottonwood (Populus deltoides), and pecan (Carya illinoiensis). Along the abandoned croplands and on rangelands, common species of invading trees include mesquite (Prosopis glanulosa), huisache (Acacia smallii), oak, and elm.

Within the specific project area, predominant trees include walnut (Juglans spp.), pecan, sycamore (Platanus spp.), oak, elm, Ashe juniper (Juniper ashei), cottonwood, and hackberry (Celtis laevigata). The ecosystem of Walnut Branch is diverse, possibly containing over 189 species.
of trees and shrubs, 42 woody vines, 75 grasses, and 802 herbaceous plants (Fentress 1986).

The fauna supported by Walnut Branch include a diverse collection of insects, fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals. Previous investigations have revealed signs of armadillos (Dasypus novemcinctus), raccoons (Procyon lotor), oppossums (Didelphis virginiana), skunks (Mephitis mephitis), rabbits (Sylvilagus floridanus), fox squirrels (Sciurus niger), and a variety of small rodents. Reptiles that were noted in the area include cricket frogs (Acris crepitans), snapping turtle (Chelydra serpentina), soft shelled turtles (Apalone spp.) and red eared sliders (Trachemys scripta) (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2003). The common fish species found in Walnut Branch include bass (Micropterus spp.), bullhead (Ictalurus spp.), Rio Grande cichlid (Cichlasoma cyanoguttata), green sunfish (Lepomis cyanellus) and various minnows. The Rio Grande cichlids are an introduced species that is relatively abundant in the creek, though the conditions are not favorable (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2003).

**Culture Chronology**

Guadalupe County has few recorded archaeological sites in comparison to other counties in Texas. As of 2008, a total of 99 prehistoric and historic sites, 74 historical markers, and 12 National Register Properties have been recorded in the county. Outlined in this chapter is the culture chronology for south-central Texas. According to the Southwestern Division, USACE Guadalupe County is part of the South Texas Coastal Plain and Central Texas Plateau-Prairies archaeological region (Hester et al. 1989).

**Paleoindian Period**

The Paleoindian period marks the first signs of human populations in the New World. It coincides with the end of the Pleistocene and spans roughly from 11,500 - 8800 BP (Collins 1995 and 2004). Current research has confirmed absolute dates at three sites in Texas, the earliest is from the Aubrey site in Denton County, with radiocarbon assays of 11, 542 ± 111 BP and 11, 590 ± 93 BP (Bousman et al. 2004: 48). Environmental data suggest that climate during the Late Pleistocene was wetter and cooler than it is today (Mauldin and Nickels 2001; Toomey et al. 1993), though it became gradually drier and warmer into the Early Holocene (Bousman 1998).

Early perceptions of Paleoindian populations generally viewed hunter-gatherers ranging over wide areas in pursuit of now extinct megafauna. This view of Paleoindian peoples, much like the dating of this period, is now being reassessed. While certainly exploiting Late Pleistocene megafauna, these peoples are perhaps better characterized as generalized hunter-gatherers whose diet included small game and plants. The Lewisville site (Winkler 1982) and the Aubrey site (Ferring 2001) possess faunal assemblages with a wide range of taxa that not only include large mammals but small to medium ones as well. Little information seems to be available on the consumption of plant resources during this cultural period, though according to Bousman et al. (2004), the late Paleoindian component at the Wilson-Leonard site reflects diverse exploitation of riparian, forest and grassland species. Skeletal analysis of Paleoindian remains indicates that the diets of the Paleoindian and later Archaic hunter-gatherers may not have differed so greatly (Bousman et al 2004; after Powell and Steele 1994).

Clovis and Folsom fluted projectile points used for hunting megafauna characterize early Paleoindian material culture. Projectile points, such as Plainview, Dalton, Angostura, Golondrina, Meserve, and Scottsbluff, are also diagnostic of the late Paleoindian. Clovis materials are associated with camp, lithic procurement, kill, cache, ritual and burial sites (Collins 1995). Meltzer and Bever (1995) have documented 406 Clovis sites in Texas. One of the earliest documented a Paleoindian site, 41RB1, was a small playa site near Miami in Roberts County, Texas (Bousman et al. 2004:15). According to radiocarbon assays the maximum age for the Miami site is 11,415 ± 125 BP (Bousman et al. 2004: 47).

**Archaic Period**

The Archaic period spans from ca. 8800 B.P. to 1200 BP and has been divided into Early Archaic, Middle Archaic and Late Archaic sub-periods (Collins 1995, Johnson and Goode 1994). In addition, Johnson and Goode (1994) distinguish between a Late Archaic I and Late Archaic II. During the Archaic, there is a shift in subsistence with a greater emphasis on the exploitation of specific local environments. Differences between sub-periods are marked by changes in material culture and site characteristics. Hunting strategies focus mainly on medium to small game along with continued foraging for plant resources.

**Early Archaic**

According to Collins (1995), the Early Archaic spans from 8800 to 6000 BP. Early Archaic projectile point styles include Angostura, Early Split Stem, Martindale and Uvalde (Collins 1995). The climate during the Early Archaic is described as drier than the Paleoindian period with a return of grasslands (Bousman 1998). Megafauna of the Paleoindian period could not subsist in the new ecosystem and gradually died out.
During the Early Archaic the exploitation of medium to small fauna intensified.

Data recovered from the Wilson-Leonard site reveals the continuation of projectile point forms and the use of small to medium size hearths that were also present during the Paleoindian period. The appearance of earth ovens implies another shift in subsistence patterns. Collins et al. (1998) suggest that the earth ovens at Wilson-Leonard were used to cook wild hyacinth along with aquatic and terrestrial resources. Information from Early Archaic human remains from Kerr County (Bement 1991) indicates a diet low in carbohydrates in relation to Early Archaic populations in the Lower Pecos area.

**Middle Archaic**

Date ranges for the Middle Archaic span from 6000 to 4000 BP (Collins 1995). Collins (1995) and Weir (1976) suggest that there was a population increase during this sub-period. Climate was gradually drying at the onset of the Altithermal drought. Demographic and cultural change likely occurred in response to the hotter and drier conditions. Middle Archaic projectile point styles include Bell, Andice, Calf Creek, Taylor, Nolan, and Travis. Johnson and Goode (1994) postulate that culture transmission from the Lower Pecos region explains the appearance of new point styles in the sub-period.

Middle Archaic subsistence focused on exploitation of resources clustered in riparian environments (Black 1989a). The accumulation of burned rock middens during the Middle Archaic reflects this focus on the exploitation of plant resources (Black 1989a; Johnson and Goode 1994). Current research has reassessed when the use of burned rock middens intensified. Data from Camp Bowie suggests that intensification occurred in the latter Late Prehistoric period (Mauldin et al. 2003). Little is known about burial practices during this culture sub-period, though a sinkhole in Uvalde (41UV4) contained 25-50 individuals (Johnson and Goode 1994:28).

**Late Archaic**

The Late Archaic is the final sub-period of the Archaic and spans from 4000-1200 B.P. (Collins 2004). The Late Archaic is marked by the introduction of Bulverde, Pedernales, Kinney, Lange, Marshall, Williams, Marcos, Montell, Castroville, Ensor, Frio, Fairland and Darl projectile points. During the early part of the Late Archaic, there were fluctuations in temperature and rainfall. Populations are believed to have increased through this sub-period. This change in climate marks Johnson and Goode’s Late Archaic II (1994).

Some researchers state that the use of burned rock middens ceased at this time, current research is challenging this notion (Black and Creel 1997; Mauldin et al. 2003). Skeletal evidence from Late Archaic cemeteries in Central and South Texas suggests the region saw increasing populations that may have prompted the establishment of territorial boundaries resulting in boundary disputes (Nickels et al. 1998). Human remains dating to this sub-period have been found near the Edward’s Plateau. Dental evidence shows a high rate of enamel hypoplasia indicating nutritional stress at this time (Johnson and Goode 1994).

**Late Prehistoric Period**

This period begins ca. 1200 BP (Collins 1995, 2004) and lasts until the Protohistoric Period (ca. 1250 AD. The term Late Prehistoric is commonly used to designate the period following the Late Archaic in Central and South Texas. A series of distinctive traits marks the shift from the Archaic to the Late Prehistoric period, including the technological shift to the bow and arrow and the introduction of pottery. The period includes two Phases: The Austin Phase and the Toyah Phase.

At the beginning of this period, environmental conditions were warm and dry. More mesic conditions appear to accelerate after 1000 BP (Mauldin and Nickels 2001). Subsistence practices remain relatively unchanged, especially during the Austin Phase. Projectile point styles associated with the Austin Phase include Edwards and Scallorn types while in the Toyah Phase the Perdiz projectile point is prevalent (Collins 1995).

Most researchers agree the Austin Phase was a time of population decrease (Black 1989:32). Radiocarbon data has revealed that a number of burned rock middens in Central Texas were used long after the Archaic and throughout the Late Prehistoric. Moreover, the “heyday of middenery began after AD 1 and peaked during the Late Prehistoric” (Black and Creel 1997:273). Radiocarbon dates from Camp Bowie middens concur with arguments set forth by Black and Creel (1997) that burned rock middens are primarily a Late Prehistoric phenomena (Mauldin et al. 2003).

Beginning rather abruptly at about 650 BP, a shift in technology occurred. This shift is characterized by the introduction of blade technology, the first ceramics in Central Texas (bone-tempered plainwares), the appearance of Perdiz arrow points, and alternately beveled bifaces (Black 1989:32; Huebner 1991:346). Prewitt (1981) suggests that this technology encroached from north-central Texas. Patterson (1988), however, notes that Perdiz points were first seen in southeast Texas by about 1350 BP, and spread to the west some 600–700 years later.
Ricklis (1995) contends that ceramics became a part of the archaeological record in Central Texas beginning about AD 1250/1300. Early ceramics in Central Texas are associated with Toyah Phase components and referred to as Leon Plain. The earliest dates for Leon Plain are relative and based on associations with “Toyah” assemblages. The Leon Plain ceramic type includes undecorated, bone-tempered bowls, jars, and ollas with oxidized, burnished or floated exterior surfaces (Ricklis 1995). Although there is a typical set of attributes associated with Leon Plain, there is notable variation within the type (Black 1986; Johnson 1994; Kalter et al. 2005). This variation is typically attributed to differences in manufacturing methods and cultural affiliation. Stable carbon and nitrogen isotope data suggests that vessels were utilized in the processing of bison bone grease/fat, mesquite bean/bison bone grease and deer/bison bone grease (Quigg et al. 1993).

Huebner (1991) suggests that the sudden return of bison to South and Central Texas during the Late Prehistoric resulted from a xeric climate in the plains north of Texas and increased grass production in the Cross-Timbers and Post Oak Savannah in north-central Texas. Together these formed a “bison corridor” into the South Texas Plain along the eastern edge of the Edwards Plateau (Huebner 1991:354–355). Settlement shifts into rock shelters such as Scorpion Cave in Medina County (Highley et al. 1978) and Classen Rockshelter in northern Bexar County (Fox and Fox 1967) have been noted during this time. Cemeteries from this period often reveal evidence of conflict (Black 1989:32).

Protohistoric Period

The transitional period between the Late Prehistoric and Historic period is usually deemed as the Protohistoric period. This period is not well documented and is marked by the end of the Toyah Phase, roughly AD 1250/1300 to 1600/1650 (Hester 1995), and the beginning of Spanish explorations of the area (ca. 1528). The period is concluded with the establishment of a strong Spanish presence in the region in the late 1600s and early 1700s. Sporadic encounters between the indigenous populations and Europeans occurred at this time. Identifying this period archaeological is problematic in that a clear set of material culture associated with this period is lacking. Protohistoric sites may have the presence of Late Prehistoric and Historic artifacts.

Historic Period

The first accounts of European contact in Texas occur with the exploits of Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca during the late 1520s to mid 1530s. In 1541, Francisco Vázquez de Coronado crossed the Panhandle with his army and encountered the Plains Indians of Texas. The next year, Luis de Moscoso Alvarado entered Texas near present day Houston County. He and his troops managed to make their way back to Mexico by way of the Mississippi River and the Texas Gulf Coast.

Three Spanish ships wrecked off the coast of Padre Island in 1554. The cargo of the ships sparked salvage attempts that year, but the fact that the majority of the ships crews were killed by the local natives did not encourage settling activities at that time (Chipman 2007). Twelve years later, a group of Englishmen were stranded near Tampico, Mexico. Three of the men walked along the Gulf Coast and the Atlantic Coast to get to Nova Scotia. These men’s experience with the natives in Texas was similar to that of Cabeza de Vaca.

The development of the mining communities in Zacatecas and Chihuahua furthered sporadic entrance into Texas. Nonetheless, the Texas territory remained relatively unknown until Spain became aware of the encroaching French in the eastern portion of Texas. LaSalle’s accidental landing in Matagorda Bay in 1685 launched an intense manhunt on Spain’s part. Within the next few years, Spain authorized the establishment of a mission in East Texas. The mission was abandoned by 1693, but it had familiarized the Spaniards with Texas and its inhabitants (Chipman 2007). By 1718, the founding of missions in Texas was in full swing. The remainder of the Eighteenth Century is commonly referred to as the “Mission Period”, and reflects the prominence of the mission system in the settling of Texas.

Though the occupation of Texas was dominated by the presidio and mission institutions, some communities of Spanish colonists popped up during the Mission Period. Families of the presidial soldiers sometimes settled near the presidio, creating communities on the frontier. In 1731, a group of Canary Islanders settled in San Antonio, creating one of the earliest Spanish settlements in Texas. By 1804, the Hispanic population of Texas was less than 5000. As the struggle to gain independence from Spain increased in Mexico, so did the influx of Americans seeking their fortunes. By the time Texas had declared independence from Mexico, the Americans in Texas outnumbered the Hispanic population (Chipman 2007).

The History of Seguin

Sir Humphrey Branch was awarded a land grant from the Mexican Government in May of 1830. Branch received the grant under Empresario Green DeWitt and land commissioner José Antonio Navarro in November of 1831 (GLOSA v. 13, 589). The land grant consisted of a parcel of land along the
northeast bank of the Guadalupe River, thirty-eight miles north of Gonzales. Branch and his family constructed a cabin in 1833 within the area presently know as Seguin (Gesick 2007). The next year, Branch decided to withdraw his colony and retreat to Gonzales due to the pressures of Indian attacks, difficulties of living on the frontier, and the escalating political situation in the area. He sold half of his property to Joseph S. Martin and the other half to Thomas R. Miller (GCDR: GT 384, 74).

In 1838, Joseph Martin entered into an agreement to establish a town at the present site of Seguin. James Campbell, Arthur Swift, and Matthew Caldwell became partners with Martin on this venture. On August 12, 1838, the four partners officially announced their plans, presented the plans for the town, and sold 44 shares of the new town. Caldwell, Campbell, and Swift each received one share, though Martin retained eleven. Thirty shares were sold to prospective townsfolk (Ivey et al. 1977).

The town was first named Walnut Springs, after the springs that fed Walnut Branch. The town’s people had met on September 22, 1838 to name the town, and to distribute the land parcels by way of drawing lots (Ivey et al. 1977). The town was precisely mapped out with lots for the city center, farming and timber, laying down rules for the dwelling dimensions and timelines for occupying the lots. Walnut Branch was not taken into consideration when the town lots were created, resulting in the town having no ownership rights to the water source and several town lots being divided by the creek. The plan led to many problems concerning the care and use of the creek and property titles. During the initial division, town lots that bordered Walnut Branch were deeded to John W. Nichols, James Campbell, Joseph Martin, Abram Roberts and James A. Swift (GCDR A:111-159). Timber lots that framed the creek were awarded to Cyrus Crosby, Joseph Martin, James Campbell, Abram Roberts, John W. Nichols, and M. L. Beebee (GCDR A: 111-159).

Early the next year, it became known that another location in Texas already had adopted the name “Walnut Springs” which would prevent the towns people from getting a post office located at the current site of Seguin. Another meeting was held to determine the new name for the town site. On February 28, 1839, the shareholders met to decide between “Tuscumbia” and “Seguin” as the new town name. Seguin won out, with eighteen votes to seven (GCDR: Ams 65). While it is commonly accepted that the name Seguin was chosen to honor Col. Juan N. Seguin who had been a messenger for Colonel Travis at the Alamo and had led a company of Texas Calvary at the Battle of San Jacinto (Kubala nd), other historic accounts challenge this assertion. Homer Thrall’s “Pictorial History of Texas” (1879-666) states that the town was “…named for Erasmo Seguin”, Juan Seguin’s distinguished father.

Local belief is that a group of Texas Rangers, commanded by Captain Jack Hays, built an adobe structure on the banks of the creek during the early years of Seguin. Other accounts indicate that they had a horse shed located at the building known as the “Captain Hall House” (Ivey et al. 1977). A local resident claims that his ancestor, Sara Day, lived in the house referred to by the town’s people as the “Ranger Station” (McDonald 2005). No documents exist that specifically indicate the location of a Ranger Station, but much of the information concerning the Texas Rangers was poorly recorded immediately following the Texas Revolution (Ivey et al. 1977).

The shareholders began building the town with houses and public buildings and received a post office in 1840 (Fitzsimon 1938). By the time Texas was annexed to the United States, the town had grown quite a bit, though many of the inhabitants of Sequin were involved in the struggles for annexation, and later the Mexican-American War. Just a few days before Guadalupe County was created in 1846, Seguin was declared the county seat (Kubala nd). The first school was created in 1849 and referred to as the “Male School”. It was one of the largest buildings constructed of Park’s concrete (limecrete) during this time. The building is still used today as part of St. Joseph’s School (Weinert 1938). In 1850, it was estimated that approximately 700 people lived in Sequin, and the town contained a gristmill, sawmill, and two cotton gins (Fitzsimon 1938).

Seguin was incorporated with the nearby town, Guadalupe City, in 1853. John R. King was the first mayor at the time of incorporation (Kubala nd). During the same year, Seguin’s first newspaper was started and called the Seguin Mercury.

The Civil War caused some tension within the town. The majority of the population was in supporter of the Confederacy due to the desire to retain the institution of slavery. The inhabitants of Seguin who opposed seceding from the US were subjected to the animosity of the supporters. Many of the Union supporters left Seguin and did not return until sympathizers were not as ostracized (Weinert 1938). Many male inhabitants of Seguin, who were supporters of the Confederacy, joined the war effort, some never to return.

Seguin remained a small town, acting as a frontier outpost for the majority of the Nineteenth Century. In 1876, the Galveston, Harrisburg and San Antonio Railway passed through Seguin. A train depot was established 2/3 of a mile
from the center of town. The inhabitants of Seguin were not happy with the arrangement, preferring the depot to be situated in the center of town. To cope, rails were laid from the mills to transport material back and forth from the depot with greater ease (Weinert 1938). Soon after the arrival of the railroad, the population of the town began to boom once again. An excerpt from the February 20, 1890 edition of the *Seguin Enterprise* (1890) spoke of the growth of the town, and even commented on the desire for a park along Walnut Creek:

There is nothing in the world that adds more to the attractions of a town than a resort of some kind, where strangers can go and while away the hours. Such a place is being made of the park, and it has been suggested that the beautiful and romantic spot on Walnut branch, in the yard of the place bought of Mrs. Henderson by P. S. Sowell, be bought for the same purpose. This spot is just north of the residence of Judge Jas. Greenwood, and is indeed a most picturesque spot, and is located within 200 yards of the court house square. Seguin is building and coming to the front. The value of every citizen’s property is fast increasing. Therefore they should feel no hesitancy in running their hands into their pockets and donating liberally toward everything that is to the advancement and interest of the town.

By 1912, the Texas Lutheran College relocated from Brenham to the Fritz Farm near Seguin. The College reached University status in 1996 (Gesick 2007).

Seguin was typically dependant on an agricultural economy. During the 1920s oil was discovered approximately fifteen miles from town, changing the economy of the town, though it was still primarily agricultural. The women of the Shakespeare Club became active in many civic concerns, one of which was the beautification of Walnut Branch. By 1933, the creek had become riddled with trash that locals had been dumping. The women pressured Seguin businessmen and Mayor Max Starcke to address the need to revitalize the creek. When funds became available from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC), Chamber of Commerce President H.H. Starcke allotted some to cleaning debris and garbage from Walnut Creek. It was later decided to extend the cleaning process into a program to develop a portion of Walnut Branch into a park. Chamber members were able to secure easements along the creek from Nolte Street (at that time Market Street) to Sebastopol ranging from six feet to sixty feet. R.H. H. Hugman’s services were secured as the environmental architect to design and direct the construction of the Walnut Branch Park (Burns 2003).

At the present time, Sequin’s economic revitalization efforts are focused on tourism with the rejuvenation of the downtown area through projects like the Walnut Branch Hike and Bike Trail.
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This chapter discusses the previously recorded sites within close proximity to the APE as well as the historical properties that are located along Walnut Branch. Background information on the historical structures was obtained from the Texas Archaeological Sites Atlas (THC 2008).

Previously Recorded Sites

Only three previously recorded/documented archaeological sites are found within the environs of Walnut Branch. Two of these are historic buildings, and one is a prehistoric lithic scatter.

Site 41GU7 is a prehistoric lithic scatter found on the premises of the Kubala Ranch on the south side of Seguin (THC 2008). The lithic debitage and burned rock appeared to have washed down from an adjacent hill. It is possible that the site was a temporary camp due to the lack of a sufficient water supply and the ephemeral nature of the scatter. Daniel Prikryl and Steven Kotter recorded the site in 1975 (THC 2008).

Site 41GU9 is known as the Sebastopol State Historical Site (Figure 3-1). The site is also a State Archaeological Landmark (THC 2008). The house was constructed in the 1850s for Catherine LeGette and may have been built by her brother, Joshua Young. LeGette lived in the house from the late 1850s to 1874, at which time she sold the house to her son-in-law, Joseph Polley. Two days after the house was sold to Polley, he sold it to Joseph Zorn, Jr. for the exact amount that Polley paid for it (Sauer et al. 1998). For a short time during the 1950s, the house was rented to the Ibarra family. The house remained in the Zorn family until the State of Texas purchased the building in 1978 (Sauer et al. 1998).

The style of construction of the Sebastopol House offers a glimpse of the use of limecrete in the area. Limecrete is a formula of concrete in which local lime is used as the bonding agent when combined with water and gravel. Dr. John Park perfected the type of limecrete that was used on the Sebastopol house. Seguin had a number of limecrete structures constructed during the mid-1800s, but Sebastopol House is one of the largest examples still standing.

![Figure 3-1. Photograph of the Sebastopol House ca. 1935 (HABS TEX, 94-SEGUI, 1-1).](image-url)
The property that Sebastopol House is situated on is south of Walnut Branch creek. Accounts from some of the grandchildren that often visited the house speak of Walnut Branch as a play area, and that there was a bathhouse and fenced garden located between the house and Walnut Branch (Sauer et al. 1998). Calvert Zorn helped to perpetuate a myth that a tunnel led from the creek to the house that could be used in time of Indian attacks (Sauer et al. 1998).

After the State of Texas purchased the property, the house site underwent several seasons of archaeological testing (Sauer et al. 1998). The results of the testing aided in the preservation of the house, as well as providing insight into the social and economic background of the Zorn family. The interior decoration of the house mimics the heyday of Nettie and Joseph Zorn.

The third site recorded within Seguin is 41GU16. This is a historic structure located on the corner of East Live Oak Street and South River Street. The site is recorded as the oldest house constructed in Seguin. The property is reported to have been used as a stagecoach stop by 1765 (THC 2009).

Historic Structures of Seguin

While only three previously documented historic properties are recorded in the vicinity of the APE, many historic homes can be found in Seguin that are not listed as historic archaeological sites on the Texas Archeological Sites Atlas. Several of these appear on the National Register of Historic Places. In this section, the homesites that are in the vicinity of the project area are briefly discussed. More in-depth information concerning the structures is presented in the historic standing structures survey report produced by Main Street Architects, Inc. Figure 1-2 in Chapter 1 depicts the location of the historical structures along the APE.

Mosey Campbell

The Mosey Campbell residence is located at 607 North Vaughn (refer to Figure 1-2-1). The structure was built with slave labor in 1851 under the supervision of Mosey Campbell, a Kentucky planter. The building was constructed of native limestone, with stuccoed exterior and plastered interior. The building has been substantially altered (Figure 3-2), though the property remained in the Campbell family for many years. In 1937, the current owner was Mrs. Henry Campbell Wallace. In 1937, she spoke of a walnut wardrobe that had been made by one of the Campbell slaves she still had in her possession. The property lies west of Walnut Branch (THC 2008).
with stone, possibly ca. 1825 (Figure 3-6), and the outline of
the foundation can still be seen today. Some confusion lies in
the actual original ownership of the building. Locals believe
that the structure was built by James Milford Day, though
land grants indicate that the Day property was located to the
north of this plot of land. The original land grant indicates
that the property was owned by M.P. Woodhouse and the
adobe structure was built by him ca. 1840.

The Day structure apparently was located not too far away,
which could be the cause of some confusion (Ivey et al.
1977). In 2003, Dorothy Jarmon reported that her family
lived at the Ranger Station “for 12-25 years” (Jarmon
2003). Her grandfather, Richard Lee, was supposedly a
descendant of Robert E. Lee “through the slaves” (Jarmon
2003). The Ranger Station was razed during the later part of
the twentieth century.

203 and 207 South Guadalupe

The residence located at 203 and 207 South Guadalupe
appears to have been constructed ca. 1900-1910 (see Figure
1-2-3 and Figure 3-7). The location of the property abuts the
west bank of Walnut Branch. The building was said to be
in “good” condition as of 1979 when it was used as both a
residence and barber shop (THC 2008).

331 West Nolte Street

The house located at 331 West Nolte Street was constructed in the
Classical Revival style in 1906 (see Figure 1-2-4). The structure
has three chimneys, and is one and one-half story. It was described
in 1977 as in “good” condition. The back of the house it adjacent
to the west bank of Walnut Branch (THC 2008).

323 West Nolte Street

The Victorian home located at 323 West Nolte Street was also constructed ca. 1885 (see Figure 1-2-5). The house is also located adjacent to the west bank of Walnut Branch. The
building was recorded as in “fair” condition in 1977 (THC 2008). Recent photographs of the structure reveal that it underwent renovations (Figure 3-8).

313 West Nolte Street

The one-story Victorian home located at 313 West Nolte Street appears to have been constructed ca. 1885. The structure has later additions and was recorded in “fair” condition in 1977 (THC 2008). The house itself is located extremely close to the west bank of Walnut Branch. The location can potentially produce historic related cultural material that would erode from the property (see Figure 1-2-6).

Nan Weinert Residence

The Nan Weinert Residence is located at 215 West Nolte Street (see Figure 1-2-7). The Classical Revival style home was constructed ca. 1918, but was remodeled in 1959. There were no major exterior changes done during the remodeling (Figure 3-9). The two-story home is located along the east bank of Walnut Branch. The house at one time belonged to Nan Weinert, but was owned by R. J. Burgess, Jr. by 1979 (THC 2008).

221 West Live Oak Street

The rear wing of the residence at 221 West Live Oak Street was the original building constructed during the 1870s (see Figure 1-2-8). The original portion was constructed of limecrete. During the 1890s, modifications to the building added Victorian style architectural elements including gabled roofs and a bay window. The property on which the house is situated is adjacent to the east bank of Walnut Branch (THC 2008).

St. James Catholic Church and Offices

The church is a red clay brick structure, Gothic Revival, of cathedral plan located on South Camp street (see Figure 1-2-9 and Figure 3-10). The church was constructed ca. 1873. The only alterations to this structure are the new towers at the front corners added around 1940. The roof is gabled and juxtaposed by a central tower. Brick detailing is common on the structure, most clearly seen in the alternating red and yellow bricks surrounding the Gothic arched windows as well as the dentil cornices.
The St. James Church offices are located at 510 South Camp Street. One of the structures was built ca. 1900, with its Victorian style architecture. The St. James property also includes the first schoolhouse built in Sequin (Figure 3-11). The schoolhouse was constructed of Park’s Concrete in 1850, and was recognized in 1962 as the “oldest continuously used school building in Texas” (Gesick 2007). Robert Hugman designed a pool located just behind the St. James School, in Walnut Branch (Figure 3-12).

Robert Hall House

The Robert Hall House is located to the east of Walnut Branch at 214 South Travis (see Figure 1-2-10 and Figure 3-13). The structure was built in 1839 in the Greek Revival style by Robert Hall. The original portion of the structure was constructed of limecrete. Later, a two-story addition was added to the rear. The original structure had a full basement and two stone fireplaces. This structure was the first house in Seguin, Texas (THC 2008). Robert Hall was originally from Tennessee, though he came to Texas as a member of the crew of the steamboat George Washington in 1835. He fought in the Texas Revolution and later enlisted as a Texas Ranger. He was one of the individuals that aided in laying out the town of Seguin (Hyman 2007).

Robert Hall purchased a plot of land from John G. King that consisted of League No. 15 Class No. 5 that was situated on the northeast side of the Guadalupe River (GCDR A:38). Hall was very active in real estate, being granted a league of land between Austin and Gonzales, that he sold parcels of during the mid-1800s. No document was found that indicated that Hall conveyed the property to anyone during the later portion of the nineteenth century. However, according to the documents relating to the division of lots of Walnut Springs, some of this property may have been included in property deeded to Thomas R. Nichols (GCDR A:111-159). The Robert Hall House is owned by Lynn and Leta Glenewinkel and is on the National Register of Historic Places.

413 West Nolte Street

The residence at 413 West Nolte Street was likely constructed ca. 1900 (see Figure 1-2-11). The Victorian style home was constructed with double brick thickness walls that were later covered by stucco. The northern portion of the lot is abutting the west bank of Walnut Branch. The building was described as being in “good” condition in 1979 (THC 2008). At the time of the writing of this report, it appears that the house is occupied and in good condition (Figure 3-14).

312 South Goodrich Street

The one-story Victorian home located at 312 South Goodrich Street was constructed sometime between 1900 and 1910 (Figure
Chapter Three: Historic Resources in the Project Area

Pedestrian Survey of the Walnut Branch Hike & Bike Trail

1-2-12). The property appears to be adjacent to Walnut Branch (THC 2008). At this time, the Victorian home appears to have been replaced with a two-story apartment-type complex (Figure 3-15).

### 382 South Goodrich

This Victorian house located at the corner of South Goodrich and West Nolte Street was constructed in 1895 (see Figure 1-1-13). The one-story house exhibits a gabled roof, and attached front porch, and one chimney. The site was recorded in 1977 as being in “good” condition (THC 2008). The back portion of the property is adjacent to the west bank of Walnut Branch.

### 411 South Goodrich

The original house structure at 411 South Goodrich was constructed ca. 1852 and owned by H.E. McCullough (see Figure 1-1-14). The McKnight sisters bought the house in 1865, at which time it acquired the name of the McKnight Homestead. The original portion was built of adobe and river gravel, but additions to the structure were done ca. 1910 (Figure 3-16). The house appears to be one story from the front, but in actuality it is two, with the rear of the house being built on a slope. There are six rooms and two hall in the structure (each floor has three rooms and one hall). A slave kitchen was built of the same material to the rear of the house, though it was in use as a garage as of 1937 (HABS No. Tex-346). The massing of the structure is L-form in plan with a pedimented projecting gable ell and porch inset into the “L”. The porch columns are large and stuccoed, as is the rest of the exterior. The house, known to the community as “Seven Cedars”, was later rented out apartment-style. Ms. Viola Gomez was living in the building in 1979. The house is located on the west bank of Walnut Branch, just north of the old schoolhouse (THC 2008). At the time the report was written, the house appears to have some large bushes growing around it, though it appears in relatively good condition (Figure 3-17).
Residence at South Goodrich at West Convent

This pioneer vernacular schoolhouse, known as the Goodrich School, was constructed sometime during the 1850s (Figure 1-2-15). The property abuts Walnut Branch, north of the Goodrich-Adams house. The schoolhouse is a one-story limecrete stuccoed building with massive brick chimneys. When the schoolhouse site was recorded in 1979, it appeared to be in poor condition (THC 2008).

Goodrich-Adams House

This house is located at 317 West Adams Street (Figure 1-2-16). The house was constructed ca. 1855, and the property is adjacent to Walnut Branch, just north of Starke Park. The original portion of the house was constructed of Park’s Concrete (limecrete) by W. E. Goodrich.

W.E. Goodrich conveyed the property to his wife S.A. Goodrich during the early 1890s prior to his death. On December 21, 1905, C.J. Duggan sold the estate of Mrs. Goodrich to Fritz Woehler (GCDR 28:16-17). Woehler conveyed the property, along with several other lots, to Ferdinand Klein on November 1, 1906 for a sum of $3,500 (GCDR 27:444-445). Klein, soon after purchasing the property, sold it to Henry G. Adams, along with 50 acres that extended south of the Goodrich Place to the Guadalupe River (GCDR 32:6). Adams conveyed a portion of the property to J.F. Boring in December of 1908 (GCDR 32:6), of which Boring sold to Sam Neel in November of 1918 (GCDR 54:279). The property that contains the Goodrich-Adams House was then owned by Erwin Adams in 1979.

The house had been altered over the years with the addition of a Victorian porch in the rear and a Greek detailed front porch with Corinthian columns (Figure 3-18). The house appears to be in fair-to-good condition (THC 2008).

Riverside Cemetery

Riverside Cemetery, though it appears on the Texas Archeological Sites Atlas as “Riverview Cemetery”, is located on the east bank of Walnut Branch at the confluence of the creek and the Guadalupe River (see Figure 1-2-17). The Cemetery has been used since the mid-1800s and several prominent figures related to the history of Texas and Seguin are interred there. John R. Jefferson, Jr., a Confederate Marshall of the Western District of Texas, was buried at the cemetery in 1888. Historical markers for Timothy Pickering Jones, Jonathan Douglas, and Ezekiel Smith are located at the edge of the cemetery property. Several plots are adjacent to the east bank of Walnut Branch.

Glen Cove; French Smith Residence

Located within the vicinity of the Riverside Cemetery is the French Smith Residence at 315 Glen Cove Dr. (see Figure 1-2-18). The western portion of the structure was built by Paris Smith and consisted of four rooms and a hall. The original portion was constructed of logs. During the early 1850s, G.B. and T.H. Holloman purchased the property and added three rooms constructed with concrete. In 1937, the building was occupied by Mrs. T.H. Holloman (HABS No. Tex-350) (Figure 3-19). At the time the structure was recorded in 1979, G.B. Hollomon III was the property owner.

The Hollomons were one of the first contractors that arrived in Seguin. They worked closely with Dr. Parks to perfect the type of concrete structures that were typical of the early Seguin community. Mrs. T.H. Hollomon reported that her husband was an avid tree lover and would...
not let one be cut down on his property. General Sam Houston gave a speech under Hollomon’s trees during his campaign for Governor of Texas. T.H. Hollomon died at the Battle of Elkhorn in 1862 (HABS No. Tex-350). This structure is a Seguin landmark, with many social functions held there.

**Hugman’s Walnut Branch Beautification Project**

Robert H. H. Hugman was responsible for designing the park along the bank of Walnut Branch that has now fallen into disrepair. During the 1930’s, Hugman designed a park running along a section of Walnut Branch, from Nolte Street (at the time was Market) to the Sebastopol House, that much resembled his later work on the Riverwalk in San Antonio. Working with the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), paths along the creek were created, with footbridges at several crossings. Similar to the Riverwalk, Hugman designed stairs that would lead guests from creek level to street level. In several areas along the creek, pools were created for swimming enjoyment (Figure 3-20).

Though no written plans of the park design have been located, local inhabitants remember most of the characteristics. The largest spring of Mountain Branch was uncovered and walled in with stone. This aided in the formation of a pool that held large goldfish, before the spring water flowed into the creek channel. Areas along the bank, especially near the south entrance to the park, were cleared of the dense foliage and covered in carpet grass (Figure 3-21). Three dams were constructed along the course of Walnut Branch. The first dam was located just north of Court Street. The next dam was located near the present County Annex parking lot. The last dam, was constructed just above Nolte Street (Figure 3-22). The Nolte Street dam formed a large pool, five feet deep, that was used for swimming. Gravel walkways were created and benches and bridges were erected along the creek. By June of 1933, the park was turned over to the City of Seguin, and citizens petitioned for the park to be extended to Austin Street. In April of 1934, the funds were awarded and the completion of the park proceeded, during which additional foot bridges were constructed and stone benches and several niches were built into the retaining wall along the creek (Burns 2003).

The park was very popular during the early years, though a major flood destroyed sections of the retaining walls and the wooden bridges and benches. Some work was done to fix the damages, but the CCC and the Works Progress Administration (WPA) had already turned their focus to more pressing tasks such as erecting the courthouse, Starcke Park, and the water and electric works. By 1953, considerable

Figure 3-20. Photograph of pool designed by Hugman, ca. 1960.
Figure 3-21. Photograph of Walnut Branch ca. 1940 showing cleared banks.

Figure 3-22. Photograph of the Nolte Street Bridge ca. 1935.
change had occurred to Hugman’s design. Sewer lines now ran underneath and through Walnut Branch, with manholes sticking up from the creek channel. A drought caused the water in the dammed pools to become stagnant and harbored large mosquito populations. Citizens feared that mosquitoes were aiding in the spread of polio and this fear led to the destruction of the three dams along the Walnut Branch Park to reduce the amount of standing water (Burns 2003).

In 1966, additional sewer lines were to be placed along the creek, and in preparation, some of the remaining rock walls were demolished. The walls were to be reconstructed after the placement of the lines, but instead were left unfinished. Flooding episodes over the years led to the need for the Army Corp of Engineers to modify the creek channel to remove obstructions. The Corp of Engineers completed a full-scale channelization of portions of the creek as well as the removed many trees along in certain areas of the creek (Burns 2003).

All of the footbridges have subsequently been washed away and there is no evidence of the paths along the creek banks, which are now overgrown with dense foliage (Figure 3-23). Several retaining walls constructed of stacked stone have been washed into the creek bed. A few of the staircases leading from the creek bank remain, though it was noted that the creek has eroded their foundations (Figure 3-24). Over the course of the years, much of the easement along the creek has reverted to private ownership. The area known as the “Memorial Rose Garden” today, has several reconstructed walls. In the vicinity, a small section of the Hugman walls was reconstructed by a local inhabitant interested in the park.

Because of the proximity to the creek and the nearby presence of historic structures, the likelihood of encountering prehistoric and historic deposits is high. However, given the historic and modern impacts to the creek channel there is a lowered probability of finding intact deposits.
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The length of project corridor is 2.5 miles and the estimated width of the ROW is 164 ft. (50 m.), for a project area of 50 acres. Based on the minimum standards of the THC guidelines, one shovel test per two acres was required. Several portions of the proposed ROW were on private property and fence lines associated with those properties were not crossed during the initial survey.

Shovel tests were 30 cm in diameter and extended to a depth of 60 cm, unless otherwise prevented. Shovel tests were excavated in 10-cm increments, and all soil from each level was screened through 1/4-inch hardware cloth. All encountered artifacts were recovered with appropriate provenience for laboratory processing, analysis, and curation. A shovel test form was completed for every excavated shovel test. Data collected from each shovel test included the final excavation depth, a tally of all materials recovered from each 10-cm level, and a brief soil description (texture, consistency, Munsell color, inclusions). The location of every shovel test was recorded with Trimble Geo XT GPS units and plotted onto aerial photographs as a backup to GPS provenience information. Any additional observations considered pertinent were included as comments on the standard shovel test excavation form. Shovel tests were not excavated on slopes greater than 20 percent.

Backhoe trenches were excavated with a 75-cm (30-inch) wide bucket. The minimum length of a trench was three meters and the maximum depth was limited to 150 cm, the proposed maximum depth of impact. Trenches were excavated in 30 cm levels, with one 5-gallon bucket of matrix collected and screened through 1/4-inch screen per level. Trench walls were cleaned by trowel and examined for cultural material. Trench walls were photographed and when cultural material was encountered, a scale profile was drawn of a representative wall. The depth, color, texture, structure, appearance of the soil zones, and inclusions were recorded and correlated to the profile drawing. The location of the trenches was recorded by GPS and when possible, through tape and compass bearings from identified reference markers. All trenches were backfilled after examination.

Backhoe trenches were excavated along the proposed Hike and Bike Trail alignment in those areas where deep impacts were proposed and there was a possibility of locating cultural deposits. These areas occur between West Court Street and West Nolte Street. The majority of the impacts in the APE were within the upper 12 inches or 30 cm of the surface and design specifications at the time of the initial survey and the submission of the initial draft report did not include those areas identified for deep impacts (>60 cm). However, backhoe trenching on the northern section of the APE was not conducted due to heavy channelization along the creek banks that has disturbed or removed the original sediments.

Site Recording and Identification

For the purposes of this survey, the definition of a site was as follows: (1) five or more surface artifacts within a 15-meter radius (ca. 706.9 m²), or (2) a single cultural feature, such as a hearth, observed on surface or exposed in shovel testing, or (3) a positive shovel test containing at least three artifacts within any given 10-cm level, or (4) a positive shovel test containing at least five total artifacts, or (5) two positive shovel tests located within 30 meters of each other.

If evidence of cultural materials meeting the minimum criteria for an archaeological site was encountered in a shovel test or on the surface, additional shovel tests were excavated at 10 meter intervals to define the vertical and areal extent of the distribution within the project area. Site boundaries were plotted on aerial photographs and a topographic quadrangle map and location data collected with a GPS unit. Digital photographs were taken of each site and Texas site forms were prepared for all new sites.

Any artifact recovered from shovel testing that did not meet the criteria of a site was recorded as an isolated find. The location of all isolated finds were plotted with a GPS unit and plotted on an aerial map.

Archaeological Laboratory Methods

All cultural materials and records obtained and/or generated during the project were prepared in accordance with federal regulation 36 CFR part 79, and THC requirements for State Held-in-Trust collections. Additionally, the materials were curated in accordance with current guidelines of the CAR. Artifacts processed in the CAR laboratory were washed, air-dried, and stored in 4-mm zip locking archival-quality bags. Acid-free labels were placed in all artifact bags. Each label contained provenience information and a corresponding lot number written in archival ink, with pencil or laser printed.
Ceramics were labeled with permanent ink over a clear coat of acrylic and covered by another acrylic coat. In addition, a small sample of unmodified debitage from each lot was labeled with the appropriate provenience data. Artifacts were separated by class and stored in acid-free boxes. Digital photographs were printed on acid-free paper, labeled with archivally appropriate materials, and placed in archival-quality sleeves. All field forms were completed with pencil. Upon completion of the project, all collected materials will be housed at CAR.

Site Assessments and Recommendations

At the survey level of investigation, site assessments and recommendations are based upon the results of subsurface probing and surface inspection. A recommendation for “no further work” or “ineligible for listing in the NRHP or formal SAL designation” was made when there was sufficient evidence to suggest the encountered cultural material was in a disturbed or secondary context. Under evaluation criteria for NRHP (36 CFR 60.4), significance is associated with the integrity of location and context of cultural materials. Integrity of the deposits is critical to satisfying 36CFR 60.4, criterion (d) for cultural properties “to have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history”.

For designation as a SAL, under Section 26.8 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure for the Antiquities Code of Texas, an archaeological site is considered significant and designated as a SAL if it is on land owned or controlled by the State of Texas or a political subdivision. On private land, under Section 191.04 of Texas Natural Resources Code 1977, Title 9, Chapter 191, Texas Antiquities Committee, entitled “Designating a landmark on Private Land”, a site must be designated as a SAL and meet one of five criteria for a site to be significant and warrant formal designation:

a) the preservation of the cultural deposits must be sufficient to allow the application of standard archeological techniques to advantage; b) the majority of artifacts are in place so that a significant portion of the site’s original characteristics can be defined through investigation; c) the site has the information potential to contribute to cumulative history by the addition of new information; d) the site offers evidence of unique and rare attributes; and/or e) the site offers a unique or rare opportunity to test techniques, theory, or method of preservation, thereby contributing to scientific knowledge.

The issue of integrity, from criteria a) and b) determines the scientific value of the following criteria and when there is poor both physical and spatial preservation, derived information from the site is reduced in quality and therefore significance. Although integrity is not explicitly implied for SAL on State owned or controlled lands, the preservation and integrity of cultural deposits is implied in determining official designation as a SAL.

For designation as a SAL, under Section 26.8 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure for the Antiquities Code of Texas, an archaeological site is considered significant and designated as a SAL if it is on land owned or controlled by the State of Texas or a political subdivision. On private land, under Section 191.04 of Texas Natural Resources Code 1977, Title 9, Chapter 191, Texas Antiquities Committee, entitled “Designating a landmark on Private Land”, a site must be designated as a SAL and meet one of five criteria for a site to be significant and warrant formal designation:

a) the preservation of the cultural deposits must be sufficient to allow the application of standard archeological techniques to advantage; b) the majority of artifacts are in place so that a significant portion of the site’s original characteristics can be defined through investigation; c) the site has the information potential to contribute to cumulative history by the addition of new information; d) the site offers evidence of unique and rare attributes; and/or e) the site offers a unique or rare opportunity to test techniques, theory, or method of preservation, thereby contributing to scientific knowledge.

The issue of integrity, from criteria a) and b) determines the scientific value of the following criteria and when there is poor both physical and spatial preservation, derived information from the site is reduced in quality and therefore significance. Although integrity is not explicitly implied for SAL on State owned or controlled lands, the preservation and integrity of cultural deposits is implied in determining official designation as a SAL.

The project area was examined for evidence of disturbances that would potentially negatively impact the preservation and integrity of cultural properties and these field observations were used in the assessment and evaluation of the sites.
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This chapter presents the results of the pedestrian survey conducted by CAR along the Walnut Branch. CAR crews conducted an intensive pedestrian survey along with shovel tests and backhoe trenches within the APE intermittently during February, May and June of 2008 and June 2009 (see Figure 1-2). The APE was divided into northern and southern reaches. The northern section included the part the APE from West New Braunfels Street to Court Street. Fourteen shovel tests were excavated along this portion of the APE that was examined February 28, 2008. The majority of the creek in this northern section of the APE had been channelized and some of the embankments have been fortified with concrete. One isolated find was identified in this section. Because of the overall negative impacts to the northern section of the APE, there is a low probability that significant undisturbed cultural properties occur within the APE and therefore, further archaeological investigations are not recommended in this section.

The southern portion of the APE ran from south of Court Street to the Guadalupe River. Twenty-five shovel tests and five backhoe trenches were excavated along this portion of the APE (see Figure 3-1). Three new sites were identified and recorded; 41GU113 and 41GU114 were located on the west bank of Walnut Branch, while 41GU115 was identified on the east bank of the creek. CAR recommends that the three sites are not eligible for listing to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or formal designation as State Archaeological Landmarks (SAL). Evaluations as to eligibility were determined based upon the physical condition of the site, artifact content and most importantly, depositional context. Recommendations apply to those portions of the site within the APE.

### The Northern Section of the APE

The northern stretch of the APE starts where the creek intersects with West New Braunfels and extended just north of Court Street. Fourteen shovel tests were excavated in this section (Table 5-1). No backhoe trenches were excavated in the Northern Section as this portion of the stream has been channelized and several segments have been lined with concrete. The soil survey for Guadalupe County (WSS 2008) indicates that the soils found in the environs of the creek consist of Tinn Clay (TW) that are frequently flooded. Soils in the area north of Kingsbury Street consisted of compact dark brown clay with the exception of Shovel Test 3 which contained mottled clay in Levels 3 through 5 (Figure 5-1). Shovel Tests 4 and 5, just south of Kingsbury Street, contained very compact soils with >50% gravels and modern trash. Figures 5-2 and 5-3 show the channelized portions of Walnut Branch north of West Kingsbury Street.

Shovel Tests 6 through 12 were excavated south of San Antonio Avenue. Shovel Test 6 yielded three pieces of burned rock (Levels 1, 3 and 6; Table 5-1) in a dark brown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST#</th>
<th>Depth (cm)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>APE section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>positive*</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>positive*</td>
<td>southern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*disturbed deposits
Figure 5-1. The APE north of West Kingsbury Street.

Figure 5-2. The APE north of West Kingsbury Street.
clay matrix. It is not possible to determine whether the burned rock was prehistoric, historic or modern in age. Two additional shovel tests were excavated north (ST 13) and south (ST 14) of the positive shovel test and both were negative for cultural material. Both shovel tests contained a dark brown clay matrix similar to Shovel Test 6. The cultural remains encountered in ST 6 were considered an isolated find and further archaeological investigations in the area are not needed.

The matrix in Shovel Tests 7 and 9 was a dark grayish soil with <20% gravels. There was a high percentage of river gravels (>50%) in Shovel Tests 10 through 12. Due to the high percentage of river gravels encountered in Shovel Test 12, it was terminated at 50 cmbs. The portion of the APE between Medlin Street and Court Street, in the environs of the Sebastopol structure (41GU9), is lined with concrete and water is present in the drainage. The property on which the structure is located abuts Walnut Branch. The structure was constructed during the 1850s (see Chapter 3). The site sits on a limestone bench and a portion of the structure is cut into bedrock (THC 2008). Moreover, this portion of the APE consists of the active creek channel with residential fences abutting the creek bank (Figure 5-4). No additional shovel tests were placed in this portion of the APE.

The matrix in Shovel Tests 7 and 9 was a dark grayish soil with <20% gravels. There was a high percentage of river gravels (>50%) in Shovel Tests 10 through 12. Due to the high percentage of river gravels encountered in Shovel Test 12, it was terminated at 50 cmbs. The portion of the APE between Medlin Street and Court Street, in the environs of the Sebastopol structure (41GU9), is lined with concrete and water is present in the drainage. The property on which the structure is located abuts Walnut Branch. The structure was constructed during the 1850s (see Chapter 3). The site sits on a limestone bench and a portion of the structure is cut into bedrock (THC 2008). Moreover, this portion of the APE consists of the active creek channel with residential fences abutting the creek bank (Figure 5-4). No additional shovel tests were placed in this portion of the APE.

The southern section of the APE extended from Court Street to the convergence of Walnut Branch with the Guadalupe River. Twenty-five shovel tests and five backhoe trenches were excavated in this portion of the APE and three new sites were documented. Sites 41GU113 and 41GU114 were located on the western bank of the creek. 41GU115 was recorded on the eastern bank of the creek.

Only four shovel tests were excavated on the eastern bank of the creek. The majority of the APE on the eastern bank had a slope exceeding 20% and therefore was too steep for shovel tests. Furthermore, a water-waste facility is located at the far south portion of the eastern bank, just north of the Max Starcke Park. In the Scope of Work, CAR proposed six shovel tests in the area of the Ranger Station. The Ranger Station was said to have been located on the southeast corner of Guadalupe and Court Streets. Currently an abandoned building sits in the southeast corner of Guadalupe and Court Street (Figure 5-5). The area was surface inspected and no historic structural remnants, such as foundations, were observed. One shovel test, ST 15, was excavated in the area and no evidence of a foundation was encountered. Shovel Test 15 contained a high percentage of gravels (>50%). Furthermore, the surface of the lot was covered with gravel and fill. Modern construction
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Pedestrian Survey of the Walnut Branch Hike & Bike Trail

Figure 5-4. Southeast corner of Guadalupe and Court Streets.

Figure 5-5. Southeast corner of Guadalupe and Court Streets.
activities have altered the original ground surface. If this was the location of the Ranger Station, no evidence of a structure was detected and no associated cultural material was recovered. The archival record contains conflicting accounts of the exact location of the Ranger Station, and whether it actually existed.

Four shovel tests were excavated in the Memorial Rose Garden (Figure 5-6). The landscape in the Memorial Rose Garden area terraces down to the creek. The entrance of the Memorial Rose Garden and its terraced landscape is shown in Figure 5-7.

Three of the shovel tests were excavated just along the creek and one was excavated at a higher elevation. One shovel test near the creek contained dark brown silty clay. The remaining three shovel tests contained a high percentage of gravels (>20%). No cultural materials were noted in the shovel tests.

Two shovel tests, ST 38 and ST 39, were excavated on the west bank during the backhoe trench investigations in June of 2009. These were used to assess proposed pathways on newly acquired property between the Guadalupe County municipal building and the Creekside Grill Restaurant. The shovel tests were excavated to a depth of 60 cm and only modern historic materials were recovered. These were; window glass fragments, glass vessel fragments, whiteware ceramics, a bone fragment, and a wire nail (Table 5-2).

The surrounding matrix contained poorly sorted terrace deposits of clay loam with gravels. The excavation of BHT2, approximately 13 meters west of ST 38 encountered buried 4-inch PVC drainage pipe and metal debris at 100–150 cm below surface, suggesting the terrace has been extensively impacted and artificially modified within the past 20 years. The collected material from the shovel tests was heavily fragmented and breakage patterns suggest that multiple episodes of post-depositional impacts occurred. Because of the disturbed context of the terrace, no site was recorded nor was the boundary of site 41GU115 expanded based upon the results of Shovel Tests 38 and 39.

Shovel tests excavated in the environs of Max Starcke Park, south of South Austin Street, revealed areas of modern gravel fill or sandy soil. Other noted impacts were a paved road in the area north of the park and several piles of construction material.

Figure 5-6. The entrance to the Memorial Rose Garden.
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Figure 5-7. Terraced landscape of the Memorial Rose Garden.

Table 5-2. Artifacts Recovered from ST 38 and ST 39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shovel Test</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Burned Rock</th>
<th>Ceramics</th>
<th>Glass</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 wire nail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Backhoe Excavations

Backhoe trenches were used to assess areas identified for deeper impacts extending to an estimated four to five feet below grade (Figure 5-8). In addition to searching for cultural materials, these trenches were used to examine the stratigraphy of the terraces and two of the previously recorded sites, 41GU113 and 41GU115. Backhoe Trenches 1 and 2 were located on the east bank of the Walnut Branch and BHTs 3, 4, and 5 were located on the west bank.

Backhoe Trench 1 was located to the south and west of the existing parking lot at the Guadalupe County Municipal Building, and three meters north of Walnut Branch. The upper 70 cm consists of alluvial fills of dark brown clay loam with a mixture of small to cobble size gravels. In the upper 50 cm there is evidence of modern trash and construction debris, including rebar, glass and plastic mixed with gravels. These fills are widest towards the channel and quickly thinning to the north. Mottling with manganese and iron staining indicate the soil has been repeatedly inundated. Beginning at 70 cm below surface is very dark brown clay that contains some carbonate filaments and small (<3 mm) nodules. Based on the geotechnical borings, this clay is at least 5 meters in thickness. There is a low probability of encountering intact cultural deposits within this clay.

Backhoe Trench 2 was located near an existing spring and to the east of 41GU115. At a depth of 90 cm, a 4-inch PVC drainage pipe running NW-SE was encountered. Below that pipe, a second PVC pipe running north/south was encountered (Figure 5-9). A 40-x-50-cm section of stainless steel was encountered at 120 cm. Backhoe Trench 2 demonstrates that large sections of the terrace, the same terrace as 41GU115, has been substantially altered and constructed of modern fill material, at least to a depth of 140 cm.

Backhoe Trench 3 was located approximately 20 m east of 41GU113 in the backyard of the Matthies House, the location...
This page has been redacted because it contains restricted information.
for the proposed Wilson Pottery Museum. The 3-m long trench reached a maximum depth of 90 cm before a limestone bench was encountered. A further discussion of BHT 3 continues in the description of site 41GU113.

Backhoe Trench 4 was placed approximately 100 m west of BHT 3 and 20 m west of site 41GU113. Approximately 8 m to the east is a remnant of a possible Hugman staircase. The maximum depth was 70 cm when a limestone bench was encountered. The results from BHT 4 are discussed in Newly Recorded Sites, Site 41GU113.

Backhoe Trench 5 was excavated to determine the composition of the section of west bank terrace currently supporting a metal building. The trench began near the top of the terrace and exposed over seven meters of deposits. Large sections of concrete debris, brick, and clay tile were mixed with lesser quantities of plastic and metal (Figure 5-10). The soil is a yellowish brown- colored clay loam that is not exposed in the soils of the project area, and according to the landowner, it was fill from utility installations along Court Street that provided the bulk of material. This section of the terrace is wholly constructed of fill and therefore contains no intact cultural deposits.

**Newly Recorded Sites**

**Site 41GU113**

41GU113 was recorded on the western bank of the creek between West Court Street and West Nolte Street and just east of South Goodrich Street. The site is along the edge of the T1 terrace constrained on the creek side by a brick retaining wall (Figure 5-11). The site is approximately 80 meters long from east to west as determined by subsurface testing and observed outcroppings of limestone, and the proposed width of approximately 15 meters is determined by the project boundary and existing structures and roads to the south and the terrace edge to the north. Within the project area, the site measures approximately 1200 square meters in area and is at an average 500 ft. AMSL in elevation. An informal footpath has worn into the terrace edge. Three shovel tests (ST 16, 23 and 26) were excavated to define the depth of deposits and their horizontal extent along the proposed trail alignment. Shovel Test 16 terminated at 22 cmbs due to impenetrable bedrock. Shovel Tests 23 and 26 were excavated to a terminal depth of 60 cmbs. Soils observed in the shovel tests consisted of a brown silty loam matrix with 25 to 45 percent gravels.

Figure 5-9. Photograph of buried PVC drainage pipes.

Figure 5-10. Photograph showing modern debris and disturbed profile in BHT 5.
Figure 5-11. Photograph showing artificial terrace on which 41GU113 is located and site planview.
Artifacts recovered from the three shovel tests are listed in Table 5-3. The site is multi-component having historic and prehistoric material present. The majority of the material (n=20) consisted of burned rock, recovered from all three shovel tests, although these were small fragments, with a total mass of 38.2 g. No age can be assigned to the burned rock and it may be modern. The presence of historic ceramics (n=2), and glass (n=2) was minimal. Lithic debitage (n=3) was found in Shovel Tests 16 (Level 1) and 23 (Level 3). The ceramics (white earthenware and porcelain) were recovered from Shovel Test 23 in Levels 1 and 6. Clear container glass came from Shovel Tests 23 (Level 3) and 26 (Level 4). No specific period can be given to the non-diagnostic prehistoric material, while the white earthenwares date from the mid to late nineteenth century (Tennis 1997). The cultural material is located within the confines of a terrace that has been altered and impacted by recent human activities. It is evident from the vertical mixing of the prehistoric and historic artifacts and the lack of well defined stratigraphy that there is extensive disturbance to the cultural deposits.

Table 5-3. Artifacts Recovered from 41GU113

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shovel Test</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Burned Rock</th>
<th>Ceramics</th>
<th>Debitage</th>
<th>Glass</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the backhoe trench investigations in June of 2009, BHT 3 and BHT 4 were excavated along the same terrace and on the same side as 41GU113. Both trenches contained historic debris that could date as early as the late 1800s. The results from BHT 3 and BHT 4 are in Table 5-4. Based upon these new results, the trenches were used to expand the boundary of the site to the east and west within the project area.

Table 5-4. Site 41GU113 Backhoe Trench Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BHT</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Ceramics</th>
<th>Glass</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Nail (wire)</th>
<th>Nail (cut)</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-aluminum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-ceramic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHT Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-No. 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHT 4 Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From BHT 3 abundant historic trash was observed from the trench fill, concentrated at depths from 30-60 cm and continuing to 80 cm. Rough limestone blocks, 30-x-20-x-30 cm were dislodged by the backhoe at the north end of the trench at a bottom depth of 60-70 cm (Figure 5-12).

It was unknown if these blocks represented a larger feature such as a foundation or retaining wall. The lack of mortar, the low height, and narrow width suggest that these are either loose blocks or perhaps used as a boundary marker. The trench contained historic glass, sections of sawn bone, cut and wire nail, whiteware, burned limestone, and clay tile. There was an unmistakable odor of charcoal and a vitreous or greasy feel to the clay loam matrix at 50 cm. The clay loam was not as compacted and had a granular structure that crumbled when dry. The trench is two meters south of a 1960s era concrete retaining wall. The upper 30 cm of clay loam appears to be modern fill that caps the burned deposits. The impression is that the burned deposits are the remnants from trash burning, and that when the current retaining wall was constructed, the area was leveled, spreading the debris, and additional fill was used to raise the grade.

The ceramic insulator (see Table 5-4), also referred to as a fencepost insulator, was used inside attic spaces to secure and support a single wire. The insulator includes a 16-penny wire nail. These insulators are currently still available from restoration supply stores. The date of use is from the early to mid-twentieth century. Fragments of white ceramic transferware indicate an earliest age of mid-to-late nineteenth century to early twentieth century (Tennis 1997). The aluminum ferrule and steel eyelet are modern.

The location of BHT 4 is used as the west boundary for the historic deposits from 41GU113. Modern trash mixed with possible historic glass and whiteware fragments was encountered in the upper 45 cm. From 45 to 70 cm, the soil is a compacted dark brown clay loam that sits above limestone bench and very dark gray clay loam. Besides the historic trash
Figure 5-12. Site 41GU113 photograph and profile of BHT 3.
in the upper levels, no prehistoric artifacts were observed. As with BHT3, the upper 45 cm contains modern trash that is spread to the edge of the terrace.

The estimated age of deposits in BHT 4 is similar to BHT 3, suggesting a late nineteenth century to early twentieth century origins based upon the presence of a fragment of ceramic transferware (Tennis 1997). The two bone fragments show evidence of hand sawing. The heaviest fragment is circular in shape and approximates the appearance of a femur section from near the epiphyseal end of a pig-size animal. The thinner fragment is a section of rib bone and has saw-cut marks along its margins.

A title and deed search of the address 320 W. Nolte Street provided by the City of Seguin and performed by Andrew Raetzsch of Texas Lutheran University confirms a land transaction from James Greenwood deeding title to Ella M. (“H”) Abner and David Abner Jr. on January 1, 1896. Ella Abner (née Ella Harris Greenwood) and David Abner owned the property until August 1954. Alada Crain Grissom owned the property for three years, deeding it to Clyde E. Grissom and Floye on September 25, 1957. Mary Matthies, for whom the house is currently named, purchased the property from them in 1974. The city of Seguin purchased the property in 2003 and is the present owner.

Mary Jo Filip, manager of the City of Seguin Main Street Program, interviewed Seguin resident Hazel Mondin who beginning in 1958, at the age of 12, lived across the street from 320 W. Nolte Street. She remembers riding horses along the banks of Walnut Branch, and that several sheds stood in the backyard. She noted that in 1957, the Grissom family remodeled the house.

When the city was initially platted in 1838, the lot size was one acre and therefore the property has been subdivided, and given the age of neighboring structures, this may have occurred by 1896. No mention was made of any structure prior to 1896 and no explicit mention is made of a structure existing by 1896. Ms. Mondin implies that the house renovated in 1957 was an older structure, but whether this structure was the original house on the property is unknown.

The artifacts from BHT 3 and BHT 4 indicate a mid-nineteenth or early twentieth century source. Additional archival research was performed for the property to attempt to determine any association between the local inhabitants and the historical material. The initial archival research documented the age of twelve properties and structures along West Nolte and adjacent streets, showing they were constructed from 1839 to 1918, with 75 percent of the structures built between 1885 and 1918 (Table 5-5).

Table 5-5. Addresses and Dates of Building/Occupation of Nearby Plots and Structures Close to the Matthies House at 320 West Nolte Street, Seguin, Texas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Year built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>215 West Nolte</td>
<td>1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>331 West Nolte</td>
<td>1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>313 West Nolte</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>323 West Nolte</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>413 West Nolte</td>
<td>ca. 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>312 South Goodrich</td>
<td>1900-1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>382 South Goodrich</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>411 South Goodrich</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>203 South Guadalupe</td>
<td>1900-1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>207 South Guadalupe</td>
<td>1900-1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hall House</td>
<td>214 South Travis</td>
<td>1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ranger Station</em></td>
<td>Guadalupe and West Court</td>
<td>1840s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>221 West Live Oak</td>
<td>1870a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James Catholic Church</td>
<td>510 South Camp</td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James Catholic Church Offices</td>
<td>511 South Camp</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James Catholic Church Schoolhouse</td>
<td>512 South Camp</td>
<td>1850s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodrich-Adams House</td>
<td>317 West Adams</td>
<td>1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossey-Cambell House</td>
<td>607 North Vaughn</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>1850s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodrich Schoolhouse</td>
<td>South Goodrich and West Convent</td>
<td>1850s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*shaded cells are nearest to the Matthies House

There is no conclusive association between the current Matthies House and the findings for site 41GU113. The terrace edge along the west bank contains intermittent concentrations of surface-to- shallow buried historic artifacts and debris. As noted in Table 5-5, near Walnut Branch, numerous neighboring houses date to the late 1800s and early 1900s and is contemporaneous with the observed historic artifacts. Site 41GU113 crosses three current property boundaries.

**Site 41GU114**

41GU114 is a multi-component site located on the west bank of the creek, south of Convent Street. The site is at 485 ft. AMS and is approximately 300 square meters in area. (Figure 5-13). Shovel Tests 21, 22 and 24 were excavated on the site. North of ST 24 was a fence and project boundary which impeded shovel testing in that direction. Shovel tests to the south were not excavated due to the steep slope (>20 percent) of the terrain. The three shovel tests were excavated to a terminal depth of 60 cmbs. The soil observed in shovel tests consisted of dark brown to very dark gray clay.

Cultural material (Table 5-6) from the site included burned rock (n=5), historic ceramics (n=3), debitage (n=1), glass
Figure 5-13. Site 41GU114 photograph and planview.
Table 5-6. Artifacts Recovered from 41GU114 located on private property and cultural material from Shovel Test 28 was not collected. The analysis of the artifacts was completed in the field. The artifacts noted in the positive shovel test (ST 35) consisted mostly of burned rock (small fragments), glass and metal (Table 5-7). Seven white earthenware sherds were present in Level 4 (hand-painted and transfer). Based on the ceramic evidence, the historic material could date as early as the mid-to-late nineteenth century (Tennis 1997). The unconsolidated structure of the sediments and the surrounding disturbances suggest the cultural materials are from a mixed context and no structural remains associated with the historic debris were detected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shovel Test</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Burned Rock</th>
<th>Ceramics</th>
<th>Debitage</th>
<th>Glass</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=9), metal (n=2) and slate (n=1). The majority of the material consisted of container and flat glass (milk and clear). The three ceramic sherds recovered from shovel tests were undecorated white earthen ware. A fragment of a lead printing plate was encountered in ST 21 (Level 5). The material suggests the historic component is late nineteenth century to early twentieth century in age. It can not be determined if the burned rock is prehistoric, historic or modern. The mix of artifacts, domestic and industrial, suggests they are accumulated trash deposits, and may have originated in another location.

The underlying geology at the location is marked by massive tabular limestone benches that can outcrop or be shallow-buried at this section of the stream. The undulating surface creates uneven soil depths on the terrace. The close proximity to the stream channel also subjects the surface to periodic flooding events and given the presence of large gravels, these can be high energy flows that would negatively impact shallow buried and surface deposits.

**Site 41GU115**

Site 41GU115 is a historic site defined originally on the basis of a single shovel test (ST 28). The site covers an estimated 100 square meters, at an average elevation of 495 ft. AMSL, and is located on the eastern side of the creek, south of Court Street on the same property as the Creek Side Grill. The boundaries of the site are constrained by the restaurant establishment to the north, a spring-fed drainage feature to the southeast, and Walnut Branch to the south and west (Figure 5-14). Shovel Test 35 was excavated south and east of ST 28 and contained no cultural material.

The soil encountered in the shovel test was a dark brown loose, silty matrix with a sandy lens encountered at 58 cmbs. At the time of the initial survey, the shovel test was located on private property and cultural material from Shovel Test 28 was not collected. The analysis of the artifacts was completed in the field. The artifacts noted in the positive shovel test (ST 35) consisted mostly of burned rock (small fragments), glass and metal (Table 5-7). Seven white earthenware sherds were present in Level 4 (hand-painted and transfer). Based on the ceramic evidence, the historic material could date as early as the mid-to-late nineteenth century (Tennis 1997). The unconsolidated structure of the sediments and the surrounding disturbances suggest the cultural materials are from a mixed context and no structural remains associated with the historic debris were detected.

After the initial field survey, geotechnical analysis results from a bore hole on the same terrace level indicated two types of modern fill extended to a depth of almost seven feet below present grade (Arias 2008). During the backhoe trenching, BHT 2 was excavated 40 meters east of 41GU115. At depths of 120 cm and 140 cm below surface, plastic drainage pipes were observed running in different directions, although draining towards the creek A piece of stainless steel backsplash approximately 40-x-50 cm in size was excavated from the bottom of the trench at a depth of 140 cm. An examination of the creek bank discovered a similar drain running beneath the location 41GU115 (Figure 5-15). Poor depositional integrity is indicated by the soil characteristics which show the site location being impacted by colluvial and alluvial processes and most significantly, repeated modern construction activity.

**Summary**

The APE was divided into two sections (northern and southern). During the archaeological investigations along Walnut Branch, 39 shovel tests and five backhoe trenches were excavated. Fourteen shovel tests were excavated along the northern section of the APE and one isolated find was encountered. The northern portion of the APE near the Sebastopol structure is very narrow and has been heavily impacted during historic and modern times through channelization and landscaping.

Twenty-five shovel tests and the five backhoe trenches were excavated along the southern portion of the APE. Despite anecdotal evidence, no evidence of foundations or cultural material was found during investigations in the area of the Ranger Station. The construction of the abandoned structure that now sits on the lot where the Ranger Station is suspected to have been located has caused disturbance to the area. Shovel tests in the Memorial Rose Garden revealed no evidence of culture material.
Figure 5-14. Site 41GU115 photograph and planview.
Three new sites; 41GU113, 41GU114 and 41GU115, were encountered on the southern portion of the APE. Sites 41GU113 and 41GU114 are multi-component with prehistoric components of unknown age and historic components that date at least to the mid-to-late nineteenth century. The backhoe trench investigations expanded the initial boundary of site 41GU113, although no particular structure or persons could be associated definitively with the historic debris. The archival information about the age of structures adjacent to, and near site 41GU113, indicates that this area was occupied by the mid-to-late nineteenth century. The cultural deposits on sites 41GU113 and 41GU114 are from shallow-buried contexts within a coarse matrix, a depositional environment not conducive to preservation. In addition, the observed disturbances along the terraces, such as extensive construction activity, indicate it is unlikely that intact, preserved, significant deposits occur at any of the newly recorded archaeological sites. Site 41GU115 contains historic debris that may date as early as the mid-nineteenth century; however, the artifacts do not appear to be in primary context, given the local evidence for extensive landscape alterations.

Table 5-7. Artifacts Recovered from 41GU115

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Ceramic</th>
<th>Glass</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Burned Rock</th>
<th>Button</th>
<th>Faunal</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three new sites; 41GU113, 41GU114 and 41GU115, were encountered on the southern portion of the APE. Sites 41GU113 and 41GU114 are multi-component with prehistoric components of unknown age and historic components that date at least to the mid-to-late nineteenth century. The backhoe trench investigations expanded the initial boundary of site 41GU113, although no particular structure or persons could be associated definitively with the historic debris. The archival information about the age of structures adjacent to, and near site 41GU113, indicates that this area was occupied by the mid-to-late nineteenth century. The cultural deposits on sites 41GU113 and 41GU114 are from shallow-buried contexts within a coarse matrix, a depositional environment not conducive to preservation. In addition, the observed disturbances along the terraces, such as extensive construction activity, indicate it is unlikely that intact, preserved, significant deposits occur at any of the newly recorded archaeological sites. Site 41GU115 contains historic debris that may date as early as the mid-nineteenth century; however, the artifacts do not appear to be in primary context, given the local evidence for extensive landscape alterations.

Figure 5-15. PVC drainage pipe beneath site 41GU115.
Chapter 6: Conclusions and Recommendations

During 2008 and 2009, CAR conducted an intensive pedestrian survey and shovel testing along Walnut Branch in Seguin, Guadalupe County, Texas. The APE is 2.5 miles long and encompasses the banks of the Walnut Branch. The archaeological work was in association with the Walnut Branch Hike and Bike Trail project. The project is a concerted effort between the City of Seguin and Jacobs to revitalize the creek.

Robert H.H. Hugman designed the park along Walnut Branch during the 1930s. The design included the construction of paths and footbridges similar to those on the River Walk in San Antonio. Heavily impacted remnants of Hugman’s work along Walnut Branch are still visible on the southern portion of the APE. Several historical structures are situated along the creek including the Sebastopol State Historic structure (41GU9). The earliest property that would have been along the creek is the Ranger Station. Remnants of that structure were not found during the survey.

Much of the creek has been channelized and modified. Immediate project impacts determined at this time do not foresee disturbances exceeding 6-12 inches below current grade in the northern section and only in the few limited areas in the southern section between West Court Street and West Nolte Street (see Figure 5-8).

Thirty-nine shovel tests and five backhoe trenches were excavated as part of the archaeological investigations. The northern section of the APE spans from West New Braunfels Street to Court Street. During the survey of this portion of the APE 14 shovel tests were excavated. No sites were identified in this portion of the APE. An isolated find, consisting of three pieces of burned rock, were recovered from ST 6.

The southern section of the APE spanned from Court Street south to the convergence of Walnut Branch and the Guadalupe River. Three new sites were recorded while surveying this area: 41GU113, 41GU114 and 41GU115. Sites 41GU113 and 41GU114 are marginally multi-component, containing mostly historic and few prehistoric materials. The presence of these materials in their present locations may be the result of alluvial and colluvial action and human modification and therefore they represent a secondary deposition. Historic site 41GU115 is located on a terrace that has been extensively modified and it is unlikely any significant intact cultural properties remain, and based on the results from field investigations, it is proposed that the presence of historic artifacts at 41GU115 is the result of secondary deposition.

Based on their derived depositional context and lack of integrity, CAR recommends that sites 41GU113, 41GU114, and 41GU115 are not eligible for listing in the NRHP or formal designation as SALs and no further work is recommended for the sites. Given the extensive modifications that have occurred within the proposed project area, we recommend that the project will have no adverse effect on cultural properties, and therefore the project should be allowed to proceed. In the event of an inadvertent discovery, the Texas Historic Commission should be notified immediately and work cease in the immediate vicinity.
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