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Abstract:

The University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA) Center for Archaeological Research (CAR), in response to a request from Bain Medina Bain, Inc., conducted an intensive pedestrian survey of the proposed Maverick Creek Greenway Trail System, in northwest San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas. The work was completed on October 4, 12, and December 21, 2018. The Area of Potential Effect (APE) consisted of a 1-km (0.6-mile) proposed trail that ran parallel to Babcock Road along Maverick Creek and Huesta Creek. The proposed trail begins at Bamberger Park and Huesta Creek (off old Babcock Road) and continues north to the intersection of UTSA Boulevard and Babcock Road. The Maverick Creek trail segment is on City of San Antonio-owned property and the project includes public funding. Therefore, the project falls under the review authority of the City of San Antonio Office of Historic Preservation (COSA-OHP) and the Texas Historical Commission (THC). The project was conducted under the Texas Antiquities Code with Texas Antiquities Permit No. 8583. Paul Shawn Marceaux served as the Principal Investigator, and Antonia L. Figueroa served as Project Archaeologist.

During the archaeological investigations, 23 shovel tests were excavated, and one site (41BX2263) was documented. Site 41BX2263 was defined by two positive shovel tests located on a small upland setting north of Huesta Creek. The site consisted of a light scatter of late nineteenth- to early twentieth-century material found in two shovel tests. CAR recommends site 41BX2263 is not eligible for State Antiquities Landmark designation or listing on the National Register of Historic Places. CAR recommends no further archaeological work and that construction of this section of the Maverick Creek Greenway Trail proceed as it will not impact any previous or new archaeological sites or features. However, in the event that construction reveals archaeological deposits, work should cease, and the City Archaeologist of COSA-OHP should be notified.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

An intensive pedestrian survey and shovel testing along the proposed trail alignment for the Maverick Creek Greenway Trail System was performed on October 4, 12, and December 21, 2018, by The University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA) Center for Archaeological Research (CAR). The Maverick Creek Greenway Trail System is located in northwest San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas (Figure 1-1). The work was in response to a request from Bain Medina Bain, Inc. The project was completed under the guidance of the City of San Antonio Office of Historic Preservation (COSA-OHP). The project fell under the Texas Antiquities Code and was performed under Texas Antiquities Permit No. 8583. The Principal Investigator was Paul Shawn Marceaux, and Antonia L. Figueroa served as the Project Archaeologist.

The goal of the survey and shovel testing was to identify and document all prehistoric and/or historic archaeological sites that may be impacted by the proposed trail. To accomplish the goal, CAR completed a combination of background research, pedestrian survey, and shovel testing across the Area of Potential Effect (APE). CAR staff excavated 23 shovel tests, and one site (41BX2263) was documented. However, further work was not recommended, and CAR recommends the proposed trail can be completed as planned.

Area of Potential Effect

The APE consisted of approximately 1 kilometer (km; 0.6 mile) of proposed trails along Maverick Creek and proposed amenities that include an amphitheater, playground, trail connections, and parking lot (Figure 1-1). The trail will run north to south along Maverick Creek from the UTSA campus (near the intersection of Babcock Road and UTSA Boulevard) to Bamberger Park. The easement of the proposed trail and amenities is 9-meters (m; 30-ft.) wide and is depicted on the ESRI topographic map in Figure 1-2.

Report Organization

The remainder of the report consists of four additional chapters. Following this introduction, Chapter 2 reviews the project setting, which includes the physical environs of the APE and previous archaeology conducted within 1 km (0.6 mile). The field, laboratory, and curation methods for the project are presented in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 documents the results of the pedestrian survey and shovel tests, while Chapter 5 provides a summary and recommendation based on the project findings.
Figure 1-1. Location of the APE with satellite imagery and proposed amenities: A) amphitheater; B) playground; C) trail connections; and D) parking lot.
Figure 1-2. The APE depicted on an ESRI topographic map.
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Chapter 2: Project Setting

This chapter presents a brief description of the project area’s physical environment, including soils, climate, and vegetation. It provides a brief description of previous archaeological investigations conducted within 1 km (0.6 mile) of the APE.

Environmental Setting

The San Antonio region is described as a moderate, subtropical, humid climate with generally cool winters and hot summers (Norwine 1995; Taylor et al. 1991). The average high temperature reported for San Antonio in 2017 was 69.6° F, and the average low was 45.5° F (U.S. Climate Data 2018).

The soil types that are present in the APE consist of Sunev loam (VaB), Anhalt clay (Ca), Tinn and Frio soils (Tf), and Lewisville silty clay (LvB). Terrain setting, slope, and drainage properties define these soils (NRCS 2018). The Sunev soils are characterized by deep, well-drained soils that occur in alluvium settings. The Anhalt soils are described as moderately deep and well drained. This soil series occurs on hillslopes, toe slopes, and base slope landforms. Tinn and Frio soils are moderately well-drained soils that occur on floodplains with 0-1 percent slopes. The Lewisville soil series are silty clay soils that are deep and well drained (NRCS 2018).

There are two waterways within the APE. Maverick Creek runs parallel to the proposed trail, while Huesta Creek crosses the southern portion of the APE (Figures 2-1 and 2-2). Both creeks are part of the Leon Creek watershed. Leon Creek runs north to south through the west-central portion of the county, ultimately draining into the Medina River south of San Antonio. Huesta Creek, a secondary branch of Leon Creek, runs close to where the proposed trail intersects with the existing Bamberger Park Hike and Bike Trail.

Three plant communities are represented in the 1-km (0.6-mile) stretch of the APE and include dense woodlands, tallgrass savannah, and short grass/tree community (NRCS 2018). The dense woodland community has a closed canopy and is dominated by hardwoods like pecan (Carya illinoinsis) and oak (Quercus) species. The lack of grasses in the dense woodland plant community is due to the shade provided by the canopy. The tallgrass savannah plant community has a 10 percent canopy cover and is dominated...
by little bluestem (*Schizachyrium scoparium*), big bluestem (*Andropogon gerardii*) and Indian grasses (*Sorghastrum nutans*). The shortgrass/tree community has a hardwood over story of 15-30 percent that is predominantly mesquite (*Prosopis*). The typical grasses in the shortgrass/tree community include sideoats grama (*Bouteloua curtipendula*) and plains lovegrass (*Eragrostis intermedia*; NRCS 2018).

**Culture History**

This section summarizes the culture history for the region. The one site recorded during the project dated to the historic period, while no prehistoric resources were recorded or observed. Therefore, a detailed discussion of the prehistory of the region will not be provided. The discussion begins with the Protohistoric period and concludes with the twentieth century. The reader may consult Collins (2004) for a detailed summary of the prehistory of Central Texas that begins during the Paleo-Indian period (11,500-8800 BP) and ends with the Late Prehistoric (1200-350 BP). Furthermore, the culture history periods that are discussed below were adapted from previous CAR reports (Figueroa and Mauldin 2005; Fox et. al 1997; Thompson and Figueroa 2005).

**Protohistoric (ca. 1528-1700)**

It has been stated by some scholars (Wade 2003) that the Protohistoric Period may coincide with the end of the Late Prehistoric period (Collins 2004). The Protohistoric period begins with the Early Spanish explorations in Texas (ca.
1528) and terminates with the establishment of a strong Spanish presence in the region during the late 1600s and early 1700s. During this period, there is sporadic contact between the native groups in the region and European explorers. The Spanish arrived in present-day San Antonio during the late 1600s when General Alfonso de León visited the area. There are few Protohistoric period sites that have been documented in South Texas (e.g., Hall et al. 1986; Inman et al. 1998; Mauldin et al. 2004).

Spanish Colonial Period in San Antonio (ca. 1700-1800)

The establishment of Spanish presidios in the region was prompted by threats from the French in the region (Moorhead 1991:27). In 1690, the Spanish founded Mission San Francisco de los Tejas, near present-day Nacogdoches, along with Santísimo Nombre de María, on the banks of the Neches River. The missions did not survive very long, and by 1693, both were abandoned. A firm foothold in the region was finally established by the Spanish in 1700, along the Rio Grande River, with the founding of Mission San Juan Bautista (Weddle 1968).

In 1718, the the Presidio San Antonio de Béxar and Mission San Antonio de Valero were established near the headwaters of San Pedro Creek, by Don Martín del Alarcón, the governor of Coahuila and the San Antonio region (Chipman 1992:14; Hoffman, translator 1937). The goal of the San Antonio de Bexar presidio and the occupying soldiers was to protect the surrounding lands and inhabitants. Moreover, San Antonio served as a way station, along the Spanish Camino Real, that was located between present day Mexico and East Texas (McGraw et al. 1991). Marqués de San Miguel de Aguayo replaced Alarcón as the governor and captain general of Coahuila and Texas (Buerkle 1976:52) in 1719. In his new position, Aguayo led an expedition into Texas with the aim of re-establishing a Spanish presence in the region that began with eight month stay in East Texas. (Buerkle 1976:52).

By 1720, Mission San José y San Miguel de Aguayo, Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción de los Hasinai, San Francisco de Espada and San Juan Capistrano were established along the San Antonio River. The establishment of Villa de San Fernando, the first civilian settlement in Texas, occurred in 1731, and it became home to Canary Islanders (Habig 1968).

There was a major shift between colonial powers in the region with the on-set of the Seven Year War (1756-1763). It was at this time East Texas missions and settlements began to dissolve, as populations began to relocate to San Antonio (Habig 1968). By 1790, the San Antonio missions began to decline and Manuel Silva, under the College of Zacatecas, recommended that Mission San Antonio de Valero be secularized. There was a shortage of clergy to service the missions, as well as there was a lack of indigenous workers to maintain their associated farmlands (Cox 2005). After Mission San Antonio de Valero was finally secularized in 1794, the associated lands were transferred to the remaining Mission Indians and other individuals who lived in the area (Habig 1968).

Early Texas (1800-1836)

Dangers to the inhabitants of the San Antonio region, in the form of Indian raids and cattle smuggling became concern as the area continued to be under Spanish control. This problem prompted the arrival of the Compañía Volante de San Carlos del Alamo de Parras from Coahuila, in 1803 (Tarin 2010). The soldiers occupied the abandoned Mission San Antonio de Valero, giving the landmark its current designation as the Alamo (see Cox 2005). Disgruntlement with the Spanish crown plagued many of the provinces, and the fight for independence began with the Hidalgo revolt of 1810. After Mexico gained its independence from Spain in 1821, a new constitution was created with Texas and Coahuila merging as one state. However, San Antonio de Béxar remained a separate department (Fox et al. 1997).

Spain struggled to regain control of Mexico and Texas. In 1833, Stephen F. Austin asked San Antonio to provide support for his efforts in fighting for Texas independence. In February of 1836, the Mexican army arrived in San Antonio. Texan troops taking position in the Alamo were assaulted and defeated in early March of 1836. Santa Ana was finally defeated and caught at the Battle of San Jacinto later that year when Texas finally gained independence (Fox et al. 1997).

Republic of Texas (1836-1845)

The first president of the newly formed Republic of Texas, Sam Houston, was inaugurated in 1836. The Texas Congress set the boundaries for the newly formed republic as the Rio Grande in the south and Louisiana eastern boundary (Nance 2004). At this time San Antonio’s population increased due to immigration. The first mayor of San Antonio, John W. Smith, was elected in 1837. However, Mexico refused to recognize Texas as independent and political tensions continued up until 1844 when a final truce was called between Texas and Mexico. (Fox et al. 1997).

State of Texas (1845-1900)

The Texas State Constitution was approved by the U.S Congress in 1845, and Texas was admitted as a state. This act,
along with the lack of agreement on boundary lines, prompted the war between the U.S. and Mexico. As a result, General Zachary Taylor and his troops advanced to the Rio Grande in May of 1846, an area of land that the Mexican government viewed as its own, and war was declared. After a series of battles, the U.S. military occupied Mexico City in August of 1847. The ratification of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 established the Rio Grande as a boundary, and it gave the United States additional territories in return for monetary compensation. The U.S. troops retreated Mexico in June of that same year (Bauer 1974; Wallace 1965).

Not soon after this war between Mexico and the United States, Texas, a new state to the Union, had to grapple with its position on slavery. During the Civil War, Texas did not suffer as much economically as the rest of the Union, but there was a shortage of commodities in San Antonio. More importantly, Texans fought on both sides of the war contributing to the civil strife that effected the rest of the Union. Finally, in June of 1865, Confederate generals serving in the Texas region surrendered signaling the end of the Civil War (Campbell 2010; Fox et al. 1997).

During the late nineteenth century, an economic boom occurred in San Antonio with the arrival of the Galveston, Harrisburg, and San Antonio Railroad. The railroad helped introduce new to the area that gave support to new merchant and saloon businesses (Fox et al. 1997). At the beginning of the twentieth century, the population of San Antonio was just over 53,000 (Fox et al. 1997). While San Antonio proper continued to grow during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, most farmsteads and ranches were established on the outskirts of Bexar County (Fox et al. 1997; Thompson and Figueroa 2005). Germans began to migrate to the Texas region between 1844 and 1847, and it was at this time that Castroville became the heart of the Alsatian colony. Many German settlers choose the San Antonio area due to better opportunities. By 1850, at least five percent of the population consisted of German immigrants (Jordan 1977).

There has been archaeological evidence of a historic farmsteads and ranching complexes in the area surrounding the APE. For instance, a German farmstead (41BX1600) dating to the nineteenth century was recorded adjacent to French Creek, which is 1.6 km (1 mile) from the APE (Thompson and Figueroa 2005). Evidence of a twentieth-century ranching complex has also been documented off Huesta Creek that is only 0.5 km (0.3 mile) from the APE (Galindo 2000).

### Previously Recorded Sites

There are six previously recorded sites within 1 km (0.6 mile) of the APE (Table 2-1; Figure 2-3). Two of the sites (41BX41 and 41BX1811) are open camp sites. Four of the sites are lithic scatters, while only one of the previously recorded sites is historic and was documented by Galindo (2000) as part of the Hausman Road Improvements project. This information was obtained from the Texas Site Atlas (THC 2018) and cultural resource management reports. Geo-Marine conducted investigations along Leon Creek in 2007, which included a revisit of the open campsite 41BX41 (Osburn 2008). Site 41BX41 was first recorded in 1977 (THC 2018). Texas A&M documented two of the sites (41BX1419 and 41BX1420) during investigations conducted on UTSA property (Clabaugh 2000). SWCA (Houk and Skoglund 2002) conducted work again on the UTSA campus in 2002 and revisited three of the sites (41BX440, 41BX1420, and 41BX1419) documented by Texas A&M. None of the previously recorded sites are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places nor are any of the sites designated as State Archaeological Landmarks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Site Type/Time Period</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41BX41</td>
<td>open camp site</td>
<td>Osburn 2008; THC 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX440</td>
<td>lithic scatter/unknown prehistoric</td>
<td>Houk and Skoglund 2002; THC 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1419</td>
<td>lithic scatter/unknown prehistoric</td>
<td>Clabaugh 2000; Houk and Skoglund 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1420</td>
<td>lithic scatter/unknown prehistoric</td>
<td>Clabaugh 2000; Houk and Skoglund 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1811</td>
<td>open camp site</td>
<td>THC 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1810</td>
<td>unknown prehistoric</td>
<td>Dowling et al. 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1858</td>
<td>ranching complex/historic</td>
<td>Galindo 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2-3. Previously recorded archaeological sites within 1 km (0.6 mile) of the APE.
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Field Methods

To identify and document prehistoric and historic sites CAR archaeologists completed a 100 percent pedestrian survey of the approximately 1-km (0.6-mile) proposed trail corridor and its associated amenities. In addition to the pedestrian survey, 23 shovel tests were excavated in order to locate and document subsurface cultural deposits. Shovel tests were approximately 30 cm (11.8 in.) in diameter and excavated to depths of 60 cm (23.6 in.) below the ground surface. Shovel tests were excavated in arbitrary 10-cm (3.9-in.) levels, and all soil matrixes were screened through one-quarter inch hardware cloth. The excavator recorded the results of the shovel tests on a standardized form. For each 10-cm (3.9-in.) level, a description of the soils and documentation of any recovered cultural material was recorded. At the conclusion of shovel tests, the hole was refilled with the screened soil. Each shovel test location was plotted with a GPS Trimble Unit. The CAR staff collected all artifacts recovered from shovel tests.

For the purposes of this survey, an archaeological site was defined as containing cultural materials or features that are at least 50 years old within a given area. Specifically, a site was identified by: (1) five or more surface artifacts within a 15-m (49 ft.) radius (ca. 706.9 m²); or (2) a single cultural feature, such as a hearth, observed on the surface or exposed in a shovel test; or (3) a positive shovel test containing at least three artifacts within a given 10-cm (3.9-in.) level; or (4) a positive shovel test containing at least five total artifacts; or (5) two positive shovel tests located within 30 m (98.4 ft.) of each other.

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. 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 laser-printed label contains provenience information and a corresponding lot number. Field forms were printed on acid-free paper and completed with pencil. All field notes, forms, photographs, and drawings were placed in labeled archival folders. Digital photographs were printed on acid-free paper and placed in archival-quality page protectors. All records generated during the project were prepared in accordance with federal regulations 36 CFR Part 79 and THC requirements for State Held-in-Trust collections. All project related materials, including the final report, will be permanently stored at the CAR curation facility.
Chapter 4: Results of the Field Investigations

On October 4, 12, and December 21, 2018, the CAR conducted a pedestrian survey of the APE that included the excavation of 23 shovel tests (STs; Figure 4-1). CAR staff began the shovel testing and pedestrian survey at the south end of the APE, where the proposed trail meets an existing trail. Figure 4-2 shows the existing trail that runs east to west under Babcock Road. Shovel tests were placed every 100 m (328 ft.) until the northern extent of the APE was reached at the corner of UTSA Boulevard and Babcock Road (Figure 4-3).
Chapter 4: Results of the Field Investigations

Figure 4-2. Existing trail that crosses west under Babcock Road.

Figure 4-3. The northern end of the APE at UTSA Boulevard and Babcock Road, facing south.
Pedestrian Survey and Shovel Testing

Table 4-1 displays the results of each shovel test. The northern extent of the APE and the various utilities at the corner of UTSA Boulevard and Babcock Road are shown in Figure 4-3. Due to the disturbance in the northern portion of the APE, a shovel test was not placed in this area. Only 15 of the shovel tests terminated at 60 cm below the surface (cmbs; 23 in.). The remaining STs were terminated at a more shallow depth due to either encountering creek gravels or fill material. Figure 4-4 shows ST 8, which was terminated at 18 cmbs (7.08 in.) due to asphalt and fill material. Shovel Tests 12 and 20 were excavated along a portion of the proposed trail that would connect to an existing trail. Shovel Test 12 terminated prior to reaching 60 cmbs (23 in.) due to creek gravels, as this part of the APE crossed Maverick Creek (Figure 4-5). Soils in the APE ranged from a brown (10YR 4/3) clay loam (with high gravel content of 70 percent or more) that was associated with shallow soils and found near the creek to a dark grayish brown (10YR 3/2) clay associated with deeper soils. Only two (STs 3 and 18) of the 23 shovel tests were positive, and the two shovel tests were identified as a single site, 41BX2263.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Depth (cmbs)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Reason for Termination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>heavy gravels/bedrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>fill/asphalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>bedrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>heavy gravels/fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>bedrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>fill/asphalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>gravels/bedrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>gravels/bedrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Site 41BX2263

Two shovel tests (STs 3 and 18) were positive for cultural material and designated as site 41BX2263 (Figure 4-5). Shovel Test 3 contained ceramic (n=2) and glass (n=3), and all three items were recovered in Level 1 (Figure 4-6). The ceramics consisted of two undecorated white earthenware rims, one piece of aqua glass, and two pieces of clear (flat) window glass (Table 4-2). Three additional shovel tests (STs 17, 18, and 19) were excavated to delineate the horizontal extent of the cultural material. Excavating a shovel test west of ST 3 was not feasible as there was a drop off into a culvert off that connect to Huesta Creek (Figure 4-7). Shovel Test 18 was excavated east of ST 3 and was positive with one piece of undecorated porcelain in Level 4. Shovel Test 17 was excavated on a slope, south of the ST 3, and was negative for cultural material (Figure 4-8). Shovel Test 19, accidently dug slightly outside the APE, was excavated northeast of ST 17 and was also negative for cultural material (Figure 4-7). All of the material dated to the early 1900s (Miller 1991; White 1978). A 1953 USGS topographic map (Helotes, Texas, N2930-W9837.5/7.5) of the project area did not indicate any structures in the area where the cultural material was recorded. Due to the low number of artifacts and lack of structural evidence in the area it was determined that the cultural material was possibly refuse deposited in the area from flooding or dumping. Further work was not recommended for the site.
Figure 4-5. Site 41BX2263 on an ESRI topographic map.
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Figure 4-6. Shovel Test 3, facing north.

Table 4-2. Artifacts Recovered from 41BX2263

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Depth (cmbs)</th>
<th>Cultural Material</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>ceramic</td>
<td>undecorated white earthenware rim</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>glass</td>
<td>aqua</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>glass</td>
<td>clear</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>ceramic</td>
<td>undecorated porcelain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4-7. Maverick Creek and culvert west of ST 3, facing west.

Figure 4-8. CAR crewmember excavating ST 17, facing south.
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Chapter 5: Summary and Recommendations

On October 4, 12, and December 21, 2018, CAR archaeologists performed an intensive pedestrian survey and shovel testing in advance of the proposed Maverick Creek Greenway Trail System located in northwest San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas. The proposed trail alignment began at Babcock Road and UTSA Boulevard, just west of Maverick Creek, and headed south to an existing trail just north of Bamberger Park and Huesta Creek. A total of 23 shovel tests were excavated along the 1-km (0.6-mile) long proposed trail alignment, and one new site (41BX2263) was documented.

Twenty-one shovel tests were negative for cultural material. A newly documented site 41BX2263 consisted of two positive shovel tests (STs 3 and 18) containing historic material (ceramics and glass). Due to the low number of artifacts and lack of structural evidence in the area, it was determined the cultural material was possibly refuse deposited in the area from flooding or dumping. Disturbance to a portion of the APE was revealed, between the documented site and Hausman Road, with the presence of asphalt and other fill material. CAR recommends site 41BX2263 is not eligible for State Antiquities Landmark designation or listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Further work was not recommended for the site, and CAR recommends the proposed Maverick Creek Greenway Trail System proceed as planned.
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