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ABSTRACT

At the request of CP&Y, Inc. (CP&Y), and on behalf of the Texas Department of Transportation Austin District (TxDOT) and the Central Texas Regional Mobility Authority (CTRMA), SWCA conducted a background literature and records review and an intensive cultural resources survey for the U.S. Highway 183 North Mobility Project in Travis and Williamson Counties, Texas (CSJ: 0151-05-100). The project alignment is along U.S. Highway 183 (US 183) from 4,000 feet north of State Highway 45 (SH 45), to 3,000 feet south of Loop 1 (MoPac), with a transition continuing along the existing right-of-way (ROW) of MoPac to its intersection with Ranch-to-Market 2222 (RM 2222). The project primarily would consist of improvements within the existing US 183 ROW from 1,000 feet north of its intersection with SH 45, south to the intersection of US 183 and MoPac, where it would continue within the existing ROW of MoPac south to the roadway’s intersection with RM 2222. Utility relocations are anticipated but the exact locales of such relocations are currently unknown. Because the project would occur on lands owned by TxDOT, a political subdivision of the State, the project is subject to the Antiquities Code of Texas and the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as the project may involve federal funding from the Federal Highway Administration.

The area of potential effects (APE) includes 49,754.75 feet (9.42 miles) of existing US 183 ROW, which is 350 feet wide. The APE also includes 18,336.33 feet (3.48 miles) of existing MoPac ROW, which fluctuates between approximately 290 to 600 feet wide. Additionally, there is a segment of APE consisting of existing RM 620 ROW approximately 5,692.58 feet (1.08 miles) long. The APE within existing TxDOT ROW, consisting of the above three segments, covers a total of approximately 715.99 acres. The APE within proposed ROW, consisting of temporary construction and permanent drainage easements along US 183 consists of approximately 2.37 acres for proposed easements and 41.61 acres for proposed ponds covers a total of approximately 43.98 acres.

In summary, the APE is approximately 73,783.66 linear feet (13.98 miles) in length, 290 to 600 feet wide, and encompasses approximately 759.97 acres (715.99 acres of existing ROW, 41.61 acres of proposed ROW ponds, and 2.37 acres of proposed easement). Utility relocations are anticipated but the exact locales of such relocations are currently unknown.

The majority of the APE has been heavily modified and extensively disturbed by highway infrastructure and, as such, the majority of the APE did not warrant pedestrian survey. As per coordination with TxDOT and the Texas Historical Commission, the APE for archaeological survey was limited to select locations that encompassed a total of approximately 47.98 acres—25.21 acres of proposed ROW ponds, 2.37 acres of proposed easement, 16.4 acres of existing ROW ponds, and 4.0 acres of existing RM 620 ROW. Additionally, the planned survey locations included three previously recorded cultural resource site areas and two creek crossings.

The background review determined that various portions of the APE have been previously surveyed, with four previously recorded sites (41TV62, 41TV297, 41TV1087, and 41WM757) within or adjacent to the APE. Sites 41TV297, 41WM757, and 41TV1087 were revisited during SWCA’s recent survey; the fourth site (41TV62), as per the approved scope of work, was not revisited as previous investigations reported the site as destroyed within the MoPac ROW. SWCA’s survey of 41TV297, 41WM757, and 41TV1087 within the existing US 183 ROW revealed no remnants of the sites as they have all been destroyed. SWCA’s survey also included assessments of two creek crossings, a 2.73-acre easement, and a total of 13 existing or proposed ROW detention pond areas.

Two creek crossings within the US 183 ROW, Lake Creek and Shoal Creek, represented high probability areas for encountering cultural material. Upon inspection, however, it was evident that both the east and west sides of US 183 are extensively disturbed and there are no intact (undisturbed) areas within the
TxDOT ROW. Right-of-entry (ROE) was not available to the proposed 2.37-acre drainage easement due to no response from the land owner so the assessment took place from adjacent public ROW. Similarly, ROE was not available to five of six proposed ROW pond areas due to either denied access or no response from the land owner so they too were assessed from adjacent public ROW. In contrast, all seven existing ROW pond areas were accessible. Areas with access and those lacking ROE all exhibited severe modification and modern disturbance as a result of urban development, highway construction, and utilities installation and were determined to not contain any intact undisturbed soils and therefore, have no potential to contain intact, potentially significant intact cultural resources.

In accordance with 36 CFR 800.4, SWCA has made a reasonable and good faith effort to identify archaeological historic properties or cultural resource sites within the APE. Based on the results of the survey, no archaeological historic properties or sites (including traces of previously recorded sites 41TV297, 41WM757, and 41TV1087) were identified within existing ROW and detention pond areas with ROE. Although survey of the proposed 2.37-acre easement and five of six proposed ROW pond areas was not possible due to no ROE, given the observed extensive urban development and the grading and excavations associated with the construction of those facilities, it is the opinion of SWCA that those areas do not warrant additional survey as they have no potential to contain potentially significant intact cultural resources.

Given the above data, SWCA recommends that because the survey discovered no archaeological historic properties or cultural resource sites within the APE where ROE was available, and the areas with no ROE are extensively disturbed and preclude the preservation of intact cultural resources, the proposed construction should be allowed to proceed as planned without additional cultural resources investigations as no archaeological historic properties eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (as per 36 CFR 60.4) or sites warranting designation as a State Antiquities Landmark (pursuant to 13 TAC 26.12) would be affected by the project.
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INTRODUCTION

At the request of CP&Y, Inc., and on behalf of the Texas Department of Transportation Austin District (TxDOT) and the Central Texas Regional Mobility Authority (CTRMA), SWCA conducted a background literature and records review and an intensive cultural resources survey for the U.S. Highway 183 North Mobility Project in Travis and Williamson Counties, Texas (Figure 1 and Figures 2a–2e). Currently, TxDOT and the CTRMA are proposing to add two express lanes in each direction within the existing right-of-way (ROW) of US 183 from 4,000 feet north of its intersection with State Highway (SH) 45 to 3,000 feet south of its intersection with State Highway Loop 1 (MoPac) with a transition continuing to the south within the existing ROW of MoPac to its intersection with Ranch-to-Market (RM) 2222. There would be an elevated direct connector between SH 45 and RM 620, with another one at MoPac. The remainder of the project would be built at the grade of the adjacent lanes. Pedestrian/bicycle facilities and sidewalks/share paths meeting ADA guidelines are planned; although, preliminary plans are currently under development. To provide a continuous four-lane section of general purpose lanes in each direction from SH 45 to MoPac, the proposed Project would also include the construction of a fourth general purpose lane southbound on US 183 from approximately 0.8 mile north of McNeil Drive/Spicewood Springs Road to MoPac. Northbound, a fourth general purpose lane would be added on US 183 between Braker Lane and McNeil Drive/Spicewood Springs Road. All construction activities would take place within the existing TxDOT ROW.

Because the project would occur on lands owned by TxDOT, a political subdivision of the State of Texas, investigations were performed in accordance with the standards and guidelines of the Antiquities Code of Texas (Code) and the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), as the project may involve federal funding from the Federal Highway Administration.

The purpose of the work was to locate and identify all prehistoric and historic archaeological sites in the area of potential effects (APE) for archaeological survey, establish vertical and horizontal site boundaries as appropriate with regard to the APE for archaeological survey, and evaluate the significance and eligibility of any site recorded within the APE for designation as a State Antiquities Landmark (SAL) and for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

DEFINITION OF STUDY AREA

The proposed project includes 49,754.75 feet (9.42 miles) of existing US 183 ROW, which is 350 feet wide (Figures 3a and 3b). The project also includes 18,336.33 feet (3.48 miles) of existing MoPac ROW, which fluctuates between approximately 290 to 600 feet wide. Additionally, there is a segment of existing RM 620 ROW approximately 5,692.58 feet (1.08 miles) long. The area of potential effects (APE) within existing TxDOT ROW, consisting of the above three segments, covers a total of approximately 715.99 acres. The APE within proposed ROW, consisting of temporary construction and permanent drainage easements along US 183 consists of approximately 2.37 acres for proposed easements and 41.61 acres for proposed ponds covers a total of approximately 43.98 acres. Subsurface impacts associated with roadway improvements would extend approximately 3 to 4 feet below ground surface, up to 70 feet below ground surface for the direct connector support columns, and 20 to 30 feet below ground surface for water quality ponds.
Figure 1. Project location map.
Figure 2a. Project area map.
Figure 2b. Project area map
Figure 2c. Project area map.
Figure 2d. Project area map.
Figure 2e. Project area map.
Figure 3b. Project schematics.
In summary, the APE is approximately 73,783.66 linear feet (13.98 miles) in length, 290 to 600 feet wide along MoPac and 350 feet wide along US 183), and encompasses approximately 759.97 acres (715.99 acres of existing ROW, 41.61 acres of proposed ROW ponds, and 2.37 acres of proposed easement). Subsurface impacts associated with roadway improvements would extend approximately 3 to 4 feet below ground surface, up to 70 feet below ground surface for the direct connector support columns, and 20 to 30 feet below ground surface for water quality ponds. Utility relocations are anticipated but the exact locales of such relocations are currently unknown.

The proposed APE has been heavily disturbed by the construction of the existing roadways, drainage facilities, and overhead and buried utility installations. For the most part, the roadways are lined with commercial and residential development, with small pockets of undeveloped land, mostly associated with nearby creeks.

The headwaters of Rattan, Walnut, Hancock, and Little Walnut Creeks, and unnamed tributaries to Buttercup, Bull, and Shoal Creeks are near the US 183 corridor, but only Lake and Shoal Creeks cross the roadway. The Lake Creek crossing is just south of the intersection of US 183 and SH 45, within the current project area. Shoal Creek parallels US 183 to the north as the roadway approaches its intersection with MoPac. The creek then crosses MoPac just north of the US 183 intersection, after which Shoal Creek heads south and crosses US 183 just east of the MoPac intersection, outside of the current project area.

Based on the results of a previous SWCA background review and constraints analysis, the majority (approximately 711.99 acres) of the APE is existing roadway and urban landscape with a negligible potential for intact historic properties. These areas were not recommended for survey. The background review also determined that various portions of the APE have been previously surveyed, with four previously recorded sites (41TV297, 41WM757, and 41TV1087) within or adjacent to the APE.

As per coordination with TxDOT and the Texas Historical Commission (THC), the APE for archaeological survey was limited to select locations that encompassed a total of approximately 47.98 acres—25.21 acres of proposed ROW ponds, 2.37 acres of proposed easement, and 16.4 acres of existing ROW pond, 4.0 acres of existing RM 620 ROW. The APE for archaeological survey included areas at or adjacent to three of the previously recorded sites (41TV297, 41WM757, and 41TV1087). Site 41TV62, as per the approved scope of work, was not revisited as previous investigations reported the site as destroyed within the MoPac ROW. SWCA also conducted survey at the Lake Creek and Shoal Creek crossings of US 183.

**REGULATORY FRAMEWORK**

Projects in Texas can come under the purview of two primary cultural resources regulations, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) and the Antiquities Code of Texas (Code).

Both are administered by the THC, the State Historic Preservation Officer of Texas. If an undertaking is federally permitted, licensed, funded, or partially funded, the project must comply with Section 106 of the NHPA, as amended. Section 106 requires that every federal agency consider the undertaking’s effects on historic properties. The process begins with a historic properties inventory and evaluation. Under Section 106, any property listed in or eligible for the NRHP is considered significant. The NRHP is a historic resources inventory maintained by the Secretary of the Interior. This list includes buildings, structures, objects, sites, districts, and archaeological resources. These regulations are defined in “Protection of Historic Properties,” 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 800 of the NHPA. Examples of projects in Texas requiring compliance with the NHPA include those conducted on federal lands or ones acquiring a federal permit such as a Section 404 permit from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).

Cultural resource sites, historic and prehistoric, located on lands owned or controlled by the State of Texas or one of its political subdivisions are protected by the Code. The Code requires state
agencies and political subdivisions of the state, including cities, counties, river authorities, municipal utility districts and school districts to notify the THC of any action on public land involving 5 or more acres of ground disturbance; 5,000 or more cubic yards of earth moving; or those that have the potential to disturb recorded archaeological sites. The THC’s Archeology Division manages compliance with the Code, including the issuance of formal Antiquities Permits, which stipulate the conditions under which scientific investigations will occur. Under the Code, any historic or prehistoric property located on state land may be determined eligible as an SAL. Projects in Texas that typically necessitate compliance with the Code include entities such as TxDOT, cities, and counties.

As previously mentioned, because the proposed project would occur on lands owned by TxDOT, a subdivision of the State of Texas, the project is subject to the Code. Additionally, the project is anticipated to involve federal funding and permits; therefore, the project must comply with Section 106 of the NHPA. Investigations were conducted under Texas Antiquities Permit 7186 with Steve Carpenter serving as the Principal Investigator. SWCA archaeologists Matthew Carter and Shannon Smith conducted the fieldwork on February 27, 2015.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

GEOLOGY

The underlying geology of the northern and central parts of the APE along US 183 and RM 620 portions of the APE is Lower Cretaceous Edwards Limestone (Figures 4a and 4b), which comprises limestone, dolomite, and chert that is 60–350 feet thick (Fisher 1974). The MoPac portion is mapped as Upper Cretaceous Austin Chalk (Figure 4c), which is chalk and marl to a depth of 325–420 feet (Fisher 1974). Given the age and nature of these formations, they have no potential to contain buried intact cultural resources.

Soils

A total of eight different soils are within the survey area (Figures 5a–5c). Urban land composes nearly 49 percent of the survey area, while Fairlie, Crawford, San Saba, and Eckert soils compose approximately 45 percent of the survey area. Tarrant, Houston Black, and Volente soils compose the remaining 6 percent (Natural Resources Conservation Service [NRCS] 2015).

Urban land, with 0–18 percent slopes, is by definition 75–85 percent covered with commercial or residential development that has altered and obscured soil features such that they do not resemble those described in the various series (Werchan et al. 1974:43). Due to these disturbances, Urban land has little to no potential to contain buried intact cultural resources.

The San Saba series consists of moderately deep, moderately well-drained, and very slowly permeable soils that formed in clayey sediments over hard limestone. These nearly level to gently sloping soils are on uplands (NRCS 2015). Given this soil series’ in place development from clayey sediments underlain by limestone, it has little potential to contain buried intact cultural resources.

Tarrant Series soils are very shallow soils over indurated limestone bedrock and interbedded with marl and chalk. These well-drained soils formed in sediments derived from Cretaceous limestone. Tarrant Series soils have a typical solum thickness of 15 to 50 centimeters (cm) (6 to 20 inches). They are nearly level to very steep soils and are found on summits, shoulders, and backslopes of ridges on dissected plateaus (NRCS 2015). As this soil series developed in place from limestone sediments, it has little to no potential to contain intact buried cultural resources.
Figure 4a. Project area geology, northern segment.
Figure 4b. Project area geology, central segment.
Figure 4c. Project area geology, southern segment.
Figure 5a. Project area soils, northern segment.
Figure 5b. Project area soils, central segment.
Figure 5c. Project area soils, southern segment.
The Houston Black series soils are very deep soils that formed in clayey residuum derived from calcareous mudstone of Cretaceous Age. Houston Black Series soils have a typical solum thickness of 203 to 264 cm (80 to 104 inches). These nearly level to moderately sloping soils occur on interfluves and side slopes on upland ridges and plains on dissected plains (NRCS 2015). Given that this soil series developed in place from clayey sediments underlain by limestone, it has little to no potential to contain buried intact cultural resources.

The Volente series consists of deep, well-drained, and moderately slowly permeable soils that formed in calcareous clayey sediments. These soils are on nearly level to sloping uplands (NRCS 2015). Based on its origin in slope alluvium, this soil series has a low potential to contain intact buried cultural deposits.

The Crawford series consists of moderately deep, well-drained, and very slowly permeable soils that formed in clayey sediments underlain by indurated limestone bedrock. These soils are on broad, nearly level or gently sloping uplands (NRCS 2015). Given that this soil series developed in place from clayey sediments underlain by limestone, it has little potential to contain buried intact cultural resources.

The Eckrant series consists of stony soils that are very shallow and shallow to indurated limestone bedrock, and are interbedded with cryptocrystalline quartz, chert, marl, and chalk. These well-drained soils formed in residuum derived from limestone. These nearly level to very steep soils are on summits, shoulders, and backslopes of ridges on dissected plateaus (NRCS 2015). Given that this soil series developed in place from limestone, it has little potential to contain buried intact cultural resources.

The Fairlie series consists of deep, moderately well-drained, and very slowly permeable soils that are on nearly level to gently sloping uplands. Solum thickness ranges between 40 and 60 inches (NRCS 2015). These upland soils have a low potential to contain intact buried cultural deposits.

**Cultural Setting**

Spanning the border between Travis County and Williamson County, the APE lies within the Central Texas archaeological region, as defined by Collins (1995) and Prewitt (1981). This area is noted by its distinctive environmental conditions, as it is located at the boundary of the moist, humid forests to the east and drier, savannah-like grasslands to the west that greatly influenced cultural development.

The following cultural-historic outline is based on the regional chronologies proposed by Collins (1995) and Johnson and Goode (1994), which build upon the seminal efforts of Suhm (1960) and Prewitt (1981, 1985). Using standard terminology, the cultural sequence is divided into four periods: Paleoindian, Archaic, Late Prehistoric, and Historic. The Archaic period is subdivided into four subperiods: Early, Middle, Late, and Transitional.

**Paleoindian Period**

Paleoindian artifacts and sites date from about 11,500 to 8,800 years before present (B.P.) and are not uncommon in central Texas (Collins 1995, 2004), but are fairly rare in the APE (Bever and Meltzer 2007). The period begins at the close of the Pleistocene with the earliest evidence of humans in the Central Texas region. Diagnostic artifacts of the period include lanceolate-shaped, fluted projectile points such as Clovis, Folsom, and Plainview types. These projectile points were hafted onto wooden spears, launched from atlatls (spear throwers), and used to hunt a variety of game, including mammoth, mastodons, bison, camel, and horse (Black 1989). During the Paleoindian period, the prominent interpretation suggests a hunter-gatherer adaptation strategy with increased harvesting of flora and small game as the big game died off and the climate warmed following the end of the Pleistocene ice age. Representative central Texas Paleoindian sites include Kincaid Rockshelter, Wilson-Leonard, Gault, and St. Mary’s Hall (Collins 1995).
ARCHAIC PERIOD

As the Paleoindian period came to an end, humans began to harvest more intensively local floral and faunal resources (Collins 1995, 2004). Material culture became more diverse and the use of burned rock middens and ovens became widespread. This period is known as the Archaic period and dates from approximately 8800 to 1200 B.P. in central Texas (Collins 1995; Johnson and Goode 1994). While Collins (1995) and Johnson and Goode (1994) subdivide the Archaic into Early, Middle, and Late subperiods, we have added the Transitional subperiod after the Late Archaic for reasons discussed below.

EARLY ARCHAIC

Early Archaic artifacts and sites date from about 8800 to 6000 B.P. (Collins 1995). Once thought to be Paleoindian in age, some unstemmed point types, such as Angostura, have recently been recognized as the first Early Archaic diagnostic styles (Collins 1995). By about 8000 B.P., these points were replaced by stemmed varieties such as Early Split Stem, Martindale, and Uvalde (Black 1989; Collins 1995). Most sites were open campsites although cave sites have been found (Collins 1995). Current site distribution data suggest that Early Archaic peoples were concentrated along the eastern and southern margins of the Edwards Plateau in areas with more stable water sources (Collins 1995; McKinney 1981). Specialized tools, perhaps used in woodworking, known as Guadalupe and Nueces bifaces, were prevalent in this period (Collins 1995). While subsistence data are sparse, it appears that people hunted deer and other small animals, fished, and cooked bulbs in earth ovens (Collins 1995). This strategy evolved, in part, due to the changing climate at the beginning of the Holocene (McKinney 1981).

MIDDLE ARCHAIC

Middle Archaic artifacts and sites date from about 6000 to 4000 B.P. with multi-use bifacial knives becoming more common. Characteristic Middle Archaic projectile points include Bell, Andice, Taylor, Nolan, and Travis, several of which are deeply notched (Black 1989). These artifacts could have served as knives and projectile points. Bison were hunted intensively at the start of the Middle Archaic but, as the climate became drier, a reliance on dry climate plants such as sotol probably became common. The end of the Middle Archaic may have been the most xeric conditions ever in central Texas (Collins 1995). The climatic change was accompanied by a technological shift as Nolan and Travis points, which are thick and have narrow blades, first appeared in the archaeological record (Collins 1995). Burned rock middens and earth ovens first appeared ca. 5000 B.P. and became increasingly common, although their exact functions may have varied based on the culture and environment (Johnson and Goode 1994). Representative sites of the Texas Middle Archaic include the Landslide, Wounded Eye, Gibson, and Panther Springs (Collins 1995).

LATE ARCHAIC

Late Archaic artifacts and sites date from about 4000 to 2250 B.P. The period began with very xeric conditions but gradually became more mesic (Collins 1995). Characteristic dart point types include Bulverde, Pedernales, Marshall, and Marcos (Collins 1995). Increasingly complex and sedentary cultural manifestations first appeared in the Late Archaic. Sites of the Late Archaic are very common and include burned rock middens, open campsites, and lithic procurement sites. Population increases are evidenced by large cemeteries and grave goods. Also, trade and exchange networks between cultures appear to have increased in complexity as evidenced by exotic goods in sites and cemeteries (Black 1989). Bement (1991) interprets the evidence for group investment in territory due to evidence in the Thunder Valley sinkhole cemetery, dated to 2900 B.P. based on stratigraphy, to indicate that groups were declaring control over a particular territorial range during the Late Archaic. Representative sites of the Central Texas Late Archaic include the Anthon and Loeve Fox sites (Collins 1995).

TRANSITIONAL ARCHAIC

As Collins (1995:384–385) notes, diverse and comparatively complex archaeological manifestations toward the end of the Late Archaic
attest to the emergence of kinds of human conduct without precedent in the area. This period (2250–1250 B.P.), referred to as the Transitional Archaic (Turner and Hester 1999) or Terminal Archaic (Black 1989), is not recognized by all researchers. Other chronologies extend the Late Archaic to 1200–1250 B.P. (Collins 1995; Johnson and Goode 1994) to encompass this later subperiod. Johnson et al. (1962) originally designated the Transitional Archaic as a subperiod of the Archaic because of the similarities between the latest dart point types and the earliest arrow point types. Since then, however, the designation has failed to be universally accepted by researchers. In two chronologies for central Texas, Collins (1995) does not include the Transitional as a subperiod of the Archaic, and Johnson and Goode (1994) separate the Late Archaic into two subperiods designated Late Archaic I and Late Archaic II. The Transitional Archaic, as it is used here, closely corresponds to Johnson and Goode’s (1994) Late Archaic II, but begins after the appearance of the Marcos point type—not with it. In this scheme, the Transitional Archaic coincides with the last two style intervals recognized by Collins (1995:Table 2) for the Late Archaic subperiod.

During the Transitional Archaic, smaller dart point forms such as Darl, Ensor, Fairland, and Frio were developed (Turner and Hester 1999). These points were probably ancestral to the first Late Prehistoric arrow point types and may have overlapped temporally with them (Hester 1995; Houk and Lohse 1993).

Several researchers believe that the increased interaction between groups at the end of the Late Archaic was an important catalyst for cultural change (Collins 1995; Johnson and Goode 1994). This change may have included increased regional stress and conflict between groups as interaction became more frequent (Houk et al. 1997). In Bexar County, for instance, researchers noted a distinct shift in settlement patterns during this period (Houk et al. 1997). Groups apparently used hilltops as camps rather than just lithic procurement locations. These elevated locations would have provided points from which to observe game and other groups of humans as they moved through the surrounding creek valleys and upland prairies (Houk et al. 1997).

**Late Prehistoric Period**

By the end of the Transitional Archaic, the bow and arrow was introduced, as indicated by the increasingly smaller size of projectile points. The Late Prehistoric period dates from 1250 to 260 B.P. (Collins 1995). Characteristic artifacts include small arrow points such as Perdiz and Scallorn, as well as a variety of specific-use tools. The Austin and Toyah intervals of the Late Prehistoric, originally recognized by Suhm (1960) and Jelks (1962) remain accepted divisions for the period. These style intervals may represent distinct cultural entities (Johnson 1994), although others challenge this view (Black and Creel 1997).

During the earlier Austin interval, use of burned rock middens may have reached its maximum, based on conclusions by Black and Creel (1997). Characteristic arrow points of the Austin interval include Scallorn and Edwards (Collins 1995; Turner and Hester 1999). By the Toyah interval, plain-ware ceramics appeared, indicating possible influence in the central Texas region from ceramic-producing cultures to the east and north (Perttula et al. 1995). Contrary to bog pollen data (Collins et al. 1993), data from Hall’s Cave in Kerr County indicate that the climate of central Texas began to dry around 1000 B.P. (Toomey et al. 1993). This drying trend may have resulted in a change in vegetation that made Central and South Texas more conducive to bison migration into the area. Bison remains in archaeological sites in the region became common after 750 B.P. (Dillehay 1974; Huebner 1991).

Most Toyah sites have the distinctive Perdiz arrow point type, and some sites also have bison processing tool kits. This technological change has been interpreted by Johnson (1994) as a spread of an ethnic group and by Ricklis (1992) as the spread of technological ideas in response to opportunities provided by increased bison populations in the Late Prehistoric. It is thought that during the Late Prehistoric period subsistence strategies became increasing complex and that human populations were very high (Black 1989; Collins 1995). Representative sites of the central Texas Late Prehistoric include the Kyle, Smith, and Currie Sites (Collins 1995).
SPANISH COLONIAL/MEXICAN INDEPENDENCE PERIOD (1630–1820s)

In the early Historic period (A.D. 1630 to present), the period of European contact and settlement in Texas, the general Austin area was inhabited by several aboriginal groups including the Jumano, Tonkawa, Lipan Apache and Comanche (Newcomb 2002). The first Europeans into the area were probably Spanish missionaries who established three missions at nearby Barton Springs in 1730 (Webb 1952). The Spanish mission period in this area was of short duration and failed to colonize or even tame the area south of the Colorado River and north of Onion Creek. An aboriginal presence thus continued in the Austin area into the 1860s.

After Mexico gained independence from Spain, the newly formed country used a policy of land grants to attract Anglos from the United States to help inhabit the sparsely populated northern regions of Mexico. During the 1820s, Stephen F. Austin obtained grants from the Mexican government to settle hundreds of families along the lower Brazos and Colorado Rivers (Webb 1952). This colony, known as the “Old Three Hundred Colony,” was successful in pushing the European settlement frontier farther west into the central Texas region. Prior to the Texas Revolution, most of the “Old Three Hundred Colony” settlement was focused south of Bastrop and the old La Bahia Road (Webb 1952).

REPUBLIC OF TEXAS/PRE-CIVIL WAR (1836–1860)

During the Texas Revolution with Mexico, the area continued to be inhabited only by aboriginal Native Americans. After the war, a growing Texan population led many settlers to move northwards in search of open, profitable land to plant crops and raise cattle. This wave of migration spurned new conflicts with the native groups living in the area, cumulating in the Battle of Brushy Creek, near what is today the town of Taylor, in February of 1839. This battle, between the Comanche and the Texas Raiders, resulted in numerous deaths and eventually resulted in the removal of the Native American presence in the area.

THE POST-CIVIL WAR TO TWENTIETH CENTURY (1865–1950)

Subsequent to the Civil War, Texas entered the Reconstruction period. To begin reconstruction, federal troops, in part, had to spread the word of the Emancipation Proclamation (Campbell 2003:268). In Galveston on June 19, 1865, General Gordon Granger and the Union army spread the word of the slaves’ emancipation (Campbell 2003:268). Thus, this day became known as ‘Juneteenth’ and has been celebrated by Texas African Americans ever since (Campbell 2003:268).

Lawlessness became a problem during the 1880s, and Travis and other central Texas counties experienced a period of “mob rule.” Citizens formed an anti-mob organization, but competing groups conducted essentially open warfare. After several people were killed, the Texas Rangers were dispatched to the area and order was eventually restored (Murphy 2007).

Recovery during this period was gradual, but was assisted by a diverse agricultural economy, particularly cattle. In the 1870s, several major cattle trails heading to markets passed through central Texas. One invention that had an effect on Texas and its economy during this time was barbed wire. Barbed wire, first demonstrated in 1871, enabled ranchers to alter land and control cattle in a less-intrusive, more profitable manner, and brought additional commerce and trade to central and South Texas (NRHP 1976). Though barbed wire was one of the largest influences on Texas in general, the most influential invention on the region was the railroad. The railroads effectively served as a means of transportation and, to varying degrees, generally bolstered growth in the economies of the region.

Throughout the early twentieth century, trade, transportation, and tourism continued to bring economic prosperity to the region. The establishment of military facilities and the activity surrounding World War I and World War II kept the railway system active and commercial activity in the east prospered.
Through the remainder of the twentieth century, population in central Texas increased largely due to expansion and commercial opportunities in urban and rural areas. The construction of public highways and automobiles facilitated the commuting of central Texas citizens to urban employment.

**METHODS**

**BACKGROUND REVIEW**

SWCA conducted a thorough background cultural resources and environmental literature search of the project area. An SWCA archaeologist reviewed the Jollyville, Texas (3097-234), Pflugerville West, Texas (3097-243), and Austin East, Texas (3097-242) U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps at the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory and searched the THC’s Texas Archeological Sites Atlas (Atlas) online database for any previously recorded surveys and historic or prehistoric archaeological sites located in or near the project area. In addition to identifying recorded archaeological sites, the review included information on the following types of cultural resources: NRHP properties, SALs, Official Texas Historical Markers (OTHMs), Registered Texas Historic Landmarks, cemeteries, and local neighborhood surveys. The archaeologist also examined the NRCS Web Soil Survey (NRCS 2015) and the Geologic Atlas of Texas-Austin Sheet (Fisher 1974). As a part of the review, an SWCA archaeologist reviewed the TxDOT Historic Overlay Maps, a mapping/geographic information system (GIS) with historic maps and resource information covering most portions of the state (Foster et al. 2006).

**FIELD METHODS**

The intensive cultural resources survey included two SWCA archaeologists inspecting the approximately 47.98 acres of existing ROW, proposed drainage easements and temporary construction easements, and proposed and existing detention ponds recommended for survey through visual (roadside) and pedestrian inspection, as well as subsurface testing in areas where disturbance did not preclude the necessity for subsurface investigations, as per THC standards. Additionally, investigators assessed the current condition of previously recorded sites 41WM757, 41TV297, and 41TV1087 for their eligibility to be listed in the NRHP or designated as SALs.

SWCA proposed a non-collection survey, wherein artifacts, if discovered, were to be tabulated, analyzed, and documented in the field, but not collected. Temporally diagnostic artifacts were to be described in detail and photographed in the field. However, no artifacts were encountered within the project area.

**RESULTS**

**BACKGROUND REVIEW**

The background review determined that various portions of the project area have been previously surveyed (Fields and Kibler 2002; Galindo 2013; State Department of Highways and Public Transportation [SDHPT] 1975, 1977a, 1977b, 1982; TxDOT 1992, 1994). There are 46 previously recorded sites within a 1-kilometer (km) radius of the APE, including four previously recorded sites (41TV62, 41TV297, 41TV1087, and 41WM757) within or adjacent to the APE: (Table 1; Figures 6a-and 6b). Within a 1-km radius of the project area are 19 other surveys, 41 additional sites, five OTHMs, four cemeteries, and one property listed in the NRHP.

Beginning about 1,000 feet north of the US 183 and SH 45 intersection, three linear surveys were conducted along US 183 that all end at SH 45. Two of these were on behalf of the SDHPT (now TxDOT) in 1977 and 1990 (SDHPT 1977b), and the other was conducted under Antiquities Permit 2437 by Prewitt and Associates (Fields and Kibler 2002). A survey along RM 620 for SDHPT in 1975 also overlaps with the US 183 intersection. No cultural resources were encountered within the current APE during these investigations.
Table 1. Previously Recorded Cultural Resource Sites Within a 1-km Radius of the Area of Potential Effects (APE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Chronology</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Distance to APE (m)</th>
<th>NRHP/SAL Eligibility</th>
<th>Year Recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV33</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Burned Rock Midden</td>
<td>905.2</td>
<td>Unknown but site reported as destroyed</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV39</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Campsite at spring</td>
<td>813.8</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV61</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Burned Rock Midden</td>
<td>173.3</td>
<td>Not eligible within ROW</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV62</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Burned Rock Midden at spring</td>
<td>within APE</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV63</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Burned Rock Midden</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV64</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Campsite at spring</td>
<td>179.3</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV83</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Burned Rock Midden</td>
<td>285.9</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV106</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Surficial lithic scatter</td>
<td>247.9</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV156</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>758.6</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV163</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>373.6</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV172</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Burned Rock Midden</td>
<td>717.6</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV176</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Burned Rock Midden</td>
<td>533.5</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV177</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Burned Rock Midden</td>
<td>759.2</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV185</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Burned Rock Midden</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV192</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>322.1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV262</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td>776.8</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV291</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>669.0</td>
<td>Not eligible within ROW</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV297</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>within APE</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV298</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV299</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Dump</td>
<td>322.9</td>
<td>Not eligible within ROW</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV346</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Burned Rock Midden</td>
<td>905.1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV347</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Burned Rock Midden</td>
<td>929.4</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV348</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Rockshelter</td>
<td>954.5</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV650</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Surficial lithic scatter</td>
<td>366.5</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV647</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>407.5</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV1085</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>177.4</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV1086</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>367.9</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41TV1087</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>within APE</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>41WM587</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Burned Rock Middens</td>
<td>916.9</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>41WM606</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Dump</td>
<td>644.3</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>41WM607</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>883.9</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>41WM608</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Surficial lithic scatter</td>
<td>163.3</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>41WM609</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>168.6</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>41WM610</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Surficial lithic scatter</td>
<td>851.8</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>41WM611</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>787.1</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Previously Recorded Cultural Resource Sites Within a 1-km Radius of the Area of Potential Effects (APE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Chronology</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Distance to APE (m)</th>
<th>NRHP/SAL Eligibility</th>
<th>Year Recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>41WM612</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Surficial lithic scatter</td>
<td>528.6</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>41WM613</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>41WM664</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Lithic Procurement</td>
<td>990.3</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>41WM757</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Surficial lithic scatter</td>
<td>Within APE</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>41WM771</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Lithic scatter and open camp</td>
<td>735.5</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>41WM809</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Rock art and graffiti</td>
<td>376.9</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>41WM893</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Railroad bed for Mansfield Dam construction</td>
<td>679.1</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>41WM894</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Historic dump/State Hog Farm slaughter house</td>
<td>956.2</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>41WM896</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td></td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>41WM897</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Hand-dug well</td>
<td>836.6</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>41WM1144</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Domestic scatter and masonry water tank</td>
<td>433.5</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6a. Survey area, northern segment.
Figure 6b. Survey area, southern segment.
TxDOT conducted a survey along US 183 from the SH 45 intersection south to SH 71 in 1982 (SDHPT 1982). No evidence of historical or archaeological resources was found during the survey, and no further investigation was recommended. However, no formal report was produced to document the methodology and results of the survey; rather, they appear in a paragraph of a letter report (SDHPT 1982). The letter mentions that a no-effect determination was made on August 13, 1981, for the Aynesworth-Wright House that is listed in the NRHP.

The previously recorded sites within the project area include 41TV62, 41TV297, 41TV1087, and 41WM757 shown on Figures 6a and 6b. Prehistoric site 41TV62 was recorded in 1959 (Atlas 2015, 41TV62 site form). The records review indicates it is located near the northwestern corner of Far West and MoPac, between the frontage road and the Greystone Road entrance ramp of MoPac. The site was a small burned rock midden near a spring. Pedernales dart points were collected from the surface and a test pit was dug on the edge of the midden. A scatter of historic artifacts consisting of metal, glass, and ceramic fragments was also observed on the surface. Recommendations were not provided in the site form indicating the NRHP or SAL eligibility status of the site. Site 41TV62 was revisited in 2010 and found to have been completely removed by the construction of MoPac (Galindo 2013).

Site 41TV297 was recorded in 1974 and consists of a complex of features associated with a natural spring and a nineteenth-century trash scatter, which were on the southern edge of a strip of land cleared for Loop 360, and may represent elements of a farmstead (Atlas 2015; 41TV297 site form). Features include a walled spring, stone wall, concrete trough, iron water pipe, and a stone-faced bank. A scatter of historic artifacts consisting of metal, glass, and ceramic fragments was noted. Recommendations were not provided in the site form indicating the NRHP or SAL eligibility status of the site. Its current condition is unknown, but in aerial photography, the site appears to have been completely destroyed by the construction of US 183.

Within a 1-km radius, there are 41 additional previously recorded sites including 41TV3, 41TV39, 41TV61, 41TV63, 41TV64, 41TV83, 41TV106, 41TV156, 41TV163, 41TV172, 41TV176, 41TV177, 41TV185, 41TV192, 41TV262, 41TV291, 41TV298, 41TV299, 41TV346, 41TV347, 41TV348, 41TV587, 41TV606, 41TV607, 41TV608, 41TV609, 41TV610, 41TV611, 41TV612, 41TV613, 41TV650, 41TV847, 41TV1085, 41TV1086, 41TV1087, 41WM809, 41WM893, 41WM894, 41WM896, 41WM897, and 41WM1144 (Atlas 2015; see Table 1).

Twenty-six of the 41 sites are prehistoric campsites, burned rock middens, surficial lithic scatters, quarries, or rockshelters. The other 15 are historic sites and include farmsteads, dumps, rock art, graffiti, and a railroad bed used during the construction of Mansfield Dam. Atlas information concerning sites 41TV156 and 41TV1085–41TV1087 was limited to locational data only. The site forms are on file with TARL, but they do not contain any site-specific information that would indicate whether they are of prehistoric or historic age.
The 19 other previously conducted cultural resources investigations that are within 1 km of the project area were mostly undertaken for roadway or utility projects (TxDOT 1992, 1994), although some were also performed in advance of residential or commercial development or along waterways.

Five OTHMs are within a 1-km radius of the project area, with subjects including Gabriel Mills, Hopewell Cemetery, Jollyville community and school, Jollyville Cemetery, and Pond Springs Cemetery. The Gabriel Mills is commemorated by OTHM No. 9096, which states:

“Samuel Mather settled here in 1849, building a grist mill on the North San Gabriel in 1852. John G. Stewart opened a store near the mill. A small log cabin was in use by 1854 for church, school and lodge meetings. A post office was established in 1858, Mather being postmaster. W. L. Brizendine owned the mill by 1865, adding a cotton gin. Known as Mather's Mill, Brizendine Mill, or Gabriel Mills, the village thrived until Austin & Northwestern Railroad bypassed it (1881); then a decline began. The post office closed in 1905, and by the 1920s the town itself had disappeared.”

The Hopewell Cemetery is one of four cemeteries that are within 1 km of the project area. OTHM No. 9105 was erected in 1993 and states:

“Pioneers who settled here in the 1840s and established the town of Hopewell faced many hardships, including Indian raids. Wofford and Mary Johnson and their daughter were killed by Comanches nearby in 1863. They were buried at this site near the grave of Cornelia Johnson, whose burial is the first recorded here. The graveyard was deeded to a local congregation in 1877 and in 1966 a cemetery association was formed. Buried here are area pioneers and their descendants, and veterans of the Civil War. This cemetery is all that remains of the Hopewell community.”

OTHM No. 14052 commemorates the Jollyville community and school. It was erected in 1983 and states:

“This area was first settled in the 1840s by Henry Rhodes. He was soon joined by such pioneers as Elisha Prewitt, who fought in the Battle of San Jacinto, and Civil War veterans Elisha Rhodes, J. Bryon Jenkins, and William H. Thompson, whose home at this site served as a stage stop. In 1866 Confederate veteran John G. Jolly established the Jollyville community. The owner of a store and blacksmith shop, he gave land for a cemetery and for a school (200 ft. W), which was merged with Pond Springs in 1903. Later growth in the Jollyville area resulted from nearby urban development.”

OTHM No. 9112 for the Jollyville Cemetery was erected in 1986 and states:

“This pioneer burial ground is a reminder of the area’s earliest settlers. It was formally set aside by John Grey Jolly (1825-99) and his wife, Nancy Isabel (Eskew) (1825-1921) -- both buried here - - for whom Jollyville community was named. The earliest marked grave is that of Margaret Evergreen Robinson, who died in 1872. Others buried here include five citizens of the Republic of Texas -- members of the Thomas V. S. Strode family, who settled in this area of the state in 1841. The last burial in the Jolly Cemetery, that of Texas Confederate veteran Charlie Strode, took place in 1929.”

OTHM No. 9324 for the Pond Springs Cemetery was erected in 1988 and states:

“This graveyard was begun for members of the Pond Springs Community in the 1860s. The oldest grave is believed to be that of Mrs. Asenath M. Stewart (d. 1862). Also interred here is Mexican War veteran William P. Rutledge, Sr. (1815-1890), and Lavinia Hyland Chapman (1844-1929), a citizen of the Republic of Texas. Although
the land was in use as a graveyard years earlier, it was not officially deeded as such by Thomas L. and H. M. Rutledge until 1872, and did not appear in deed records as a cemetery until 1877. It serves as a reminder of early Pond Springs history.”

The Austin Memorial Park is the fourth cemetery that is within 1 km of the project area. It is along MoPac at Hancock Drive, and the earliest burial dates to 1928. There are more than 1,000 graves within the cemetery’s 97 acres.

The Aynesworth-Wright House was listed in the NRHP in 1980. It is currently located at 11693 Research Boulevard, but was originally built at 4507 East Avenue about 1852. This early Greek Revival-style residence was built around 1852 by pioneer cabinet maker and itinerant Baptist preacher Isaiah Hezekiah Aynesworth and Nancy Anne Seaton for their family soon after arriving in Texas from western Tennessee (NRHP Nomination Form 80004156).

The previous year, Aynesworth had purchased 246 acres from Edward Burleson out of the Thomas Hawkins survey for $500. Family tradition holds that the house was built as much as possible like the one in Tennessee to assuage Nancy's homesickness (NRHP Nomination Form 80004156). Isaiah apparently did not have his own congregation in Austin, but traveled throughout the area on horseback performing marriages, baptisms and preaching. He also farmed his land and leased part of it to neighbors for sharecropping.

The Aynesworths moved to Burnet County in 1855 and sold the home and land to Dr. Joseph Wright, one of Austin’s earliest physicians and the surveyor for the layout of the University of Texas campus. His family occupied the house until 1940. As one of the oldest remaining homes in the Austin-Travis County area, the structure is significant not only for the architectural style and building techniques employed in an earlier time, but also as a representation through its history of two types of early Austin pioneers (NRHP Nomination Form 80004156).

**Historic Map Review**

The historic overlay review of maps dating to 1894, 1896, 1904, 1906, 1932, 1934, 1954, 1955, 1959, and 1966 determined that several historic-age resources have been documented that may have associated archaeological deposits that extend into, or are adjacent to, the APE (Foster et al. 2006). The 1894 General Land Office map of Travis County depicts the project area to the east of two railroad lines that intersect at the nearby community of McNeil. From there, the International and Great Northern Railroad (I&GNRR) continues south and to the west of another parallel rail line. The former I&GNRR is the present-day Missouri Pacific Railroad, and its tracks run parallel and to the west of the portion of the MoPac ROW that is within the project area. The poor quality of the map renders some property owners’ names nearly illegible, but it can be discerned that the project area traverses parcels owned by Richard Sextet, Elisha Allen, Henry M. Jolly, Jos. D. Goods, Wm. Bell, James Rogers, Jos. M. Mitchell, James P. Wallace, and George W. Davis. Besides the county line, other geographic features are the nearby communities of Duval and Waters that are along the railroads to the east of the project area.

The 1896 USGS map of Austin contains cultural features that are within or adjacent to the project area. A road segment and a structure are depicted within the project area just south of the present-day intersection of US 183 and SH 45. These features are within what was labeled as Richard Sextet’s parcel in the 1894 map. The project area then traverses south of the community of Jollyville before passing adjacent to two structures. The community is within what was labeled as Henry M. Jolly’s parcel in the 1894 map, while the structures are probably within the northern two parcels belonging to Jos. D. Goods. As the US 183 roadway turns due south, a structure is depicted within the project area at a roadway intersection that appears to be within the second Jos. D. Goods parcel. Two or three more structures are depicted on the 1896 map at the present-day intersection of US 183 and MoPac, along with a tributary to Shoal Creek. Just south are two or three structures of the Spicewood Springs community that appear to be within the MoPac ROW.
Jollyville was founded in 1866 and named for John Grey Jolly, who set up a blacksmith shop and a store and provided land for an early school (Odintz 2013). Henry M. Jolly was not encountered in a search of John Grey Jolly’s descendants, but may have been a sibling or other relative of John Grey Jolly.

The 1904 U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) map of Austin soils does not have the same level of detail as the 1896 map, but it does add a couple cultural elements, including the community of Rutledge that is depicted just south of the present-day intersection of US 183 and SH 45. One structure in the community of Spicewood Springs appears to be adjacent to the project area, midway along the MoPac portion of the project. The 1906 USACE Maneuver Grounds map contains only the extreme southern end of the project and besides the I&GNRR, it does not contribute any cultural features.

The 1932 map of Travis County depicts a number of structures within or adjacent to the project area. There are two structures south of Jollyville that are adjacent and may be the same ones illustrated in the 1896 map. As the US 183 roadway turns due south, two structures flank the project area, while another is within the project area, near the roadway’s intersection with MoPac. At the actual intersection and just south of it are two structures within the project area. One structure at Spicewood Springs is adjacent, along with another one to the south.

The 1934 USDA map does not contribute any cultural features to the project area, but it is notable that the community of Rutledge, which was depicted just south of the present-day intersection of US 183 and SH 45 in the 1904 soil map, is now northwest of the intersection and appears to be adjacent to the railroad. This depiction might call into question the accuracy or the geo-referencing of the 1904 map, were the following historical facts not known. The community of Rutledge was named after a family in the Pond Springs area, and was on the stage line from Austin to Burnet (Wynn 2013). It was originally near the present-day intersection of US 183 and SH 45, but with the arrival of the railroad in 1882, a new Rutledge developed 1 mile east on the railroad. The new community soon had a section house for railroad crews, a blacksmith shop, a store and post office, a cedar yard, and a quarry. However, Rutledge was practically deserted by 1908 (Wynn 2013).

The 1954 USGS Austin West topographic quadrangle contains only the extreme southern end of the project area, where two structures at the end of a two-track road are depicted within the project area. The 1955 USGS Austin topographic quadrangle contains more of the project area, depicting it from where the US 183 roadway turns due south to the end of the MoPac portion. Just northwest of the US 183 and MoPac intersection are three structures within the project area and at least six adjacent to it, including the Rogersville Church. The intersection itself contains about 10 structures, and another seven are within the MoPac portion of the project area.

The 1959 USGS map of Lake Travis includes the northern half and the extreme southern end of the project area. Four structures are within the project area and another is adjacent to it just south of the present-day intersection of US 183 and SH 45. South of the Pond Springs community are a structure and a church adjacent to the project area. One structure is within or adjacent to the project area just north of the county line, while two more adjacent structures appear south of the county line and may be the same ones depicted on Jos. D. Goods’ parcel in the 1896 map.

The 1966 USGS Austin West topographic quadrangle contains only the extreme southern end of the project area, where a structure is depicted at the northwest quadrant of the MoPac and Northland Drive intersection, and adjacent to the project area. Finally, SWCA consulted the 1980 map of historical markers in Travis County and the map revealed an unlabeled marker at the US 183 and McNeil Drive intersection, and another that appears to be labeled “Charles” at the US 183 and Loop 360 intersection. The marker noted near McNeil Drive may be the present-day one commemorating the Jollyville community and school, but no marker is currently recorded at the US 183 and Loop 360 intersection.
FIELD SURVEY

On February 27, 2015, two SWCA archaeologists conducted an intensive pedestrian survey of proposed ROW, proposed drainage easements, temporary construction easements, and proposed and existing detention ponds associated with the proposed US 183 North Improvement Project in Travis and Williamson Counties, Texas. Based on the 47.98 acres of survey area, THC and Council of Texas Archeologists (CTA) survey standards would require a minimum of 30 shovel tests for the project area. However, as anticipated, the severity of modification and modern disturbance as a result of urban development, highway construction, and utilities installation eliminated the need for such intensive subsurface investigation. SWCA archaeologists excavated a total of nine shovel tests in areas where such disturbances did not preclude subsurface testing, all of which were negative for cultural material (Figures 7a and 7b). Where disturbance was too extensive for subsurface testing, SWCA performed a 100 percent visual and pedestrian inspection of the area and documented the disturbance by means of field notes and photographs.

Overall, the US 183 and MoPac corridors exhibit extensive construction and utility impacts including: the paved US 183 and MoPac mainlanes, frontage roads, access/exit ramps, imported fill, open drainage ditches, concrete reinforced ditches, buried communication lines, overhead utility poles, street lights, commercial driveways, perpendicular surface street intersections, culverts, buried wastewater lines, fire hydrants, electrical boxes, commercial landscaping, water lines and shut off valves, highway and frontage road signage, and other unknown utilities (Figures 8 through 11).

During the survey efforts, SWCA archaeologists inspected two creek crossings (Lake Creek and Shoal Creek) on US 183, revisited three previously recorded site locations (41TV297, 41TV1087, and 41WM757), examined a total of 14 existing and proposed detention ponds, and approximately 5,692 feet of existing RM 620 ROW east of US 183. Because right-of-entry (ROE) had not been obtained to five of six proposed ROW ponds due to no response or denial from the land owner and the proposed easement on private property, those areas could not be surveyed. However, SWCA made observations of these areas from the adjacent existing ROW to provide documentation of the current conditions of those areas. Each are discussed in detail below.

CREEK CROSSINGS

Of particular concern following the background review were the US 183 crossing of Lake Creek and the Shoal Creek crossing at the intersection of US 183 and MoPac, as these areas appeared to present the highest probability for encountering cultural material. Upon inspection, however, it was evident that both the east and west sides of US 183 are extensively disturbed within the TxDOT ROW.

Lake Creek bisects the APE just south of the US 183 and RM 620 interchange. The creek runs roughly northeast to southwest through the APE (Figure 12). Disturbances from urban development and utilities are prevalent within the ROW at this location. The ROW consists of a well-maintained grassy area that has been graded (Figure 13). No evidence of the creek could be discerned within the ROW. Lake Creek follows its natural course west of southbound US 183 but is diverted south of its natural course east of US 183 and below the overpass. East of US 183, the creek appears as a man-made concrete drainage ditch (Figure 14). Given the above disturbances and conditions there are no intact sediments within the TxDOT ROW in the area of the Lake Creek crossing. As such, no shovel tests were excavated in this location.
Figure 7a. Survey results map, northern segment.
Figure 7b. Survey results map, southern segment.
Figure 8. Overview of typical disturbance within the APE. Utilities and perpendicular surface street intersections at US 183 and Pecan Park, facing southeast.

Figure 9. Overview of typical disturbance within the APE. Concrete culvert, imported fill, and road disturbance at Pond 12 location, facing northwest.

Figure 10. Overview of typical disturbance within the APE. Overhead utilities, concrete reinforced ditches, fencing, and road disturbances at Pond 3 location, facing northwest.

Figure 11. Overview of typical disturbance within the APE. Street lights, highway signage, access roads, and concrete culvert and detention pond at Pond 2 location, facing southeast.

Figure 12. Overview of Lake Creek running northeast to southwest under US 183, facing northwest.

Figure 13. Graded ROW within Lake Creek survey area, note highway and utility disturbances, facing south.
Shoal Creek traverses the APE just south of the US 183 and Capital of Texas Highway interchange. The creek runs roughly northwest to southeast at its crossing on US 183. No evidence of the creek could be discerned within the ROW at this location. The adjacent area has been extensively modified and developed into a soccer field with several man-made ponds (see discussion of Pond 12 below) separated by berms (Figure 15–17). As with the Lake Creek crossing, no intact sediments remain within the TxDOT ROW in the area of the Shoal Creek crossing, therefore no shovel tests were excavated in this location.

**PREVIOUSLY RECORDED SITE REVISITS**

Four previously recorded sites are mapped within the project area including 41TV62, 41TV297, 41TV1087, and 41WM757 (see Figures 7a and 7b). Site 41TV62 was revisited in 2010 and the part within the MoPac ROW was found to have been completely destroyed by the construction of MoPac, therefore this site locale was not revisited during the current survey efforts (Galindo 2013). SWCA archaeologists visited the remaining three previously recorded site areas (41TV297, 41TV1087, and 41WM757) to assess their conditions and eligibility to be listed in the NRHP or designated as SALs.

**41TV297**

Site 41TV297 was recorded in 1974 and consists of features and artifact scatters likely related to a historic-age farmstead (Atlas 2015). Recommendations concerning NRHP or SAL eligibility were not provided in the original site form, however SWCA’s review of aerial imagery of the location indicated the site was destroyed by the construction of US 183 (see Figure 7b). SWCA’s recent revisit to the site locale revealed that the previous site area has been destroyed, as it is currently within the travel lanes of US 183, south of Capital of Texas Highway (Figure 18).
Figure 17. Soccer field in Shoal Creek survey area, facing east.

Figure 18. Previously recorded site 41TV297 location within the travel lanes of US 183, south of Highway 360, facing east.

Figure 19. Previously recorded site 41TV1087 location now paved over by the US 183 northbound access road and Gateway Shopping Center, facing east.

41TV1087

Site 41TV1087 is recorded southeast of the US 183 and Loop 360 intersection, with parts of the recorded boundary of the site overlapping the US 183 frontage road (Atlas 2015). Only locational information was available for site 41TV1087 and as such, the type and age of the site is unknown (Atlas 2015). Aerial photography depicts commercial development adjacent to the frontage road at this location (see Figure 7b). A revisit to the site locale revealed that the site has been completely paved over by the US 183 northbound access road and Gateway Shopping Center (Figure 19). One shovel test (ST04) was attempted within the ROW in this location; however, the shovel test was abandoned due to the presence of utilities (Table 2).

41WM757

Site 41WM757 is a surficial lithic scatter that was recorded in 1988 on the basis of flakes, cores, and debitage (Atlas 2015). The site is mapped along the northeast edge of US 183 near its intersection with Hunter’s Chase Boulevard, and the recorded boundary of the site overlaps with the US 183 northbound frontage road (Atlas 2015) (see Figure 7a). It is of unknown antiquity and may have been a lithic quarry or workshop. Recommendations were not provided in the site form indicating the NRHP or SAL eligibility status of the site. Its current condition is unknown, but in aerial photography, the site appears to have been completely destroyed by the construction of US 183. Much like the other sites within the APE, 41WM757 has been completely destroyed. The site locale is now paved over by the parking lot for the Sail & Ski Center (Figure 20). No exposed ground surface was present within the ROW, thus no shovel tests could be excavated.
### Table 2. Shovel Test Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST ID</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Depth (cmbs)</th>
<th>Munsell</th>
<th>Soil Color</th>
<th>Soil Texture</th>
<th>Inclusions</th>
<th>Comments/Reason For Termination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td>0–30</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gravels and construction fill</td>
<td>Construction fill. No cultural materials encountered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td>0–30</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gravels and construction fill</td>
<td>Construction fill. No cultural materials encountered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td>0–30</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gravels and construction fill</td>
<td>Construction fill. No cultural materials encountered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gravels and construction fill</td>
<td>Dense utilities and presence of fill, shovel test abandoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td>0–25 10YR4/4</td>
<td>Dark yellowish brown</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Imported leveling sandy fill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25–30</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gravels</td>
<td>No cultural materials encountered. Termination due to basal clay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td>0–25 10YR4/4</td>
<td>Dark yellowish brown</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Imported leveling sandy fill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25–30</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gravels</td>
<td>No cultural materials encountered. Termination due to basal clay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td>0–25 10YR4/4</td>
<td>Dark yellowish brown</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Imported leveling sandy fill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25–30</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gravels</td>
<td>No cultural materials encountered. Termination due to basal clay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td>0–15</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gravels and construction fill</td>
<td>Very disturbed. No cultural materials encountered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td>0–15</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gravels and construction fill</td>
<td>Very disturbed. No cultural materials encountered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DETENTION PONDS AND EASEMENT

SWCA examined a total of 14 existing detention ponds during the pedestrian survey. For organizational purposes, SWCA arbitrarily numbered the ponds 1 through 14, from north to south along the APE (see Figures 7a, and 7b). All of the pond locations exhibited extensive disturbances related to urban development, utilities, highway construction, and drainage infrastructure. Figures 21–24 provide representative photos of the conditions observed at these facilities. Brief descriptions and observed disturbances for each pond location and are presented below.

Pond 1, the northernmost pond, is in the northwest quadrant of the RM 620 and US 183 interchange (see Figure 7a). An approximately 8-foot-deep existing detention pond with limestone block shoring is present at this location. The pond is bordered by chain link fencing with maintained grass landscape surrounding the pond. A vacant lot is just west of the pond containing a pile of asphalt and a paved area. Other disturbances include overhead and underground utilities (e.g. LG light standard, water, and storm sewer). Investigations included the excavation of one shovel test (ST01), which revealed compacted construction fill overlying a dense imported gravel layer at 30 cm below ground surface (cmbs) (Figure 25; see Table 2).

Pond 2 is due south of Pond 1, in the southwest quadrant of the US 183 and RM 620 interchange (see Figure 7a). Commercial development surrounds this existing pond, with minimal vegetation consisting of maintained grasses and a few mature pecan trees. The 6-foot-deep existing pond structure has a similar construction to Pond 1 and is also bordered by a chain-link fence. The area immediately surrounding the pond has been graded and contains a parking lot and streetlights, sidewalks, and commercial driveways. Due to the extensive amount of disturbances, no shovel tests were excavated within this locale.

Figure 20. Previously recorded site 41WM757 location now paved over by the Sail & Ski Center parking lot, facing southeast.

Figure 21. Typical disturbances within existing pond locations. Fenced in limestone block detention pond at Pond 1 location, facing south.

Figure 22. Typical disturbances within existing pond locations. Graded ROW, access road, and parking lot in Pond 2 location, facing south.
Ponds 3 and 4 are adjacent to the northern end of Pond Springs Road where it intersects with US 183 (see Figure 7a). Pond 3 is east of Pond Springs Road and consists of a long, narrow detention pond with solid concrete walls approximately 15 feet deep. Grates are present on the southern side of the drainage and the paved flow diversion on the east end of the pond directs water to an unnamed tributary.

Pond 4 is directly opposite Pond 3 on the west Pond Springs Road from Pond 3. The existing pond is approximately 4 feet deep and split, with the northern section exhibiting modified sloped banks while the southern section has concrete shoring and modified sloped banks. Both sections are between Pond Springs Road and the northbound US 183 access road.

Disturbances at Ponds 3 and 4 include utilities, grading, ROW maintenance, and roadway and drainage construction. Both ponds are bordered by chain link fencing. No shovel tests were attempted in either pond due to the pervasive construction disturbances and buried utilities.

Pond 5 is on the west side of Pond Springs Road approximately 0.25 mile north of its intersection with Hunters Chase Drive (see Figure 7a). The pond area has been completely modified with excavated sloped banks. Grates and underground culverts are present on the south side of the pond. A large culvert is also present at the former drainage headwater on the western edge of the pond. West of, and adjacent to, the culvert is the large 18-acre easement where ROE was not available. One shovel test (ST02) was excavated within the Pond 5 area at its western edge, adjacent to the large easement. The shovel test encountered shallow construction fill overlying dense imported gravels at 30 cmbs (see Table 2).

Adjacent to Pond 5 is an approximately 17-acre existing drainage easement that, due to no ROE, could not be surveyed (see Figure 7a). However, observations from Pond 5 and the US 183 ROW indicate that the area has been extensively graded and contoured for drainage flow. As such, it is the opinion of SWCA that there is no potential for the easement to contain intact soils with intact buried cultural materials.
Ponds 6–9 are on private properties adjacent to the southern end of Pond Springs Road, just north of the intersection with US 183. At the time of SWCA’s survey, there was no ROE for the properties, so SWCA made assessments of the ponds from adjacent public ROW. As access was not granted for the Pond 6–9 locales, no shovel tests were excavated within any of properties.

Pond 6 is north of a public storage facility (see Figure 7a). The existing pond is within a small open, grassy field with underground utilities present at the eastern edge of Pond Springs Road. A separate runoff area runs east to west, at the west end of the pond area. The pond is sloped but has a maximum depth of approximately 3 feet.

The proposed Pond 7 area is across Pond Springs Road from Pond 6 in an open field that was being cleared of trees and bulldozed at the time of SWCA’s survey. (Update 4/2/15: this pond location is no longer being used as part of this project.)

The proposed Pond 8 area is south of a public storage facility and consists of an open field with sparse pecan and chinaberry trees (see Figure 7a). An existing utility parallels Pond Springs Road at the eastern edge of the proposed Pond 8 locale.

The proposed pond at the Pond 9 location is just north of the intersection of Pond Springs Road and US 183 and consists of a level, maintained grassy field (see Figure 7a).

Pond 10 is 0.06 mile northeast of the intersection of Duval Road and West Cow Path Road (see Figure 7b). Access was not granted for this property at the time of survey, so the Pond 10 locale was assessed from West Cow Path Road at the western edge of the pond area. The existing pond is heavily modified with a drainage culvert running from under Cow Path Road eastward into the pond. The culvert has sloped concrete banks and is approximately 6 feet deep.

Pond 11 is on private property approximately 0.1 mile northeast of Seton Center Parkway, north of an apartment complex (see Figure 7b). The pond area was observed from the gate located approximately 40 meters west of the existing road as access was not granted for this property. The majority of the pond area is within an existing overhead transmission line ROW. The existing pond has a modified grassy slope with a single concrete divide in the center of the pond. The pond is approximately 8–10 feet deep. One shovel test (ST03) was excavated just outside of the gate next to a cement drainage ditch (see Table 2). The shovel test revealed disturbed sediments (e.g., construction fill and imported gravels) similar to ST01 and ST02.

Ponds 12 and 13 are at the US 183 and MoPac interchange (see Figure 7b). Pond 12 is in the northeast quadrant of the interchange and exhibits a broad man-made floodplain. The northeastern two-thirds of the pond area have been leveled to create a soccer field. The southwestern one-third is heavily modified and bermed, creating a lake along the course of Shoal Creek. The entire area has been excavated to a depth of about 15 feet. SWCA excavated three shovel tests (ST05, 06, and 07) within the Pond 12 area, all of which were negative for cultural materials, encountering only a 25-cm-thick layer of imported sandy fill overlying construction fill at 30 cmbs (see Table 2).

Pond 13 is a heavily modified 25–30 foot depression located between the north and southbound US 183 on-ramps. Shoal Creek runs roughly east to west through the densely wooded northern edge of the proposed pond area. A cement culvert flows beneath the MoPac access road. One shovel test (ST08) was excavated within the pond area and encountered shallow dense impassable gravels at 15 cmbs (see Table 2).

Pond 14, located east of the MoPac access road between West Anderson Lane and Steck Avenue, is a long, narrow facility divided into four separate ponds. The 10- to 15-foot-deep ponds are divided by earthen berms and all have modified, grassy slopes. Railroad tracks are present on the eastern side of the pond area and multiple utilities parallel the MoPac access road on the west side of the ponds. One shovel test (ST09) was excavated in between Pond 13 and 14, just west of the railroad tracks and east of MoPac. The shovel test encountered construction fill overlying gravels at 15 cmbs (see Table 2).
Conclusions

Overall, the US 183 APE is heavily modified and extensively disturbed as a result of transportation infrastructure and urban development. Roadway construction, maintenance, and subsequent utility installations have impacted the entire project area. SWCA inspected the ground surface and conducted limited shovel testing and did not observe any historic or prehistoric cultural material within the areas selected for survey in coordination with TxDOT and the THC. Four previously recorded sites are mapped within the APE, however all have been destroyed. A total of nine shovel tests were excavated within the few areas with seemingly intact soils but all encountered disturbed sediments.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SWCA conducted an intensive cultural resources investigation of the proposed U.S. Highway 183 North Mobility Project in Travis and Williamson Counties, Texas. Investigations were performed in accordance with the standards and guidelines of the Antiquities Code of Texas under Texas Antiquities Permit 7186 and the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA.

A background review determined that various portions of the APE have been previously surveyed, with four previously recorded sites (41TV62, 41TV297, 41TV1087, and 41WM757) within or adjacent to the APE. Sites 41TV297, 41WM757, and 41TV1087 were revisited during SWCA’s recent survey; the fourth site (41TV62), as per the approved scope of work, was not revisited as previous investigations reported the site as destroyed within the MoPac ROW. SWCA’s survey of 41TV297, 41WM757, and 41TV1087 within the existing US 183 ROW revealed no remnants of the sites as they have all been destroyed.

SWCA’s survey also included assessments of two creek crossings, a 2.37-acre easement, 5,692.58 feet of existing RM 620 ROW, and a total of 14 existing or proposed detention pond areas. Two creek crossings (Lake Creek and Shoal Creek) within the US 183 ROW represented high probability areas for encountering cultural material. Upon inspection, however, it was evident that both the east and west sides of US 183 are extensively disturbed and there are no intact portions of the TxDOT ROW in the area of either creek crossing.

Due to no response, right-of-entry was not available to the proposed 2.37-acre easement so the assessment took place from adjacent public ROW. Similarly, ROE was not available for five of six proposed ROW pond areas so they too were assessed from adjacent public ROW. In contrast, all seven existing ROW pond areas were accessible. The 2.37-acre easement and the proposed ROW pond areas with no ROE exhibited severe modifications and modern disturbances as a result of urban development, highway construction, and utilities installation; accordingly it is SWCA’s opinion that those areas do not contain any intact soils and therefore, have no potential to contain intact, potentially significant intact cultural resources. Accordingly, SWCA recommends that no additional investigations at these locations are warranted.

In accordance with 36 CFR 800.4, SWCA has made a reasonable and good faith effort to identify archaeological historic properties or cultural resource sites within the APE. Based on the results of the survey, no archaeological historic properties or sites (including traces of previously recorded sites 41TV297, 41WM757, and 41TV1087) were identified within existing ROW and detention pond areas with ROE. Although survey of the proposed 2.37 acre easement and five of seven proposed ROW pond areas was not possible due to lack of ROE, given the observed extensive urban development and the grading and excavations associated with the construction of those facilities, it is the opinion of SWCA that those areas do not warrant additional survey as they have no potential to contain potentially significant intact cultural resources.

Given the above data, SWCA recommends that, because the survey discovered no archaeological historic properties or cultural resource sites within the APE where ROE was available, and the areas with no ROE are extensively disturbed and preclude the preservation of intact cultural resources, the proposed construction should be allowed to proceed as planned without additional cultural resources investigations as no archaeological historic properties eligible for listing in the NRHP (as per 36 CFR 60.4) or sites
warranting designation as SAL (pursuant to 13 TAC 26.12) would be affected by the project.
REFERENCES

Bement, L. C.

Bever, M. R. and D. J. Meltzer

Black, S. L.

Black, S. L., and Darrell G. Creel

Campbell, R. B.

Collins, M. B.


Collins. M. B., C. Britt Bousman, and Timothy K. Perttula

Dillehay, T. D.

Fields, Ross C. and Karl W. Kibler

Fisher, W. L.

Foster, T. R., T. Summerville, and T. Brown

Galindo, Mary Jo
2013 Intensive Archaeological Survey of the MoPac Improvement Project, Travis County, Texas. SWCA Cultural Resources Report No. 10-481. SWCA Environmental Consultants, Austin.

Hester, T. R.

Houk, B. A., and J. C. Lohse

Huebner, J. A.

Jelks, E.
1962 The Kyle Site: A Stratified Central Texas Aspect in Hill County, Texas. Archeology Series 5. Department of Anthropology, University of Texas, Austin.

Johnson, L., Jr.
1994 The Life and Times of Toyah-Culture Folk: The Buckhollow Encampment, Site 41KM16 of Kimble County, Texas. Office of the State Archeologist Report 40. Texas Department of Transportation and Texas Historical Commission, Austin.

Johnson, L., and G. T. Goode

Johnson, Le., Jr., D. A. Suhm, and C. D. Tunnell

McKinney, W. W.

Murphy, V. S.

National Register of Historic Places [NRHP]

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)

Newcomb, W. W., Jr.
2002 The Indians of Texas. University of Texas Press, Austin.

Odintz, Mark


Prewitt, E. R.

1985 “From Circleville to Toyah: Comments on Central Texas Chronology.” Bulletin of the Texas Archeological Society 54:201-238.
Ricklis, R. A.

State Department of Highways and Public Transportation (SDHPT)

1977a MoPac: *From US 183 in Northeast Austin, South to North of Northland Drive (RM 2222).* IPE 236. State Department of Highways and Public Transportation, Austin, Texas.


1982 Cultural Resources Assessment of US 183: *From SH 71 North and West to RM 620.* IPE 314A. State Department of Highways and Public Transportation, Austin, Texas.

Suhm, D.A.

Texas Archaeological Sites Atlas (Atlas)

Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT)


Toomey, R. S., III, M. D. Blum, and S. Valastro, Jr.

Turner, E. S., and T. R. Hester

Webb, W.P. (Editor)
1952 *The Handbook of Texas,* 2 Vols. Texas State Historical Association, Austin.

Werchan, Leroy E., A. A. Lowther, and Robert N. Ramsey.

Wynn, Frances W.