

Draft

**Historic Resources Survey Report
State Highway 29
County Road 266 to D. B. Wood Road
Williamson County, Texas**

Prepared for:

Williamson County

Prepared by:

CP&Y, Inc.
10415 Morado Circle #200
Austin, Texas 78759
512.349.0700
Project No: WIL07091.03
Principal Investigator: Susan Lassell
Architectural Historian: Leslie Wolfenden

November 2008

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 1 |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 2 |
| A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION | 3 |
| B. METHODS FOR IDENTIFYING NHRP PROPERTIES | 4 |
| Background Research..... | 4 |
| Reconnaissance Survey | 4 |
| Right-of-entry Site Visits | 5 |
| Survey Coverage | 5 |
| C. REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA | 6 |
| State and Federal Regulations..... | 6 |
| National Register of Historic Places Criteria | 7 |
| Historic Landmarks and Markers | 9 |
| Cemeteries..... | 10 |
| II. EVALUATION CONTEXT | 11 |
| A. INTRODUCTION..... | 11 |
| B. EXPLORATION AND SETTLEMENT (1835-1848)..... | 11 |
| C. TRANSPORTATION (1840-1977) | 13 |
| Frontier Travel (1840-1865) | 13 |
| Stagecoach Routes (1845-1880)..... | 14 |
| Railroad Networks (1881-1903)..... | 15 |
| Modern Roadway Systems (1900-1977)..... | 15 |
| D. AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES (1840-1970) | 16 |
| Farming (1850-1940) | 16 |
| Ranching (1840-1970) | 17 |
| E. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (1840-1990)..... | 18 |
| Liberty Hill (1840-1980)..... | 19 |
| Georgetown (1840-1960)..... | 20 |
| Growth of Austin and its Effects on Surrounding Communities (1940-1990) | 20 |
| III. PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED RESOURCES..... | 22 |
| A. NRHP | 22 |
| B. Landmarks (RTHL, SAL, Local) | 22 |
| C. Markers (OTHM, Centennial, Zivley, Local)..... | 22 |
| IV. ANALYSIS OF SURVEY RESULTS | 24 |
| A. SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS | 24 |
| B. INDIVIDUAL HISTORIC-AGE RESOURCES | 24 |
| REFERENCES | 32 |

List of Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Right-of-entry Site Visit Properties | 5 |
| Table 2: Properties Not Surveyed | 5 |
| Table 3: Property Type Definitions within the Project Area | 21 |
| Table 4: NRHP Listed or Eligible Properties..... | 22 |
| Table 5: Landmark Properties..... | 22 |
| Table 6: Markers | 22 |
| Table 7: Property Type Analysis of Historic-Age Resources within the Project Area..... | 24 |

List of Figures

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| | Follows page |
| Figure 1 Project Location Map | 1 |

Appendices

| | |
|------------|--|
| Appendix A | Area of Potential Effects and Historic-age Resources |
| Appendix B | Historic-age Resources Inventory Table |
| Appendix C | Photo Inventory Sheets |
| Appendix D | Williamson County Historical Commission Correspondence |

Executive Summary

This report presents the results of a reconnaissance-level survey of all pre-1965 non-archeological sites and districts, buildings, objects, and structures that was conducted in order to identify historic resource constraints for the future expansion of State Highway (SH) 29 from County Road (CR) 266 to D. B. Wood Road in Williamson County. The project area is approximately 18.8 miles in length. The existing SH 29 facility typically consists of two lanes in each direction (east and west) and narrow shoulders. In some areas, such as in the town of Liberty Hill, there is a center left-turn lane.

Historic resources constraints surveys were conducted throughout the alternatives development phase of project planning. Early efforts focused on identification of known resources in the broadest study area. As potential alignment corridors were mapped, project historians conducted reconnaissance field surveys of a 1000' wide study area to identify historic-age resources to be evaluated against National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) criteria. When the alternatives were narrowed down to several viable corridors, more intensive surveys were conducted of resources that could be affected in order to identify fatal flaws that would require design modifications.

The historic resources survey identified a total of 68 historic-age resources and one resource listed in the NRHP and none have been previously determined eligible in the study area. The current study identified 11 resources that are recommended eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. A comprehensive inventory list of all surveyed historic-age resources and preliminary NRHP recommendations appears in **Appendix B** of this report. The project location maps follow this section of the report (see **Figure 1**).

I. Introduction

This report documents the efforts and results of historic resources surveys along SH 29 between the Williamson County line at CR 266 heading east to D. B. Woods Road in Williamson County, Texas. All work was conducted by TxDOT-certified architectural historians at CP&Y, Inc. who meet the Secretary of the Interior's professional qualifications standards. The report includes findings of the survey, results of additional research, recommended determinations of NRHP eligibility, and recommendations for additional intensive study, if necessary. Each surveyed resource is included in the inventory table, survey maps on aerial base, and individual photo sheets.

The purpose of these efforts is to provide technical findings and preliminary determinations of project impacts during project planning. Although federal review by TxDOT staff is not required as there is no federal funding on this project, this report follows the Section 106 process and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 as amended, in accordance with the 2005 Programmatic Agreement for Implementation of Transportation Undertakings (PA-TU) authorized between the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and TxDOT and associated guidance documents published by TxDOT.

The project planning date is 2010. To ensure an adequate planning window, and in accordance with TxDOT-ENV's current guidance, the project team documented all non-archeological historic-age resources dating from 1965 or earlier. As the historians are integrated with the engineering company, historic resource studies could be started early, allowing alternatives to be studied and revised as needed to avoid historic properties. This integration allowed for early identification of project design constraints and potential project impacts associated with the proposed project. Once the alignment alternatives were identified, the study area for each alignment was defined as 400 feet on either side of existing location (along SH 29) and 500 feet on either side of new location corridors (shown on the survey maps in **Appendix A**). Property owner meetings were held in October 2007. Open house meetings were held in May and August of 2008 to get the public's input to help project engineers arrive at preferred alternatives. In total, there were eighteen alignments. There were ten alternatives that circumnavigate Liberty Hill: Northeast 1, Northeast 2, Northwest 1, Northwest 2, Northwest 3, Northwest 4, Southeast 1, Southeast 2, Southwest 1, and Southwest 2. Other alternatives include Segment 1 and 2. Going from the Williamson/Burnet county line to Ronald Reagan Boulevard, Segment 1 includes four options: north, south, center, and combination. Running from Ronald Reagan Boulevard to D. B. Woods Road, Segment 2 includes four options: north, south, center, and combination. The process for alignment eliminations is described in detail in the Alternatives Analysis report to which this study is appended.

Currently, the preferred alignment is a combination of Southwest 2 and Southeast 1. The survey includes all buildings, structures, objects and non-archeological sites, and districts located on parcels wholly or partially included within the study area.

A. Project Description

Williamson County is one of the fastest growing counties in Texas and is the 12th fastest growing county in the nation. Communities such as Round Rock, Cedar Park, and Leander have experienced explosive growth in commercial and residential development. Other fast-growing communities include Liberty Hill and Georgetown and the areas in between along State Highway (SH) 29. Over 20,000 lots for new home construction have been platted in the areas between Liberty Hill and Georgetown (Williamson County, 2007).

In order to meet these future traffic needs, Williamson County is planning the expansion of SH 29 from its current configuration, consisting of two lanes in each direction with occasional two-way left turn lanes within a 100- to 120-foot usual right-of-way, to a potential six lane freeway section with frontage roads within a 400-foot right-of-way. CP&Y has been tasked by the county to perform a corridor study of SH 29 from the Burnet County line to D. B. Wood Road in Georgetown, a distance of approximately 19 miles (see **Figure 1** in **Appendix L**).

The purpose of this study is to determine the best means to accomplish this expansion by evaluating alternatives, such as reconstruction and realignment. Many factors are considered, including geometric design issues, environmental impacts, socio-economic impacts, right-of-way costs, utility conflicts, construction costs, ease of construction, and public input to develop a viable set of alternatives. A number of corridors have been studied, including the no-build, expanding the existing corridor to the north, to the south, to both sides equally, and a combination of expanding to the north and south in different locations to minimize impacts. New location corridors to the north and south of the city of Liberty Hill have also been developed to minimize impacts throughout the city of Liberty Hill.

In August of 2008, a preferred corridor was selected. This corridor mainly follows the Southwest 2, Southeast 1, and Segment 2 combination corridors, with minor tweaks in the alignments and a proposed right-of-way width of 300 feet instead of 400 feet. The preferred was selected due to fewer social and environmental impacts, as compared to the other preliminary corridors. The width of the proposed right-of-way was reduced in size due to public input.

B. Methods for Identifying NHRP Properties

Background Research

Several sources were consulted to identify properties that may have been previously surveyed or listed in a national, state, or local register. The Texas Historical Commission (THC) manages an online database of surveyed and listed historic resources called the Texas Historic Sites Atlas Online. The Atlas database revealed four Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks (RTHL) properties, no State Archeological Landmarks (SAL) of non-archeological type, and five Official Texas Historical Markers (OTHM). Of these OTHMs, one is a Centennial marker. The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) online database indicated one NRHP property in the study area. Research of the TxDOT and FHWA websites indicated no significant interstate resources in the study area. The THC survey files were also reviewed for additional resources. Project historians coordinated with the Williamson County Historical Commission (WCHC) through correspondence as well as informal meetings. A copy of WCHC correspondence is located in Appendix X.

As a result of the archival research, a basic outline of historical contexts was prepared in order to evaluate the surveyed properties. The historical context is provided in the following section, and is followed by a discussion of the property types that represent these themes.

Project historians conducted windshield survey of viable alternative corridors on an ongoing, as needed basis between October 2007 and August 2008 to visually identify historic-age resources forty-five years of age or older in the study area visible from the public right-of-way. Project historians also utilized the Williamson County Appraisal District (WCAD) database provided by the county and the WCAD website to identify other buildings forty-five years of age or older. More information about potential historic resources was provided by area citizens at public meetings and via communication with county commissioners.

Reconnaissance Survey

With information gathered from the windshield surveys, WCAD research, and citizen input, project historians conducted reconnaissance surveys of the study area, identifying, photographing, mapping, and describing all non-archeological, historic-age resources forty-five years of age or older within the study area and visible from public right-of-way, and other resources deemed particularly noteworthy that may not be fifty years of age or older at the time of the letting date. In most cases, reconnaissance-level survey was sufficient for making NRHP eligibility recommendations, especially with regard to Criterion C. Historic-age resources that were not visible from public right-of-way or that warranted additional research on Criterion A or B associations were surveyed beyond reconnaissance level to determine potential for NRHP eligibility.

Right-of-entry Site Visits

WCAD provided information that indicated the presence of historic-age resources on the properties where the resources were not visible from public right-of-way. Sometimes the resources were obscured by vegetation, outbuildings, or terrain. Sometimes, WCAD indicated no improvements; however, aerial views of the parcels showed the existence of buildings or groups of buildings that could be historic-age based on their interrelationships, size, or proportions. For these historic-age resources not visible from the public right-of-way, right-of-entry (ROE) requests were sent out by the county. Property owners who granted ROE allowed project historians access to the parcels of interest to evaluate the historic-age resources and to take photographs. See **Table 1** below for list of ROEs requested. See **Appendix B** for additional information.

| Site # | Name | Address | Purpose |
|--------|----------|-------------|--------------|
| 5 | Austin | 2052 CR 210 | Not eligible |
| 6 | Butler | 16750 SH 29 | Eligible |
| 47 | Jones | 12805 SH 29 | Not eligible |
| 53 | Cox | 12551 SH 29 | Not eligible |
| 58 | Gaddy | 800 CR 258 | Not eligible |
| 67 | Richmond | 4300 SH 29 | Not eligible |

Survey Coverage

Some historic-age resources were not surveyed or evaluated for varying reasons. Some were not assessed because ROE was denied. Others were not surveyed because alignments were removed from consideration due to engineering or environmental constraints. Still others were not surveyed at an intensive level because they were not going to be directly impacted by the alignments. These properties may need to be assessed if the alignment should change in the future. **Table 2** provides a list of which resources were not surveyed. Further discussion is contained in **Appendix B**.

| Res. # | Address | Notes | Findings |
|--------|-------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| 13 | CR 277 | Alignment taken out of consideration | WCAD date of 1910 and large agricultural lands makes it likely to have significance as example of early farmstead/ranch; final determination cannot be made without ROE |
| 30 | 1851 CR 214 | Alignment taken out of consideration | WCAD dates of 1900 and 1945 on 5 contiguous parcels with same owner; house, stone wall, and corn crib of historic-age; final determination cannot be made |

| | | | |
|-----|---|--|---|
| | | | without ROE |
| 33 | 295 CR 214 | Not directly impacted by any alternative | WCAD date of 1900 with extensive agricultural lands makes it likely to have significance as example of early farmstead/ranch; final determination cannot be made without ROE |
| 35 | 104 Church St (United Methodist Church) | Not directly impacted by any alternative | Could be contributing property to Liberty Hill historic district |
| 36 | Main Street (Masonic Learning Center) | Not directly impacted by any alternative | Could be contributing property to Liberty Hill historic district |
| 37 | Main Street (Stubblefield Building) | Not directly impacted by any alternative | Could be contributing property to Liberty Hill historic district |
| 40 | 200 Stubblefield Road | Not directly impacted by any alternative | Could be contributing property to Liberty Hill historic district |
| 45d | 933 CR 279 | Alignment taken out of consideration | WCAD date of 1950 but view of house is obstructed by vegetation; final determination cannot be made without ROE |
| | Downtown | Liberty Hill historic district | If any alignment shifts that could impact the district, a full intensive survey would need to be done as the potential is high for downtown and surrounding area to be significant as a historic district |

Project historians did not survey downtown Liberty Hill for a possible historic district as the project engineers were not considering alignments through downtown. The potential for the presence of multiple NRHP eligible properties and/or a historic district is very high.

C. Regulatory Requirements and Evaluation Criteria

State and Federal Regulations

Because future phases of the SH 29 corridor project may involve FHWA funding and/or TxDOT reviews, the historic resources investigations are being conducted in accordance with current standards for coordinating environmental reviews under state and federal regulations. There are four sets of regulations that apply to all FHWA-funded activities with regards to historic and archeological resources:

- **The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)** requires consideration of important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage.

Important aspects of our national heritage that may be present in the project corridor are considered under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

- **Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (Section 106)** requires TxDOT to identify historically significant resources that are located within a proposed project area of potential effects and show that project planners and engineers have “taken into account” project effects on properties listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The Section 106 process is a process requiring consultation between TxDOT, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and the interested public. In Texas, the Texas Historical Commission (THC) is the state agency that serves as the SHPO for Section 106 purposes. The coordination process, and many of the standards for conducting related studies, is stipulated in the *First Amended Programmatic Agreement Regarding the Implementation of Transportation Undertakings (PA-TU) between FHWA, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Texas SHPO, and TxDOT*.
- **The Texas Antiquities Code (TAC)** requires consideration of State Archeological Landmarks (SAL) on any project that involves lands owned or controlled by the state or by local municipalities and counties. The process for such consideration is outlined in a Memorandum of Understanding between TxDOT and the Texas Historical Commission (THC).
- **Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966**, as amended in Section 6009(a) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equality Act: A legacy for users (SAFETEA-LU) sets the policy on publicly owned parks, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites. Section 4(f) requires that before approving a project that “uses” a Section 4(f) resource, FHWA must find that there is no prudent and feasible alternative AND that the selected alternative minimizes harm to the resources. The Section 4(f) requirements apply only to sites listed or eligible for listing in the NRHP unless the FHWA determines that the application of Section 4(f) is otherwise appropriate (23 Sec 771.135 Section 4(f)).

National Register of Historic Places Criteria

In order to be considered for listing in the NHRP, buildings, structures, objects, sites, and districts must meet standards of historic significance defined by the Keeper of the National Register (36 CFR 60). A property must be evaluated within its historic context and it must retain characteristics that make it a good representative of properties associated with that aspect of the past (US Department of the Interior, 1998).

Districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that meet the Criteria for NRHP Evaluation must possess significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, or culture *and* possess integrity of location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The quality of significance is present in properties that:

- A) Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- B) Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- C) Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D) Have yielded or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.

In addition to being significant under one or more of the Criteria listed above, a National Register property must also retain historical integrity of those features necessary to convey its significance. The Keeper of the National Register has identified and defined seven aspects of integrity. An understanding of why the property is significant is important in determining which of these aspects of integrity are most important:

- *Location* is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.
- *Design* is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
- *Setting* is the physical environment of a historic property.
- *Materials* are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.
- *Workmanship* is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture of people during any given period in history or prehistory.
- *Feeling* is a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
- *Association* is the direct link between an important historic event, person, or period and a historic property.

Determining which of these aspects of integrity are most important to a particular property requires knowing why, where, and when the property is significant (US Department of the Interior 1998:48).

For eligibility under Criteria A and B, a significant property "is eligible if it retains the essential physical features that made up its character or appearance during the period of its association with the important event [or] historic pattern." While it is preferable under Criteria A or B for all aspects of integrity to be present, eligibility for the NRHP under these Criteria is less dependent on design and workmanship than on historical associations, materials, setting, location, and feeling.

Properties eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C are significant as good examples of an architectural style, a building form, a type or method of

construction, or an architect's or builder's body of work. Therefore, they must retain a high degree of physical integrity as well as having a relation to the historic context. The most important aspects of integrity under Criterion C are design, materials, and workmanship. Location and setting will also be important for those properties whose design is a reflection of their immediate environment (US Department of the Interior 1998: 48).

In all cases (except for archeological sites nominated under Criterion D), the physical features of the site "must be visible enough to convey their significance. Its integrity is questionable if its significant features are concealed under modern construction" (US Department of the Interior 1998:46).

In order to qualify for the National Register, a historic district must possess significance and be an identifiable entity. It must be important for historical, architectural, archeological, engineering, or cultural values. A historic district should possess a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development. The identity of a district results from the interrelationship of its resources, which can convey a visual sense of the overall historic environment. Each potential historic district is analyzed in terms of contributing resources, non-contributing resources (modern infill, demolition, alterations, and other physical changes), and integrity as a whole to assess whether it is eligible for the National Register.

Historic Landmarks and Markers

While there are no state or federal laws that safeguard the protection of Official Texas Historical Markers (OTHM) that are not 50 years of age or older, agreements between county historical commissions (CHC), the THC, and TxDOT require that proposals to impact or relocate historical markers be coordinated with CHCs and the THC. These "Subject" markers, standardized by the THC as cast aluminum plaques after 1958, may or may not be placed in proximity to historically significant sites. "Building Markers," signed either by the THC's freestanding medallion or the words "Recorded Texas Historic Landmark" (RTHL) affixed to a building or structure, carry an official designation of the State dating from 1962. While RTHLs are not automatically considered historic properties per the PA-TU, they provide an indication of potential historical significance.

OTHM's that are 50 years of age or older and located within the study area are subject to review and evaluation as objects of potential historical significance under Section 106. These stone and metal markers themselves may be eligible for NRHP listing for their design/workmanship or association with a state-sponsored initiative to commemorate historic events or persons significant to Texas and/or US history. Examples of these markers are the Zivley, El Camino Real (Old San Antonio Road) tablets erected by the Daughters of the American Revolution in 1916-17, and Texas Centennial Markers.

Cemeteries

Cemeteries are protected by State law, primarily Chapters 694-712 of the Health and Safety Code. Those cemeteries found on property owned or controlled by a political subdivision of the state are also protected through the Texas Antiquities Code (Title 9, Chapter 191 of the Texas Natural Resources Code of 1977). Chapter 41 of this code contains the Rules of Practice Procedure that are applicable to the identification and consideration that must occur at historic cemeteries. Under Federal law, cemeteries that are over 50 years of age are also subject to evaluation and review under Section 106 and the PA-TU if they fall within the project's study area.

Cemeteries may be found eligible for listing in the NRHP if they derive their primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events. Cemeteries are typically identified during archeological survey and evaluated in accordance with each of these regulatory authorities.

II. Evaluation Context

A. Introduction

The historic-age resources located in the study area have been evaluated in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's standards and guidelines for the identification, evaluation and documentation of historic properties (National Park Service (NPS) Guidelines), in accordance with the PA-TU. NPS Guidelines state that "the significance of a historic property can be judged and explained only when it is evaluated within its historic context" based on the "core premise . . . that resources, properties, or happenings in history do not occur in a vacuum but rather are part of larger trends or patterns" (US Department of the Interior 1998:7).

Thus, the first step is to understand the significant historical themes that shaped the development of the area and led to the physical environment as it is seen today. Certain themes are universal in their power to shape the cultural landscape, such as early settlement, transportation, and either agriculture or commerce, depending on whether the area is rural or urban. Other themes will need to be explored only for certain study areas, such as "Lumber Industry" in east Texas or "Border Culture" in south Texas. Much of this context information is pulled from the Handbook of Texas Online website. The themes that shaped the project area, and that are summarized below, include: Exploration and Settlement, Transportation, Agricultural Practices, and Community Development.

Once the significant themes have been identified, the evaluation context defines the types of properties that have the potential to represent those themes. Property types are generally distinguished by a combination of functional purpose, common physical characteristics, and known association with the historical theme. According to the guidelines, each context may be represented by a variety of property types, and property types can be significant within more than one context. This explains why a property type may show up in more than one section below. To avoid redundancy, the associated property types are simply listed at the end of each theme's narrative. **Table 3** presents the resource types of each property type, including notes on character-defining features.

With this understanding of both the historic themes and the associated property types, surveyors know what to look for during field investigation. The survey results section of this report will reveal how many of each property type were actually identified in the project area.

B. Exploration and Settlement (1835-1848)

The earliest known occupants of the region, the Tonkawas, hunted buffalo on foot, but later transitioned to a horse culture and used firearms to a limited degree in the eighteenth century. The Tonkawas were generally friendly towards the

earlier settlers, but were nonetheless removed from the area by the 1850s. Before the arrival of Europeans, the Lipan Apaches ranged through the western part of future Williamson County. After the Spanish missions were established on the San Gabriel River in the eighteenth century, the Apaches raided the missions for horses. The Comanches arrived in the eighteenth century and lived in the region until as late as 1838. After Anglo settlements crowded out the Comanches, they continued to raid settlements until the 1860s.

Europeans first explored future Williamson County in the late seventeenth century, when Captain Alonso De León sought a route between San Antonio and the Spanish missions of east Texas that would serve as an alternative route to the more southerly *Camino Real*, later known as the Old San Antonio Road. The new route, called *Camino de Arriba*, passed through the area of Williamson County along Brushy Creek and the San Gabriel River (see Transportation context). In 1716, two explorers in the Spanish service, Louis Juchereau de St. Denis and Domingo Ramón, led an expedition that passed through the area and camped on Brushy Creek and the San Gabriel River, naming them respectively Arroyo de las Benditas Ánimas and Rio de San Xavier. Founded in the mid-eighteenth century, the San Xavier Missions occupied a series of sites along the San Gabriel River, just over the eastern border of Williamson County in present-day Milam County.

The Mexican government awarded land grants in the area that is now Williamson County to Mexican families and later as part of Robertson's colony prior to the Texas Revolution; however, no settlement resulted from these grants. Anglo settlement started in the region during the Texas Revolution and into the early days of the Texas Republic. The first substantial Anglo presence in Williamson County was a Texas Ranger military post in late 1835, now known as the Tumlinson Block House. Named after Captain John J. Tumlinson, Jr., the commander of the Texas Rangers who garrisoned the post, the post was occupied for only two months before the Rangers were recalled due to the invasion by Santa Anna's forces. It was located near the headwaters of Brushy Creek (Odintz).

In 1839, the first civilian settlement was established by a San Jacinto veteran Dr. Thomas Kenney and a party of settlers who built a fort, called Kenney's Fort, on Brushy Creek near the site of the present day crossing of the Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad (in present-day Round Rock). Several other sites along Brushy Creek were settled soon after, but Native American raids kept Anglo settlement to a minimum. Many of these settlements were abandoned in 1842 when Governor Sam Houston advised settlers to pull back from the frontier due to continuing Native American depredations (Odintz).

After 1846 with the easing of Native American attacks and the annexation of Texas to the United States, settlers arrived again, travelling to the frontier along Brushy Creek and the San Gabriel River. Arriving by the 1840s, some of the early settlers to the Liberty Hill area were Taylor Smith, Greenleaf Fisk, and U.

H. Anderson (Matthews). By 1848, there were at least 250 settlers in western Milam County (present-day Williamson County), many of whom signed a petition to obtain a seat of local government closer to them than Milam County's. In response to the petition, the Texas legislature established Williamson County on March 13, 1848, naming it for prominent judge and soldier Robert M. Williamson. The county seat was set up in Georgetown (Odintz). Located in the center of Williamson County, Georgetown lies along the San Gabriel River. It was named for George Washington Glasscock, who donated land for the site with his partner Thomas B. Huling. Settlers were attracted to the county seat for its clean water, cheap fertile land, and the abundance of wood. The first wave of pioneers came from Tennessee, Kentucky, North Carolina, Arkansas, Illinois, and other states. Arriving in the early 1850s, families named Bryson, Poole, and Spencer settled in the Liberty Hill proximity.

Early settlement resources include a variety of buildings and features with varying roles in terms of settlement. Associated property types include, but are not limited to:

- Transportation structures, such as stagecoach stops, roadway networks
- Domestic buildings, such as houses and support buildings
- Commercial buildings, such as general stores, banks, hotels, trading posts
- Small community settlements

C. Transportation (1840-1977)

Earliest examples of transportation were farm roads and railroads during the second half of the nineteenth century and county and state road during the first half of the twentieth century. Transportation resources include a variety of resources with varying roles in the transportation of goods and people.

Frontier Travel (1840-1865)

The earliest roads in Texas evolved from Native American trails or the marked trails of early Spanish explorers, but the first known roads developed as the result of the necessity of travel from Mexico to San Antonio, Goliad, and the East Texas missions. These first roads were part of the Old San Antonio Road (OSR) network or the *Camino Real*. The OSR is more accurately described as a network of trails with different routes used at different times with feeder roads branching off the main course. The route used by travelers depended on season, natural conditions, and Native Americans. All of the routes began at the Presidio del Río Grande, southeast of present-day Eagle Pass. The routes led across south Texas, converging in San Antonio. Beyond San Antonio, the roads diverged. An upper, early trail known as the *camino de los tejas* followed the springs of the Balcones Escarpment and eventually turned eastward toward the Sabine River. A later road named the *camino arriba* was established at the end of the eighteenth century, and looped southward of the *camino de los tejas* (*Handbook Old San Antonio Road*).

Later roads connected forts, way stations, and trading posts. Due to practically non-existent overland transportation routes in Texas, early settlers traveled along the Gulf coast, the lower reaches of a few navigable rivers, or on the few extremely primitive roads by way of animal-drawn wagons. Settlers also used natural streams as transportation routes, and because of this important function of streams and rivers, special value was placed on land adjacent to these water bodies.

After 1835, the OSR fell into disuse as greater emphasis was placed on north-south routes. Courses shifted to accommodate the growth of new settlements and new markets, and to provide access to coastal trade. After the Mexican War, the OSR regained some of its former importance as travelers from east Texas hurried to San Antonio and on to the west coast during the Gold Rush. During the Civil War, the OSR served as a significant route from transporting cotton from east Texas to San Antonio onwards to Laredo and Mexico. Large sections of the route were abandoned after the Civil War in favor of shorter, newer roads linking urban centers of the state. In the late 1800s, the arrival of railroad dramatically changed transportation routes, town development, and commerce, thereby bringing about the abandonment of some old roads.

An early specification of the Republic of Texas called for a road thirty feet wide with tree stumps not to exceed twelve inches high. Early roads often were rocky trails or mud streams. Early Texas law called for the establishment of first-class roads between county seats. These roads were forty feet wide cleared paths. Second-class roads were thirty feet wide, and third-class roads were twenty-two feet wide. Road courses were longer and less efficient as they circumnavigated around hills, large trees, and other obstacles. Under state law, counties were responsible for all early highway work; however, they built more local roads than highways.

Stagecoach Routes (1845-1880)

One method of transportation was by stagecoach. Stagecoach routes provided a nineteenth century transportation network, making travel and mail delivery possible to all communities. Stagecoach operations were closely tied to government mail contracts, providing the solid financial base that allowed stage companies to also transport passengers and freight. Travel by stagecoach was fraught with danger from bandits and Native Americans, especially in frontier areas around Austin and San Antonio. Stage lines reported thefts of mules and supplies, destruction of way stations, and murders of drivers, guards, and passengers by raiding parties. Even with these threats, new stage routes were added every year as the frontier expanded westward and new towns formed along stage routes.

At the beginning of the Civil War, thirty-one stagecoach lines operated in Texas. The majority of these served population centers in the eastern half of the state.

Many routes were short ones between small towns with stage service to most communities. Through the years, new settlements sprang up along stage lines and near military posts that guarded the routes. One stage line left Austin, heading northwest from town, travelled along a road called the 'mountain road' or Central National Road. This road passed through the communities of Jollyville, Pond Spring, Running Brushy (Cedar Park), Bagdad, Liberty Hill, South Gabriel, and Lampasas. A stagecoach often made several stops in a community, not just at the stagecoach stop, often stopping at the stable, the inn, the post office, and sometimes even the tavern. The place where the horses were changed, called relay stations or stage stands, was considered the official 'stop.' The stage route that went through Liberty Hill on its way to Fort Croghan (near present day Burnet) stopped at the Bryson farmstead and also stopped in Liberty Hill proper (Scarborough). The Central National Road was also referred to as the 'military road' due to the amount of military traffic between Austin and Fort Croghan (Stever).

Railroad Networks (1881-1903)

The Austin & Northwestern Railroad (A&NW) incorporated on April 29, 1881 to build a line from Austin to Abilene. However, the company was only able to construct 106 miles of track. The initial sixty miles opened in May 1882 between Austin and Burnet, passing through Liberty Hill and Bertram on the way. This line is famous for bringing almost 16,000 carloads of granite from Granite Mountain to Austin to be used to build the state capitol building. Several cars derailed near Brush Creek in Travis County, and large granite blocks can still be found in the streambed.

The A&NW line slightly bypassed Liberty Hill, which for many towns spelled their doom. Such was not the fate for Liberty Hill, which had moved twice to accommodate new locations of the post office or stage stop. The railroad was sold in 1890 and became part of the Houston & Texas Central (H&TC) (later Southern Pacific). The A&NW was profitable during the late nineteenth century, carrying mainly mineral resources. In 1901, the Texas legislature approved the merger of A&NW into the H&TC. As a condition of the merger, a new passenger terminal was constructed in Austin, and the line was extended from Burnet to Lampasas in 1903 (Werner).

Modern Roadway Systems (1900-1977)

Very few roads in the United States had any kind of hard surface at the beginning of the 1900s. The coming of the automobile had a dramatic effect toward highway development. The automobile forced drivers to recognize the needs for road improvements (Kite). Roads were generally poor throughout the county. The early SH 29 was in varying conditions: between Liberty Hill and Burnet unpaved, between Liberty Hill and Bertram improved, and between Liberty Hill and Leander was partially graded and partially paved. SH 104 between

Georgetown and Liberty Hill was paved (Humble Oil 1925). By 1930, there were 11,882 automobiles in the county, and extensive improvements, including blacktopping of all major roads, took place in the 1930s. By 1938, SH 29 and SH 104 in Williamson County were paved. Where SH 29 crossed the county line into Burnet County, it changed from paved to gravel surface (Humble Oil 1938). SH 29 originally started in Gregory going through Goliad, Cuero, Gonzales, Austin, Liberty Hill, Burnet, Llano, Mason, and on to Junction City. In 1977, it was shortened and rerouted from Menard to Mason, Llano, Burnet, Liberty Hill to Georgetown out to SH 95, just north of Taylor (TxDOT files).

Although SH 29 from Georgetown to Liberty Hill is still relatively sparsely populated by commercial enterprises and residences, businesses and planned communities are sprouting along the roadway, particularly at major intersections.

Associated property types include, but are not limited to:

- Early trails and roads
- Roads, including farm to markets (FM), ranch to markets (RM), county roads, state highways, and interstates
- Rest stops and picnic areas
- Bridges
- Culverts
- Rail-related features, such as railroads, rail bridges, section houses, depots, water stations, trestles, and rail sidings

D. Agricultural Practices (1840-1970)

Agricultural resources include a variety of buildings with varying roles in the production of crops and livestock. The form of individual structures, as well as the arrangement of structures, fields, fence lines, and vehicular access, often recalls the type of farming originally practiced.

Farming (1850-1940)

Agriculture and ranching played a big part in Williamson County history. According to the Williamson County 1850 census, a population of 1,379 Anglos and 155 slaves lived along the San Gabriel River and Brushy Creek in mostly agricultural communities. Most of the improved acreage grew corn. Family farms and subsistence agriculture remained the norm prior to the Civil War. In the 1860s, Williamson County left the frontier life behind and became a populous, agriculturally diverse county. The Anglo population increased to 3,638 in 1860 with slaves rising to 891 in number. The county's geographical diversity was reflected in the varied agricultural crops. The rich blackland soils in the eastern portion of the county grew wheat and corn. Cotton was not an important cash crop during the 1850s and 1860s with only 271 bales produced in 1860. Ranching took place in the western section of the county (see Ranching Context).

The county was a poorer place after the Civil War, though it received little physical damage. The total value of farms fell from \$833,418 to \$389,239. The economic recovery in the 1870s owed a large part to the explosion of cotton farming. Cotton went from 4,217 bales in 1880 to 33,945 in 1890 to 80,514 in 1900. In 1900, Williamson County ginned more cotton than any other county in Texas except for Ellis County. The cotton industry was helped in large part by the arrival of the railroad with the International-Great Northern Railroad in 1876, which shipped cotton to distant markets. The proportion of cropland shifted from corn and wheat to cotton, with cotton going from approximately a third of the improved acreage in 1880 to three-quarters in 1910. With the shift to cotton culture, land ownership trends changed. In 1880, over seventy-five percent of the land was worked by owners. By 1890, less than half was operated by owners. By the time of the Great Depression, ownership dropped to twenty-nine percent.

The cotton industry underwent dramatic changes in the early twentieth century. The combined effects of soil depletion, overproduction, and the arrival of the boll weevil harmed the cotton industry profoundly by the late 1920s. The effects of the Depression caused farmers to turn to livestock instead of cotton and other staple crops. Between 1930 and 1940, cotton acreage dropped fifty percent and cotton production fell from 68,266 bales to 36,890. Cotton continued to be an important crop in the eastern part of the county. However, farmers turned to sorghum and wheat and to livestock in the later twentieth century (Odintz).

Associated property types include, but are not limited to:

- Farmsteads with support buildings, such as barns, dairies, sheds, coops, cribs, water tanks, windmills, cisterns, water troughs, fencing, corrals, fields, and pastures
- Processing plants and storage buildings, such as grist mills, grain elevators, railroad sidings for transporting products, cotton gins
- Irrigation systems, such as pumps, gates, and canals

Ranching (1840-1970)

In the 1840s, early settlers found large herds of wild cattle roaming the plains, and cattle ranching became widespread by 1860. The cattle population boomed between 1850 and 1860, going from 11,973 head to 38,114. Sheep ranching also proved popular, with sheep growing from 2,937 in number in 1850 to 16,952 in 1860. Wool production followed suit going from 3,449 pounds to 32,994 in the same decade.

In the years immediately following the Civil War, the value of livestock dropped from \$823,653 to \$341,794. The growth of cattle and sheep industries aided the county's economic rebound and the arrival of the International-Great Northern Railroad. Various feeder routes to the Chisholm Trail passed through the county

and many cattle drives passed through or originated in the county from the 1860s to the early 1880s. The town of Taylor in eastern Williamson County became an important railhead for transporting cattle to markets around the country. Cattle raising was an important part of the agricultural economy, and by 1969 ranchers owned 65,093 head of cattle.

Sheep and goat ranching also played an important role in the agricultural economy. The sheep industry recovered its pre-war level by 1880 and peaked at 39,961 sheep and 171,752 pounds of wool in 1890. After declining around the turn of the century, sheep ranching revived in the 1930s and reached a new high of 59,919 sheep and 336,494 pounds of wool in 1959. Mohair became significant by 1930 and reached a peak in 1959 with 44,668 goats producing 209,098 pounds of mohair. Wool and mohair production more than doubled in the decade preceding 1940. Along with traditional livestock such as cattle, sheep, and goats, poultry farming played a significant role in the county's economy in 1950 when it was fifth in the state in production of chickens and eggs (Odintz).

Associated property types include, but are not limited to:

- Ranches with support buildings, such as barns, dairies, sheds, coops, cribs, water tanks, windmills, cisterns, water troughs, fencing, corrals, fields, and pastures

E. Community Development (1840-1990)

Williamson County became more ethnically diverse around the turn of the century. The non-Anglo American settlers added distinctive customs, religious denominations, and architectural styles. In 1870, there were only 111 settlers of foreign birth out of a population of 6,368, about three percent. During the 1880s and 1890s, significant numbers of Scandinavians, Germans, Czechs, Wends, and Austrians moved to Williamson County. During the 1910s, Mexican arrivals reached a significant level, due to the Mexican Revolution that was creating unrest in Mexico. There were only 294 Mexicans in the county in 1900; by 1930, the Mexican population reached 4,967. The proportion of foreign-born in the county population remained around 10 percent from the 1890 to 1930. Prior to the Civil War, there were Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian congregations. European settlers brought Lutheran, Catholic, and Czech Moravian denominations. The Mexicans were predominately Catholic. By 1930, Williamson County had a culturally diverse population of 44,146 inhabitants. African Americans accounted for 16 percent of the county population in the 1930s (Odintz).

Community resources include a variety of buildings with varying roles in the daily life of residents, including domestic and commercial types, often giving clues to how residents lived. Associated property types include, but are not limited to:

- Domestic buildings, such as single-family dwellings, multiple-family dwellings, and ancillary buildings
- Commercial buildings, such as general stores, offices, banks, restaurants, gas stations, and warehouses
- Educational buildings, such as one-room schoolhouses, classrooms, gymnasiums, auditoriums, universities
- Social and recreational buildings, such as fraternal meeting halls, clubhouses, churches, dance halls, community centers, and picnic areas or parks

Liberty Hill (1840-1980)

Settlement started in the Liberty Hill vicinity in the 1840s. Taylor Smith and his family purchased land where Liberty Hill developed from Henry Field, who returned home to England before 1850. More settlers arrived in the 1850s coming from Tennessee, Arkansas, and the Carolinas. John T. and Amelia Bryson came by wagon train in 1852 and Reverend William Oliver Spencer in 1853, both families settling near the Smith's farmstead. A post office was opened in 1853, three miles west of the present townsite. Spencer was appointed postmaster and he suggested the name Liberty Hill. Thornton P. Poole of South Carolina came with some forty settlers and fifty-two slaves by wagon train in 1854 to Liberty Hill. By the 1870s, the town had two stage stops, schools, churches, hotels, stores, livery stable, a dry goods store, a newspaper, a mill, and a doctor (Scarborough).

In 1881, the state capitol building in Austin burned down. This incident changed Liberty Hill from a stagecoach town to a train town as businesses shifted toward the train tracks of the A&NW railroad, which was constructed in the early 1880s to ship granite from the Marble Falls area to Austin for the capitol building reconstruction. The 'Lone Star Engine' pulled 15,700 carloads of granite from the quarry through the towns of Grover, Liberty Hill, Leander, Walkerton, White Stone, Brueggerhoff (Cedar Park), Rutledge, Cummings, and Rattan on its way to Capitol Hill.

Shifting the town site was nothing new to Liberty Hill as it had moved eastward twice before 1882, in response to relocations of the post office and a local stage stop. By 1882, Liberty Hill had built a schoolhouse. In 1884, the Liberty Normal and Business College was chartered and soon added a student population to the town. The college was a nonsectarian institution with a curriculum of humanities and science courses, telegraphy, music, and commercial training (Odintz). By 1886, Liberty Hill supported a college, two cotton gins, numerous businesses, a post office, a town park, and two stage stops. The college declined in the early 1900s and closed its doors in 1910. The buildings were turned over the public school system. Although the population grew, it never officially reached over 500 through the mid twentieth century. From its frontier beginnings through the

1980s, Liberty Hill had an agricultural economy. This started changing after the 1980s with the expansion of the Austin population and improvements to US 183. Liberty Hill was incorporated in 1999.

Georgetown (1840-1960)

Historically, Georgetown developed to the east of IH 35, east of the project area. Although the project area ends just outside of urban Georgetown at D. B. Wood Road, the project area is primarily rural along its length except around Liberty Hill, where it is a typical small Texas town, which was bypassed by SH 29. Geographically, Georgetown does not fit into the project context, but is included here for its importance in county development as the county seat.

After the initial wave of Anglo American settlers to the Georgetown vicinity in the 1840s, Europeans arrived in the mid 1800s: Swedes in 1850s; Germans, Austrians, and Swiss in 1870s; and Moravians and Czechs after 1880s. The economy was based on agriculture in large part due to a major tributary cattle trail through the heart of Georgetown to the Chisholm, Dodge City, Shawnee, and Western trails. Southwestern University was established in 1873 and the railroad reached town in 1878, greatly contributing to the town's growth and importance. In the nineteenth century, Georgetown had limestone quarries, various mills (grist, flour, planing, woodworking), cotton gins, various factories (brick, flue, chair, mattress) and various shops (tin, pewter, blacksmith, saddlery, shoe), bakeries, confectioneries, and a bottling works. Cotton was the dominant crop in the area from the 1880s to 1920s (see Agricultural Practices context). The Georgetown and Granger Railroad connected Georgetown to Austin in 1904. In 1921, the town suffered extensive damage from a flood that led the town to seek flood control, which culminated in the building of dam that created Lake Georgetown. Population growth and industrial expansion continued modestly in the twentieth century until approximately 1960, after which development accelerated.

Growth of Austin and its Effects on Surrounding Communities (1940-1990)

In neighboring Travis County, the growth of Austin began affecting transitions in both Liberty Hill and Georgetown. From 1940 to 1990, Austin's population grew from 87,930 to 472,020, a rate of forty percent per decade. By 2000, the population reached 656,562. The city's corporate area, which was 30.85 square miles in 1940, exploded to 225.40 square miles by 1990, more than seven fold. During the 1950s and 1960s, much of Austin's growth reflected rapid expansion of its traditional strength – education and government. The student population of the University of Texas doubled reaching 39,000 by 1970. Travis County government employees tripled between 1950 and 1970. Adding to the population growth was Austin's emergence as a high technology center by the 1970s, budding music industry in the 1970s and 1980s, and a new convention center in 1992. The population growth translated into more residential neighborhoods,

apartment complexes, and traffic problems. More and more people opted to commute into Austin by living in the suburbs around Austin and in nearby communities, including Round Rock, Georgetown, Cedar Park, and Leander. Liberty Hill started to feel these same effects by 2000 when their official population reached 1,400.

| Theme | Property Type | Resource Types |
|------------------------|--|---|
| Exploration/Settlement | Transportation | Stagecoach stops, roadway networks |
| | Domestic Buildings | Houses with support buildings |
| | Commercial Buildings | General stores, banks, hotels, trading posts |
| | Community Settlements | Small communities with mixture of resources above |
| Transportation | Trails | |
| | Road-related features | Farm to market roads, ranch to market roads, county roads, state highways, interstates, memorial highways |
| | Rest stops & picnic areas | Restroom facilities, picnic tables, information centers, vending machines |
| | Bridges | Made of wood, metal, concrete, or mixture in trestle, truss, or flat formation |
| | Culverts | Bridge-class culvert, box culvert, pipe culverts |
| | Rail-related features | Railroads, rail bridges, section houses, depots, water stations, trestles, rail sidings |
| Agricultural Practices | Farmsteads/Ranches/Plantations with support buildings and land | Main residence, land, barns, dairies, sheds, coops, corn cribs, water tanks, windmills, corrals |
| | Processing plants | Grist mills, grain elevators, railroad sidings, cotton gins, warehouses |
| | Irrigation systems | Pumps, gates, canals |
| Community Development | Domestic buildings | Single-family dwellings, multiple-family dwellings, ancillary buildings |
| | Commercial buildings | General stores, offices, banks, restaurants, gas stations, warehouses |
| | Educational buildings | One-room schoolhouses, classrooms, gymnasiums, auditoriums, universities |
| | Social/Recreational buildings | Fraternal meeting halls, clubhouses, dance halls, community centers, picnic areas or parks |

III. Previously Identified Resources

A. NRHP

Of the historic-age resources surveyed, one is currently listed in the NRHP and none have been previously determined eligible through coordination with the THC.

| Name | Location | Designation #/Year |
|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Bryson Stage Coach Stop | SH 29, Liberty Hill | #78003000/1978 |

B. Landmarks (RTHL, SAL, Local)

Of the historic-age resources surveyed, five are listed as RTHLs, none as State Archeological Landmarks (SAL) of non-archeological type, and none as local landmarks. There are four archeological SALs have been previously recorded. Locations of SALs of archeological type are restricted information per state and federal law.

| Name | Location | Designation#/Year |
|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Liberty Hill Methodist Church | Main Street, Liberty Hill | RTHL / #9292 / 1962 |
| Liberty Hill Masonic Hall | Main Street, Liberty Hill | RTHL / #9291 / 1976 |
| Stubblefield Building | Main Street @ Myrtle Street, Liberty Hill | RTHL / #12998 / 1976 |
| Bryson Stagecoach Stop | SH 29, Liberty Hill | RTHL / #9038 / 1981 |
| John G. Matthews House | 600 CR 263, Liberty Hill | RTHL / #9296 / 1976 |

C. Markers (OTHM, Centennial, Zivley, Local)

Of the historic-age resources surveyed, one is listed as a Centennial marker, four are listed as OTHMs, and one is listed as a United Methodist Church Historic Site.

| Name | Location | Type | Designation #/Year |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------|---------------------------|
| Manuel Flores | CR 260 @ SH 29, Liberty Hill | Centennial | #9093 / 1936 |
| First Baptist Church of Liberty Hill | | OTHM | #13922 / 1974 |
| Liberty Hill Cemetery | SH 29, Liberty Hill | OTHM | #9290 / 1971 |
| John G. Matthews | Liberty Hill Cemetery, SH 29, Liberty Hill | OTHM | #9295 / 1982 |
| William O. Spencer | Liberty Hill Cemetery, SH 29, Liberty Hill | OTHM | #9343 / 1994 |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|------|
| Liberty Hill United Methodist Church | Main Street, Liberty Hill | United Methodist Church Historic Site | #158 |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|------|

The United Methodist Church marker is designated by the United Methodist Church, which considers one of their churches to be designated a historic site when it is a location or structure associated with an event, development, or personality deemed of strong historic significance in the history of an Annual, Central, or Jurisdictional Conference. The case for historicity, maintenance, and use must be well established and effort must be made to collect and preserve substantive proof of the site's history, such as books, pamphlets, maps, pastoral and church records, journals, letters, periodicals, photographs, and personal memorabilia, which should be kept in the Conference archives (United Methodist Church).

IV. Analysis of Survey Results

A. Summary of Survey Results

Overall, the survey identified 68 historic-age sites that architectural historians then analyzed per NRHP evaluation criteria. The locations of each resource are indicated on maps in **Appendix A**, an inventory of the surveyed resources is included in **Appendix B**, and individual photo sheets are located in **Appendix C**. Of the 68 historic-age sites documented, 11 are known to be associated with a significant historic event, or associated with persons of transcendent importance, or embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master. These associated sites are discussed further below. The remaining sites are recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP and their evaluations can be found in **Appendix B**.

| Property Type | Subtype | Function | # of Sites |
|----------------------|------------------------|--|-------------------|
| Agriculture | Farmstead/Ranch | Main residence with ancillary building(s) | 23 |
| | Farmstead/Ranch | Main residence with ancillary building(s) and cemetery | 1 |
| Commerce | Specialty store | Store | 1 |
| Domestic | Single-family dwelling | House | 23 |
| Funerary | Cemetery | | 5 |
| Marker | OTHM | | 3 |
| | Centennial | | 1 |
| Religious | Church | | 2 |
| Social/Recreation | Fraternal meeting hall | | 1 |
| Transportation | Stagecoach-related | Stagecoach stop | 1 |
| | Automobile-related | Picnic area | 1 |
| | | Dam | 1 |
| Unknown | Not evaluated | | 5 |
| TOTAL | | | 68 |

B. Individual Historic-age Resources

In order to qualify for listing in the NRHP, a historic-age resource must possess significance and must have the characteristics that make it a good representation of properties associated with that aspect of the past. If a historic-age resource meets these Criteria, then it can be recommended **eligible** for the NRHP. Conversely, if a documented historic-age resource does not possess significance in any of the National Register Criteria, lacks integrity, is not within a NRHP eligible historic district, or is non-contributing element within a NRHP eligible district, it would be recommended **not eligible** for the NRHP. Information regarding non-eligible resources can be found in **Appendix B**.

Certain sites were identified by project historians as conveying varying degrees of significance and integrity, and determined that these sites warranted further investigation to evaluate their NRHP eligibility. The following assessment provides a more detailed discussion of these historic-age resources of special interest and presents rationalization for NRHP eligibility recommendations.

- **Resource #4, 17733 SH 29**

This parcel has not been fully evaluated as the ROE was denied, but the main house is visible from ROW. The two-story hipped-roof residence has hipped dormers, exposed rafter tails, one-over-one wood sash windows, one-story hipped-roof side addition in compatible style, and an inset full-width one-story porch with square box columns. Based on what is visible from public ROW and for planning purposes, the parcel is recommended **eligible** for listing in the NRHP. However, until project historians can have access to the property, final NRHP eligibility determinations cannot be made. The parcel would be impacted by Segment 1 south, Segment 1 center, and Northwest 3 alignments.

- **Resource #6, 16750 SH 29, Hall-Russell Ranch**

This property has an appraisal date of 1850, making it a property of interest to project historians. ROE had been granted on October 17, 2007, but was later verbally rescinded on May 1, 2008. ROE was not re-obtained until October 6, 2008. Project historians conducted survey work on October 15, 2008. Upon arriving on site, historians discovered an official “State Historical Survey Committee” plaque on the main house. This was surprising as the Atlas database and maps had been reviewed with no previously identified resources near this location. The Historical Markers Program coordinator at the THC was contacted to obtain further information about the resource’s official survey status. A files search revealed that this property is known as the Hall Ranch House, listed as an RTHL in 1962, the same year the RTHL program was initiated.

According to the RTHL application, the house was built in 1853 by slave labor when the land was owned by John Russell. The lumber for the house was hauled in from Bertram while the stone came for the surrounding land. The stone walls are approximately two feet thick. The sources of information for the application were Abstract of Title and several credible citizens in Liberty Hill including Judge J. E. Hickman (deceased) and George L. Russell (descendant of original owner). The Russells were among the first settlers to the Liberty Hill area in the early 1850s, but do not appear to have been prominent citizens. The RTHL is known as the Hall Ranch House as Mr. Marvin Hall was the person who filled out the RTHL application. The Historical Markers Program coordinator is in the process of getting this resource added to the database as of October 16, 2008.

The property is a good example of a mid nineteenth century ranch that has an original stone farmhouse (1853) and a distinctive stone and wood barn, along with other outbuildings and pasture land. The farmhouse is a two-story side-gabled center-passage plan limestone house with a two-story full-width porch on the front and one exterior stone chimney. The lower porch level is screened. The windows on the front appear to be original with a few aluminum frame storm windows. The windows on the north and rear side of the original house have been replaced with aluminum two-over-two sash. The original front doorway maintains its original features including the three-light transom over the door. The second floor has a central door topped by a five-piece beveled stone lintel. The roofline has been extended for a two-story addition on the west end of the house, approximately one-third the size of the original house. The addition is also a side-gabled center-passage plan with a two-story porch. The addition has false-bevel wood drop siding. The addition's windows are one-over-one wood sash.

Immediately to the west of the house is a round stone cistern with a stone lid and a stone pump house. The pump house has a square plan, a centrally located door on the east side, and single window openings on the south and north sides. The roof is supported by concrete joists and cedar posts. There is a metal skeletal structure south of the pump house – the last remaining vestiges of the windmill.

North of the house is an equipment shed on a concrete slab. The ca. 1940 shed has triple garage door-sized openings on the southeast side. It has a side-gabled wood-framed roof covered in standing seam metal with a wood ridgeline ventilator. The siding is painted flush wood.

A larger machine shed is located to the north of the equipment shed. The ca. 1930 shed is side-gabled with a secondary extended roof. The flush wood siding is attached to wood framing. The roof span is supported by slender metal poles (probably replacements). The roofs are covered in standing seam metal with a wood ridgeline ventilator.

Further to the north is a ca. 1930 wood and stone barn with a gambrel roof. It has a double pen with central passage plan. The pens are made of local stone with cement-based mortar. The upper level has wood framing and the second floor joists are strengthened with cross bracing. The roof has two slender shed-roofed dormers (one on either longitudinal side) that allow hay to be tossed down from the loft to the exterior corral areas. The corral areas are protected by flush wood siding and shed-roofed metal roofs. The gambrel roof gables are covered in metal as is the roof.

The ranch is significant at the local level in the area of Agricultural Practices under Criterion A at the local level. The site is also significant under Criterion C at the local level as an example of pioneer architecture. The farmhouse is a very early example for the type of construction – a two-story masonry rural residence. Although the house has seen some changes in the two-story addition and window

alteration, very few examples from this time period remain in the area. The property includes various agricultural auxiliary buildings in varying conditions. It maintains associated ranching acreage thereby keeping integrity of setting and association necessary to convey mid nineteenth century agricultural heritage of the area. The site is not significant under Criterion B for its association with the Russell pioneer family. The property retains integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. It is recommended **eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criterion A for Agricultural Practices at the local level and under Criterion C for Architecture at the local level.

The ranch would be adversely impacted by Segment 1 south, Segment 1 center, Segment 1 combo, and Southwest 2 alignments.

- **#8, SH 29, Liberty Hill Cemetery**

According to the Liberty Hill OTHM marker, this cemetery has been in use since at least 1852, when the earliest settlers were establishing homes in the area. The first formal grant of land for a community burial ground was granted by John T. and Amelia Edwards Bryson in 1875, when three-and-one-half acres were deeded to the Liberty Hill cemetery trustees: T. N. Bryson, C. C. Chance, W. H. Poole, J. B. Roddy, and T. S. Snyder. A stone wall built by the Brysons and their neighbors protected this acreage. Additions to the original plot include land formerly owned by John T. Bryson and donated by Dr. and Mrs. H. L. Fowler. The Royal Arch Masons established an adjacent three-acre Masonic cemetery in 1932, later transferring the title to the Liberty Hill Lodge #432, A.F. & A.M., which gave it to the Liberty Hill Cemetery Association in 1959. By later land purchases, the cemetery now contains more than twenty acres. The earliest portion of the cemetery dates to the settlement period for Liberty Hill and the surrounding area, and evokes the pioneer and agricultural heritage of the area.

As the main cemetery for the community of Liberty Hill since the 1850s, the cemetery is significant under Criterion A at the local level in the area of Settlement. Cemeteries are required to also meet Criteria Consideration D: Cemeteries in order to be considered eligible for the NRHP. Liberty Hill Cemetery meets the requirements for Consideration D through its age and its association with events, such as the settlement of Liberty Hill. The cemetery retains integrity of location, design, setting, materials, feeling, workmanship, and association. As such, Liberty Hill Cemetery is recommended **eligible** for listing in the NRHP. The cemetery would be impacted by Segment 1 south and Segment 1 center.

- **Resource #12, SH 29, Bryson Stage Coach Stop**

According to the NRHP marker, the NRHP listed Bryson home/stage coach stop stands as one of the last known remaining structures of the original settlers in the Liberty Hill community. The 1854 hewn-log, open dog-trot structure served as

the family dwelling for one of the first and most prominent pioneer families in the settlement and later doubled as the stage coach stop for the stage line that ran between Austin and Fort Croghan and other points west. John and Amelia Bryson with their family of six children were typical of pioneer families who journeyed to Texas by covered wagon in search of land offered by the Texas government to encourage settlement of the area. Both were leading citizens in the pioneer community.

The NRHP listing indicates that the Bryson Stage Coach Stop is significant at the local level in the early development of Liberty Hill under Criterion A. The property is closely tied to the Bryson family, early and prominent settlers in the area, and as a stagecoach stop in Liberty Hill. The site is also significant under Criterion C at the local level as an example of pioneer architecture. Although poorly maintained, it retains good integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. It is **listed** in the NRHP individually. It is also listed as an RTHL. The stagecoach stop would be impacted by Segment 1 north, Segment 1 center, Segment 1 combo, and Northwest 4 alignments.

- **Resource #19, 1890 Loop 332**

The one-and-a-half-story, hip-on-gable house was built in 1910. It is a modified L-plan Folk Victorian with an L-plan porch. The majority of the windows appear to be original, as is the siding. There is a small addition of south side, which is retained within the footprint of the porch. Based on age and reconnaissance-level investigation, this property appears to meet Criterion C Architecture as a good example of a Victorian residence in Williamson County. Thus, it is recommended **eligible** for listing in the NRHP. The parcel would not be directly impacted by any alignment, but is located close to Segment 1 and Southwest 2 alignments.

- **Resource #22, 1919 Loop 332**

The modified L-plan Folk Victorian residence has a hipped roof with cross gables, a partial-width inset front porch, and L-plan rear porch. The house retains original wood-frame windows, front door, and clapboard siding. The garage at the back of the house dates to circa 1940. The fencing along the front of the property is the old fashioned 'crochet' bent wire type. Based on age and reconnaissance-level investigation, this property appears to meet Criterion C Architecture as a good example of a Victorian residence in Williamson County. Therefore, it is recommended **eligible** for listing in the NRHP. This parcel would be impacted by Segment 1 South and Segment 1 Center alignments.

- **Resource #46, CR 279@ San Gabriel River, Martha Chapman Dam**

Known as the Martha Chapman Dam, the low-water crossing on old CR 279 crosses the south branch of the San Gabriel River. Constructed of rubble limestone with concrete mortar and a layered asphalt-on-concrete roadbed, it

represents a turn-of-the-century transportation structure. Although called a dam, the purpose of it is not to dam or retain the water, but to provide safe dry passage for vehicles and pedestrians over the river.

The dam remains fairly intact with raised curbing on the upstream side, stepped buttresses on the downstream side, and roadway approaches on both ends. Approximately halfway across the span are remnants of two rectangular stone footings or foundations. Their purpose is unknown. There is also a box inlet spillway drain of concrete and stone on the upstream side.

The narrowness of the roadbed crossing and its masonry load-bearing construction indicate an early date of construction, probably predating the Texas Highway Department (THD), founded in 1917. TxDOT files indicate that printed THD standards were available prior to 1917. These files indicate that concrete bridges had to have a minimum width of sixteen feet. From a distance, the crossing appears to be narrower than sixteen feet and is not made of poured concrete. Measuring the crossing on an aerial map, it measures roughly fourteen feet.

It appears to be significant under Criterion A for its association with turn of the century transportation at the local level and under Criterion C for transportation engineering at the local level. It appears to retain integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. It is recommended **eligible** for listing in the NRHP. Final determination of eligibility would require intensive archival research and an intensive survey, which was deemed beyond the scope of this project since none of the alternatives under consideration would impact the structure.

- **Resource #47a, 12805 SH 29, Whitehead Cemetery**

One of several historic-age resources located on this parcel, the family cemetery is a very good example of a rural family cemetery with especially fine attention to stylistic touches such as the entry arch, stone perimeter wall with ‘crochet’ bent wire fencing, and grave markers. The Whitehead descendents have owned the property for over 130 years, and the cemetery is still open for the burial of Whitehead family members.

The cemetery is significant under Criterion A at the local level in the area of Settlement. The Whitehead Cemetery meets the requirements for Criteria Consideration D through its age, its association with an early pioneer family in Liberty Hill, and distinctive design features. The cemetery retains integrity of location, design, setting, materials, feeling, workmanship, and association. As such, the Whitehead Cemetery is recommended **eligible** for listing in the NRHP.

- **Resource #59, 1401 CR 258**

The house is a modified L-plan Folk Victorian with a curving front porch. The bay window and dormer retain decorative shingles and bargeboard. The windows, doors, and siding appear to be original. The roofing material is new but the crest details were retained when the roof was replaced. Based on aerial views, the property appears to have one or two outbuildings that cannot be seen from ROW. ROE is needed to get an unobstructed view of the architectural features of the property and fully assess the integrity of the resource. Further investigation and analysis will be necessary, but based on age and reconnaissance-level investigation, this property is recommended **eligible** under Criterion C Architecture as a good example of a Victorian farmhouse in Williamson County.

- **Resource #60, 450 CR 260, Krause Farmstead**

This property represents an intact example of an early 20th century combination farm and ranch. Both the house and the main barn date to the first period of construction on the property, 1925 (Krause interview). The current owner's family moved to the property in 1935, and made some additions that remain in use. The property is actively used to run cattle on the east portion and in crop production on the west. The hipped-roof residence has an inset partial-width L-plan front porch with square columns, wood one-over-one sash windows, an external brick chimney, and horizontal siding. The barn is covered in vertical wood planks and corrugated metal roofing. The gabled ends feature a sliding barn door on each end and saw-toothed bottom edge on the planks. The saw-tooth detail is repeated on one of the long sides to provide exterior access for animals. The other long side has a shed-roofed carport. The roof has a partially louvered, gabled cupola. Near the barn is a corrugated sheet metal building that appears more modern. Across CR 260 from the house is a windmill with an elevated water tank.

The Krause farmstead is significant at the local level for Agricultural Practices under Criterion A. The property includes various agricultural auxiliary buildings in varying conditions. It maintains associated farming acreage thereby keeping integrity of setting and association necessary to convey early twentieth century agricultural heritage of the area. The site is not significant under Criterion B for association with a significant person or under Criterion C as an example of agricultural architecture as it is a ubiquitous example of a farmstead that can be found across Texas. The property retains integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. It is recommended **eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criterion A for Agricultural Practices at the local level.

- **Resource #61, CR 260 @ SH 29, Transportation/Centennial Marker, Manuel Flores Centennial Marker**

Placed in 1936, the grey granite Centennial marker for Manuel Flores commemorates a pivotal event in Texas history. According to the Handbook Online, Manuel Flores, a trader and Mexican agent, led an expedition from Matamoros to bring war supplies to Native Americans in Texas who Mexico was trying to organize to revolt against Texas and the United States. After killing four members of a surveying party between Seguin and San Antonio, the Flores group was trailed by a company of Texas Rangers for two days. Led by Lieutenant James O. Rice, a part of the Ranger company confronted the Mexican group on the North San Gabriel River on May 17, 1839 in a skirmish known as the Battle of the San Gabriels. Flores' band was routed, and Flores was reported among the dead. The Texans found documents that gave full information regarding the Cordova Rebellion, a plot uniting Mexican forces with Cherokees to conquer Texas. These documents prompted President Mirabeau B. Lamar to demand that the Cherokees leave Texas, and this precipitated the Cherokee War. Rice later settled on Brushy Creek in 1846 and was one of the petitioners in the organization of Williamson County and one of the commissioners who selected the county seat. He served as postmaster, operated a tavern and a tannery, and was at one time the second wealthiest man in the county. As a Centennial marker, the marker is significant under TxDOT's centennial celebration program of 1936 and is recommended **eligible** for inclusion in the NRHP.

References

- Handbook of Texas Online*, s.v. "Civil Engineering,"
<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/CC/stc1.html> (accessed May 14, 2008).
- Handbook of Texas Online*, s.v. "Fort Croghan,"
<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/FF/qbf13.html> (accessed May 14, 2008).
- Handbook of Texas Online*, s.v. "Old San Antonio Road,"
<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/OO/exo4.html> (accessed May 15, 2008).
- Hicks & Company. *Comparative Properties for the Bryson Farmstead Historic Resources Investigation*. Austin: 2006.
- Humble Oil & Refining Company. *Humble Road Map of Texas*. New York: General Drafting Office Co., Inc., 1938.
- Humble Oil & Refining Company. *Highways of Texas*. Houston: Humble Oil & Refining Co., 1925.
- Humphrey, David C. *Handbook of Texas Online*, s.v. "Austin, Texas,"
<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/AA/hda3.html> (accessed May 15, 2008).
- Krause, Clyde. In person interview. February 28, 2008.
- Kubiak, Len. *Texas History Series*, "History of Liberty Hill from 1853 to Modern Times,"
<http://forttumbleweed.net/historyD.html> (accessed May 15, 2008).
- Mann, William L. and Lucie C. *Price Handbook of Texas Online*, s.v. "James O. Rice,"
<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/RR/fril.html> (accessed May 19, 2008).
- Matthews, Myreta Julia. *Handbook of Texas Online*, s.v. "Liberty Hill, Texas,"
<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/LL/hll14.html> (accessed May 5, 2008).
- Mercier, Glynda L. *Handbook of Texas Online*, s.v. "Inland Waterways,"
<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/II/eti1.html> (accessed May 14, 2008).
- Odintz, Mark. *Handbook of Texas Online*, s.v. "Liberty Normal and Business College,"
<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/LL/kbl11.html> (accessed May 13, 2008).
- Odintz, Mark. *Handbook of Texas Online*, s.v. "Williamson County,"
<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/WW/hcw11.html> (accessed May 5, 2008).
- Patten, Roderick B. *Handbook of Texas Online*, s.v. "Manuel Flores,"
<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/FF/ffl16.html> (accessed May 19, 2008).

-
- Scarborough, Clara Stearns. *Handbook of Texas Online*, s.v. “Georgetown, Texas,”
<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/GG/hfg3.html> (accessed May 14, 2008).
- Scarborough, Clara Stearns. Land of Good Water, Takachue Pouetsu: A Williamson County, Texas, History. Georgetown, Texas: Williamson County Sun Publishers, 1973.
- Stever, Rex H. *Handbook of Texas Online*, s.v. “Stagecoach Lines,”
<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/SS/ers1.html> (accessed May 5, 2008).
- Texas Department of Transportation. “Highway Designation File, State Highway No. 29,”
<http://www.dot.state.tx.us/tpp/hwy/sh/sh0029.html> (accessed May 14, 2008).
- Texas Historical Commission. Recorded Texas Historic Landmark file for Hall Ranch House.
- United Methodist Church. “Historic Sites of the United Methodist Church,”
<http://www.gcah.org/site/pp.aspx?c=ghKJIOPHIoE&b=3611845&printmode=1> (accessed May 6, 2008).
- Werner, George. *Handbook of Texas Online*, s.v. “Austin and Northwestern Railroad,”
<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/AA/eqa12.html> (accessed May 13, 2008).

APPENDIX A
Survey Area and Historic-age Resources

APPENDIX B
Historic-age Resources Inventory Table

APPENDIX C
Photo Inventory Sheets

Appendix D
Williamson County Historical Commission Correspondence