CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SURVEY OF THE SAM HOUSTON SPRINGS PROJECT AREA, PART OF THE TRINITY RIVER INTERPRETIVE AREA, GREAT TRINITY FOREST, DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS.

by
Aaron J. Naumann
Marsha Prior, Ph.D.
Natalie Thomas
Christopher Goodmaster

Principal Investigator
Duane E. Peter

for
Brown Reynolds Watford Architects
3535 Travis Street
Suite 250 LB-102
Dallas, TX 75204

TEXAS ANTIQUITIES PERMIT NUMBER 4211

MISCELLANEOUS REPORTS OF INVESTIGATIONS
NUMBER 436

Geo-Marine, Inc.
2201 K Avenue, Suite A2
Plano, Texas 75074

May 2009

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of an archeological inventory and historical survey for the Sam Houston Springs project area in Dallas County, Texas. The property is part of the City of Dallas Master Plan for the Pemberton Hill Road. Brown Reynolds Watford Architects contracted Geo-Marine, Inc., to conduct the necessary cultural resources studies as required by the State of Texas Antiquities Code. An archeological inventory of the 37.25-acre tract was conducted between August 16 and September 6th, 2006, under Texas Antiquities Permit # 4211, in conjunction with a review of the historical record and land owner interviews.

The property was reportedly identified to have one archaeological site 41DL72 within its boundaries. The project area is also one of the potential locations for the original Beeman cabin, who were the first settlers of the City of Dallas. Therefore, the main purpose of this archaeological inventory was to revisit a known archaeological site, assess the property for evidence of the Beeman cabin, while additionally assessing the property for previously unknown cultural resources. The historical survey for the property included an investigation of the relevant historical records and land owner interviews, as a means of researching reviewing the historical significance of the property. Historic and archival sources were synthesized in order to more clearly understand the movements of Sam Houston while making his journey through this area. While historic sources offer tantalizing suggestions of the events and places associated with this journey, the precise identities of people and places involved are merely suggestive rather than scientifically conclusive. It is the conclusion of this research that Sam Houston most likely did not visit this property.

The cultural resources management survey discovered that the majority of the contextual integrity of the landscape has been compromised by historic mining and Army Corps of Engineer activities, but four localities within the project boundaries were observed to possess limited intact soils. Two of these localities produced evidence attributable to the prehistoric archaeological site 41DL72, but, unfortunately, no evidence was unearthed to support the identification or location of the Beeman cabin. There were other cultural materials observed on the property, but these materials are of more recent historic association and are deemed to be ineligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP) or for designation as a State Archaeological Landmark (SAL).

All materials collected and generated from this project will be curated at the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory (TARL) in Austin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to express his appreciation and gratitude to the many individuals who contributed to the successful completion of this report. Many thanks go to the interviewees, Mr. Billy Ray Pemberton and Mrs. Lois Billingsly. The first hand information provided by these individuals concerning the Pemberton family history and their activities within the project area is critical to our understanding of the landscape and its role in the regional historic sequence. The author would like to especially thank Mr. Billy Ray Pemberton for his insight into the project area and the information about the use history of the land, because without his knowledge many aspects of the property would be unexplained. There are many Geo-Marine, Inc., personnel in need of mention, including Mr. Duane Peter the cultural resources vice-president, served as the Principle Investigator on the project and was instrumental in the editing process. Ms. Missi Green, the culture resource division manager, was very generous with her time when we were strategizing the approach of the archaeological survey. Ms. Marsha Prior, an ethnologist, and Ms. Natalie Thomas, an architectural historian, combined forces to investigate the historical record and synthesize these findings with the information provided via landowner interviews. Their work has assisted greatly in our understanding of the historical significance of the property. Mr. Steve Hunt, laboratory supervisor, needs to be given many kudos for assisting in conducting the initial field work under stressful conditions. He also supervised the data entry and artifact processing with assistance from the sole Geo-Marine, Inc., intern Mr. Sam Barrick. Mr. Shaun Phillips supported the GPS aspect of the project and created all of the maps for this report. He was especially tested when the GPS technology failed during data collection, which he was able to thankfully recover. Text, copy editing and report production were overseen by Mr. Naumann and Ms. Sharlene Allday. Final formatting and report layout were both performed by Ms. Denise Pemberton.

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This report presents the findings of the cultural resources survey for the Sam Houston Springs project area, which is situated within the proposed development area for the Trinity River Interpretive area within the Great Trinity Forest within southeast Dallas (Figure 1). Geo-Marine, Inc. (GMI), as a member of the Brown Reynolds Watford Architects team, was tasked with the responsibility for the cultural assessment of this property in partial fulfillment of the city's obligation under the State of Texas Antiquities Code to ensure that major projects do not inadvertently destroy archaeological or architectural properties that are historically significant. GMI conducted this work (GMI project # 30428.00.03) as a subcontractor to the City of Dallas. Duane Peter, GMI Senior Archaeologist, served as the Principle Investigator. Additional GMI personnel who participated in these investigations included: Aaron Naumann and Christopher Goodmaster, Project Archaeologists; Marsha Prior, Senior Ethnologist; Natalie Thomas, Architectural Historian; and Steve Hunt, Archaeologist.

The results of previous archival research (Peter et al. 2003) indicated that one known archaeological site (41DL72) was contained within the bluff portion of the eastern portion of the project area. This research also reported the high potential of the property being the location of the frontier cabin belonging to Mr. John Neely Bryan and Mrs. Margaret Beeman Bryan, the founders of the City of Dallas.

Therefore, the scope of this survey was to investigate the property to determine the presence of historic features (foundations, cellars. etc.), to assess the extent and integrity of the previously recorded prehistoric archaeological site (41DL72), and to assess the potential of the property to additionally contribute to our understanding of prehistory or history. Historic and archival sources were synthesized in order to more clearly understand the movements of Sam Houston while making his journey through this area. While historic sources offer tantalizing suggestions of the events and places associated with this journey, the precise identities of people and places involved are merely suggestive rather than scientifically conclusive. These examinations included a strategy incorporating both archaeological survey methods and historical research methods. The Project Area includes approximately 37.25 acres of land presently under the ownership of the City of Dallas.

CHAPTER 2
ENVIRONMENTAL BACKGROUND

Dallas County is part of the Texan biotic province defined by Blair (1950) as an intermediate zone between the forests of the Austroriparian and Carolinian provinces and the grasslands of the Kansan, Balconian, and Tamaulipan provinces. Some species reach the limits of their range in the Texan province. Almost all of Dallas County falls within the Blackland Prairie, one of several tall grass prairies present in this part of Texas. Grasses in the uplands dominate the vegetation in the Blackland Prairie, with woodlands being restricted to stream courses and river bottoms. Prior to the disturbances associated with the historic period, the project area would have been covered with a water oak-elm-hackberry forest, with occasional grassy clearings and shallow water marshes and ponds (McMahan et al. 1984). Today, this bottomland forest can include cedar elm, american elm, willow oak, southern red oak, white oak, black willow, cottonwood, red ash, sycamore, pecan, bois d'arc, flowering dogwood, dewberry, coral-berry, dallisgrass, switchgrass, rescuegrass, bermudagrass, eastern gamagrass, Virgina wildrye, Johnsongrass, giant ragweed, yankeeweed, and Leavenworth eryngo (McMahan et al. 1984:22), and most of these were probably present prehistorically. Also possibly present were cherry, sweetgum, hawthorn, hickory, blackberry, sedge, Indiangrass, giant cane, and beaked panicum (United States Department of Agriculture [USDA] 1980:50, 92). Although the faunal community in this region has undergone changes due to the expansion of the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex, species of wildlife which previously inhabited the area would have included bobwhite, quail, pheasant, meadowlark, field sparrow, sage grouse, lark bunting, various species of turtles, cottontail, swamp rabbit, squirrel, muskrat, raccoon, gray fox, red wolf, and white-tailed deer (Schmidly 1983; USDA 1980:50).

The region has a warm temperate, subtropical, and humid climate that is generally mild, with periods of extremely hot and cold weather being limited in duration. Yearly rainfall is fairly evenly distributed, with the maximum rainfall occurring in April and May and the minimum in August. Much of the rainfall occurs in the form of heavy thunderstorms, with the rapid runoff allowing only limited absorption of water by the soil. Snowfall is rare, with an average of less than 2.5 cm (1 in) falling per year. The snowfall is generally present for less than one week. The prevailing winds are southerly. Temperatures remain above 0° C (32° F) approximately 240 days each year (USDA 1964:72-73, 1969:51-52).

exposes the sub-soil. The surface layer is general grayish brown fine sandy loam extending to a depth of 0.1 m. The next layer is a medium acid, reddish brown sandy clay loam that can range to a depth of 0.3 m. Below that, to a depth of 1.03m is a strongly acid, yellowish red sandy clay loam, which is underlain by a strongly acid, reddish yellow loamy fine sand that can be upwards of 2m deep (USDA 1980:33).

Trinity clay, frequently flooded is a deep nearly level, somewhat poorly drained soil on the floodplain. The soil is typically flooded two or three times a year, and the floodwaters range from shallow to moderately deep. The surface layer is moderately alkaline, dark clay nearly 0.18 m in depth. The following layer is a moderately alkaline, dark grayish brown clay that can be 0.5 m in depth. The next layer is a moderately alkaline, very dark gray clay extending to a depth of 1.13 m; followed by a moderately alkaline, dark grayish brown clay extending to a depth of 1.7 m (USDA 1980:36).

CHAPTER 3
CULTURAL SETTING

PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS

The history of archeological investigations within the upper Trinity River drainage and the culture-historical framework for the area are aptly summarized in three, relatively recent major reports concerning the archeology of the upper Trinity River basin (Peter and McGregor 1988; Prikryl 1990; Yates and Ferring 1986). Although the combined efforts of professional and avocational archeologists have resulted in the documentation of numerous sites, much research remains to be done. As noted by McGregor (1988:27-29), much of the excavation efforts within the upper Trinity River basin have focused on reservoir development, especially along the Elm Fork (Brown and Lebo 1991; Crook and Harris 1957, 1958, 1961; Ferring and Yates 1997, 1998; Lebo 1995a, 1995b; Lebo and Brown 1990; Skinner 1982a, 1982b; Skinner and Baird 1985) and the East Fork (Dawson and Sullivan 1973; Lorrain and Hoffrichter 1968; Lynott 1975; Ross 1966). Investigations at Joe Pool Lake (Jurney et al. 1988; Peter and McGregor 1988) and test excavations at the River Bend site, 41TR68 (Peter et al. 1987), have provided the initial data assemblage necessary for understanding prehistoric adaptations along the West Fork of the Trinity River.

Reservoir studies along the East Fork have included work at Lake Ray Hubbard and Lake Lavon, east and northeast of Dallas, respectively. Lake Lavon was surveyed in 1949 with test excavations conducted at the Campbell Hole (41COL10) and Hogge Bridge (41COL1) sites (Stephenson 1949a). Additional excavations at the Hogge Bridge site resulted in the formal definition of the Wylie focus—a Late Prehistoric manifestation believed to be characterized by arrow points, flexed burials, large pits, and trade pottery from cultures to both the east and west (Stephenson 1952). Later excavations were undertaken by Southern Methodist University (SMU) as a result of the planned enlargement of Lake Lavon (Dawson and Sullivan 1973; Lynott 1975). Lake Ray Hubbard was surveyed with the help of members of the Dallas Archeological Society (DAS) in 1963 (Harris and Suhm 1963). Subsequent excavations were conducted at the Glen Hill (41RW4) and Upper Rockwall (41RW2) sites (Ross 1966), and the Lower Rockwall site (41RW1; Lorrain and Hoffrichter 1968). Much of this work concentrated on excavations at sites with "Wylie focus pits" in an effort to better comprehend the function of these large features. A low level of professional work continues within the East Fork basin, most of which is in compliance with the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act (Austin 1993a; Cliff

In addition to these large projects, many smaller cultural resources investigations have been conducted near the current project area. In the 1940s, R. King Harris investigated numerous sites in the area, including sites 41DL66, 41DL72, 41DL73, and 41DL97. These sites were recorded as prehistoric lithic scatters with ceramic components. Sites 41DL66 and 41DL97 were located in close proximity to the project area, but unfortunately have apparently been destroyed by continuing urban development in the years since their discovery. During 1974 and 1975, North Texas State University (now known as the University of North Texas) conducted an archeological reconnaissance within the flood plain of Fivemile Creek (McCormick 1976). Six sites were investigated during this project, two of which, 41DL80 (designated 41-DA-5 NTSU) and 41DL102 (designated 41-DA-6 NTSU), are within the Dallas Floodway Extension. In 1981, Environment Consultants, Inc., undertook a survey for the Dallas Floodway Extension (Bennett et al. 1981) that included a large area south and west of the project area that extended to the railroad tracks. Twenty-two sites were investigated during this project, of which 13 (sites 41DL69, 41DL70, 41DL73, 41DL80, 41DL84, 41DL91, 41DL99, 41DL104, 41DL204, 41DL205, 41DL206, 41DL208, and 41DL220) are located within the present Dallas Floodway Extension project. None of these sites, however, are within approximately one mile (1.6 km) of the current project area.

In 1990, AR Consultants conducted an archeological survey for the Rochester Park Levee, and two previously recorded sites, 41DL69 and 41DL70, were investigated. In addition, archival research was conducted for the project area and an oral history of the nearby Metzger Dairy was recorded (Skinner et al. 1990). Also in 1990, AR Consultants began a cultural resources survey of a proposed new levee and associated borrow pits at the Central Wastewater Treatment Plant (Skinner et al. 1991), after which AR Consultants continued to monitor the sites found at the Central Wastewater Treatment Plant (Skinner and Whorton 1995). Sites 41DL318, 41DL319, 41DL337, 41DL338, 41DL355, 41DL356, and 41DL357 were all recorded during these investigations. AR Consultants again visited the area in 1993 for an archeological survey around Little Lemmon Lake (Skinner and Whorton 1993). Two sites (41DL350 and 41DL351) were located, both of which are within the Floodway Extension Area of Potential Effects (APE). Finally, between 1995 and 1997, AR Consultants monitored several construction projects within the Dallas Floodway (Skinner, Whorton, and Trask 1996; Trask et al. 1997). Two historic sites, 41DL370 and 41DL371, were recorded during one of these projects (Skinner, Whorton, and Trask 1996).

In 1997, GMI conducted an archeological, architectural, and geoarcheological evaluation of the area of the proposed Dallas Floodway Extension, which is to run from the existing Dallas Floodway south to Interstate 20. GMI concluded that a strong possibility exists that buried, stratified archeological sites dating to the late Holocene could be preserved in the study area, particularly near the former channel of the West Fork (Cliff et al. 1998). GMI also conducted testing and evaluation of seven prehistoric sites (41DL318, 41DL319, 41DL357, 41DL337, 41DL338, 41DL355, and 41DL356) and an evaluation of the research potential of site 41DL320, the old Forest Avenue Dump, located along the Trinity River near its intersection with Interstate 45, in 2000. Based on testing operations it was determined that the seven prehistoric sites be considered ineligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The current plans for the Dallas Floodway Extension did not impact site 41DL320; therefore, no addition archeological investigations were conducted (Buyssee 2000). Most recently, floodwater erosion of site 41DL350, located near Little Lemmon Lake, revealed that burials are present within the flood plain sites of the Elm Fork (Dalbey 2003).

hearths, and a low density of artifacts, including a Clovis point (Crook and Harris 1957, 1958, 1961). Although the original radiocarbon dates from the hearths suggested an anomalous early age for Clovis points (ca. 37,000 B.P.), more recent work by the Smithsonian Institution (Stanford 1981) appears to have resolved the date controversy. Stanford has demonstrated that the presence of naturally occurring lignite—either as a fuel in these hearths or as an inadvertent inclusion—contaminated the radiocarbon samples. Consequently, the commonly accepted date of 10,000-12,000 B.P. for Clovis-period occupations is probably a reasonable estimate for the first human occupation of Northcentral Texas.

An exception to the generally limited data on Paleo-Indian sites in Northcentral Texas is the deeply buried Clovis-age Aubrey site (41DN479), located on the Elm Fork of the Trinity River north of Dallas (Ferring 1989). The discovery of this site, buried approximately 7-8 m below the top of the Elm Fork flood plain just below the Lake Ray Roberts dam, suggests that well-preserved Paleo-Indian sites in Northcentral Texas can only be located through the examination of deeply stratified Holocene alluvium in modern flood plain situations.

Despite the lack of extensive data relating to the early Paleo-Indian period in Northcentral Texas, some have attempted to generalize settlement mobility and intensity of site occupation by drawing on local data and on comparisons with other areas. For instance, a number of researchers have seen evidence for a high degree of group mobility in the broad distribution of Paleo-Indian artifacts over the landscape and in the variety of nonlocal lithic raw materials employed in artifact production (Meltzer and Smith 1986; Shafer 1977; Story 1990b:177). Likewise, the well-documented exploitation of megafauna by Paleo-Indians in the western United States, coupled with the presence of similar species in Northcentral Texas between 11,000 and 9,000 years ago (see Slaughter and Hoover 1963), has resulted in the popular (and logical) conclusion that "big game hunting" was part of the Paleo-Indian subsistence strategy in Northcentral Texas. However, the recent important excavations at the Aubrey site have indicated that subsistence efforts did not focus on big game animals alone. Rather, the entire range of prairie and forest species was utilized by the occupants of the site. These included bison, deer, rabbit, squirrel, fish, and abundant turtle (Ferring 1989; Ferring and Yates 1997). Although mammoth remains are present, their exploitation has not been substantiated (Ferring and Yates 1997). Whether this pattern of a more generalized foraging subsistence system is characteristic of Clovis adaptations on the fringes of the Eastern Woodlands and the focus on now extinct, big game species is more characteristic of a Plains adaptation remains to be documented. However, Ferring and Yates (1997:5) suggest that, in general, the Clovis people probably employed "very flexible adaptive strategies."

Archaic Period

The Archaic period in Northcentral Texas is tentatively dated between 6500 B.C. and A.D. 700. As is true for many areas, a threefold division of the Archaic period, which consists of early, middle, and late "subperiods," has been applied in Northcentral Texas (Prikryl 1990). Thus, the Early Archaic has been dated from 6500 to 4000 B.C., the Middle Archaic from 4000 to 1500 B.C., and the Late Archaic from 1500 B.C. to A.D. 700. Recent overviews that cover the Archaic in this portion of Texas include Hoffman (1989a); Prikryl (1990); and Story (1985, 1990b). Archaic remains are usually found in upland settings and are frequently mixed with later material. As with the Paleo-Indian period, the initial discussion of the Archaic period in Northcentral Texas (Crook and Harris 1952, 1954), which defined the Carrollton and Elam foci, was based upon

seasonal basis. Faunal remains indicate that Late Archaic populations exploited a mix of prairie, forest, and riparian species, with white-tailed deer, rabbits, turtles, and mussels being primary food resources (Ferring and Yates 1997:6). The results of investigations at a number of Late Archaic sites at Lake Ray Roberts are summarized by Ferring and Yates (1997:305):

> The most substantial occupations of the project area took place in the later part (post-3,000 yr bp) of the [Late Archaic] period. This is clearly a broad regional trend . . . although poor site exposure limits our understanding of earlier periods. Late Archaic sites here uniformly register mobile foragers that exploited all habitats available to them. Residential mobility . . . is implied. Repeated occupations at multiple sites were characterized by use of rock-lined and unlined hearths. On stable surfaces these are recorded as rock middens. In aggrading environments, discrete hearth construction events are clear. Import and curation of chert tools is evident, and contrasts with core-biface curation in the [Middle Archaic] period. Chert was preferentially used for straight, expanding and corner-notched points, while local raw materials were reduced on-site and dominate the contracting-stemmed forms. Despite quite good resource availability, dietary stress is recorded from skeletal and dental analyses. . . .

A human burial dating to the Late Archaic has been found in a flood plain context. Site 41DL350 is a stratified site located on the banks of the Trinity River near Little Lemmon Lake. Five features, mostly consisting of fire cracked rock and burned clay, were found in the sediments located above the burial. Quantities of lithics and bison and deer bone were also found in the features. One radiocarbon sample, taken from an organically stained, charcoal rich soil deposit 72 cm above the human remains returned a date of 610 ± 70 BP. A rib skeletal sample returned a date of 930 ± 40 BP. The skeleton apparently dates to AD 970-1040 (2 sigma calibration), while the feature dates to AD 1270–1430 (2 sigma calibration [Dalbey 2003]). The burial site probably represents an occupation location that was occupied repeatedly from 900 to 600 years ago (Dalbey 2003).

The documentation of large pits associated with Late Archaic period sites in the Richland Creek and Chambers Creek drainages (Bruseth and Martin 1987) also suggests that important sociopolitical changes may have occurred during this time period. Unfortunately, the significance of these pits remains an enigma despite their excellent documentation.

Late Prehistoric Period

The beginning of what is called the Late Prehistoric period in the upper Trinity River basin (ca. A.D. 700-1700) is marked by the initial appearance of arrow points. The A.D. 700 date for the start of this period is based upon dated contexts for similar material in the Brazos River drainage to the west. Both Lynott (1977) and Prikryl (1990) have proposed that the Late Prehistoric period be divided into an early and a late phase, with the early phase reflecting a continuation of the foraging subsistence system of the preceding Late Archaic period and the late phase reflecting Southern Plains influences. In this view, the early phase dates between A.D. 700 and 1200 and is characterized by sand- and grog-tempered ceramics and Scallorn, Steiner, Catahoula, and Alba arrow points (Lynott 1977; Prikryl 1990). The late phase dates from A.D. 1200 to 1600 and is associated with the appearance of shell-tempered ceramics, various unstemmed triangular points (e.g., Maud, Fresno, Harrell, Washita), and Perdiz points (Lynott 1977; Prikryl 1990). Evidence of horticulture and bison procurement also appears in sites of this period (Harris and Harris 1970; Morris and Morris 1970).

century (Stephenson 1952:305), but the dating of these remains has always been uncertain (Prikryl 1990:77). As late as 1993, the available data allowed Fritz (1993:241) to state that, apart from Cobb-Pool, Late Prehistoric sites in Northcentral Texas seemed to show a generalized adaptation in which the most important plant foods were nuts, wild seeds, fruits, and the problematic, possible tuber that might be a species of *Psoralea*. Since then, several small projects have shed additional light on the introduction of maize horticulture into Northcentral Texas. The Harbor Pointe site (41DL369), located on Rowlett Creek (a tributary of the East Fork of the Trinity River) yielded remains of at least four individuals dated by AMS analysis of bone collagen to cal A.D. 1010 (1035) 1165. No pottery was recovered with these remains, although shell beads and a shell gorget were present, and a stable carbon isotope ratio of -21.6‰ indicates that the group's diet contained little or no maize (Cliff et al. 1996; cf. Lynott et al. 1986:Figure 2). More recently, a disturbed burial (41DL373), located on Spring Creek (a tributary of Rowlett Creek), was dated by AMS analysis of bone collagen to cal. A.D. 1155 (1220) 1275, with a stable carbon isotope ratio of –17.8‰ (Peter and Clow 1999). This value is similar to stable carbon isotope values believed to represent the initial introduction of maize agriculture in New York around A.D. 1000 (van der Merwe and Vogel 1977) and is comparable to values of –18.0‰ to –20.0‰ for initial maize-consuming Caddo populations in Arkansas (Rose and Hoffman 1989). Assuming that (1) these carbon isotope ratios directly reflect changes in the C_4 plant contribution to the human diet (see Herz 1990 for a discussion of other possibilities), and (2) these burials are representative of more regional changes in prehistoric dietary patterns, then maize horticulture may have been introduced into Northcentral Texas around A.D. 1200.

Protohistoric Period and Historic Native American Groups

Within Northcentral Texas, the time from A.D. 1600 to 1800 has been designated the Protohistoric period. Prior to the founding of New Mexico in 1598, the European presence in the Southwest and on the Southern Plains had been sporadic at best—Coronado in 1540–1541, the Rodriguez-Chamuscado party in 1581, and Espejo in 1582–1583, among others. After 1598, however, Spanish influence was never absent from the Southern Plains, although actual contact with Europeans continued to be limited and there are only brief records of journeys into or through the area (Hofman 1989b; John 1975). Despite this, it was not until the beginning of the nineteenth century that the physical presence of Europeans on the Southern Plains became commonplace—the result of increasingly peaceful relations between the Spanish in Texas and the Plains Indians to the north, and the acquisition of Louisiana by the United States in 1803. Prior to about 1725–1750, Apachean groups appear to have dominated the western portion of the Southern Plains, known as the High Plains, while after this time the area was increasingly controlled by the Comanche and Kiowa. On the eastern portion of the Southern Plains, within the area now known as the Lower Plains and Northcentral Texas, the Wichita tribes became dominant (Bell et al. 1967; Hofman 1989b:91).

Unfortunately, since good historical documentation is very sparse for the upper Trinity River basin during the Protohistoric period, it is not clear which specific aboriginal groups were residing in the Dallas area at the beginning of this period. What is clear is that the Protohistoric period in Northcentral Texas was a time of population fluctuation, movement, and amalgamation (see Newcomb 1993). Available data suggest that many, if not all, of the aboriginal occupants of the eastern margin of the Great Plains, which includes Northcentral Texas, were Caddoan-language speakers, from the Arikara in the north to the Wichita and Kichai in the south. In this light, it is worth noting that it has also been suggested that the Socoatino, encountered by the

day Menard County. For the next 117 years, they waged intermittent warfare against first the Spanish, then the Mexicans, the Texans, and, finally, the United States (Webb and Carroll 1952:1:385). The Comanches were signatories to the 1867 Medicine Lodge Treaty with the United States, in which they agreed to cede all of their territory except for a 5,546-square-mile reservation in southwestern Oklahoma. Following a general uprising by the Comanche and Kiowa in 1874, they were defeated by the United States army in 1875 and permanently confined to their Oklahoma reservation (Webb and Carroll 1952:1:385).

Archeological remains that can be associated with these Protohistoric groups are rare compared to the remains of earlier periods. Within the upper Trinity River basin, and in Dallas County itself, little evidence of these historic Indian groups has been found, with the exception of a few Native American sites with European items (Sollberger 1953). In actuality, all of these groups are better represented in the regions that surround the upper Trinity River valley.

Groups of the Wichita Confederacy, being Plains Villagers, have left much more substantial archeological remains. A number of villages belonging to historic Wichita groups have been identified and investigated in Oklahoma, within Northcentral Texas, and along the boundary of Northcentral Texas and Northeast Texas (Bell 1984; Fox 1983:41–46). On the basis of excavations at the Pearson site in Rains County, Texas, due east of Dallas County, the Norteño focus has been proposed for these historic Wichita components (Duffield and Jelks 1961). The most extensive archeological work has been done at several sites along the Red River in Texas and Oklahoma, near the present-day Texas town of Spanish Fort, northwest of Dallas County, which is believed by some to be the site of the village attacked by Parilla in 1759 (Bell et al. 1967). The excavations at the Longest site (34Jf–1) in Oklahoma documented the presence of a fortified enclosure and circular grass-covered lodges. Artifactual material recovered from these Wichita sites shows a mixture of artifacts of Native American manufacture and of materials obtained in trade with the French or the Spanish. Artifacts of Native American manufacture include triangular arrow points (i.e., Fresno, Harrell, and Washita), thick end scrapers on flakes, diamond-shaped beveled knives, T-shaped perforators, bifacial gun flints, bison scapula hoes, pottery elbow pipes, and Womack Engraved pottery. Trade artifacts found to be present at Wichita sites include metal knives and knife handles; axes; splitting wedges; kettle fragments; awls; chisels; scissors; buttons; flintlock gun parts; bullets and shot; bridle parts; metal ornaments such as bells, finger rings, and bracelets; and numerous trade beads (Fox 1983:45).

HISTORIC BACKGROUND

The first presence of Europeans in North Central Texas may have occurred in 1542, when the remnants of the de Soto expedition, led by Luis de Moscoso de Alvarado, entered modern Texas in an effort to find a land route to New Spain. Some researchers believe that the expedition crossed North Central Texas (Lebo and Brown 1990:61), although others place the route much farther to the east and south (Bruseth and Kenmotsu 1991; Chipman 1992; Hudson 1986; Schambach 1989; Weber 1992). A consistent presence in the region did not occur until the early 1700s, when French traders from Louisiana began to move west along the Red River. The Spanish considered this French incursion to be a threat to the security of New Spain, and they responded by redoubling efforts to counterbalance the French influence with the Native Americans in East and North Central Texas. These efforts continued until 1763, when France ceded Louisiana to Spain under the Treaty of Paris. This reduced the perceived threat to the security of New Spain and resulted in a reduction in Spanish investment in eastern and northern

Following the presidential election of 1860, Texas, in common with the rest of the South, began to consider secession. In a February 23, 1861, referendum on the issue, Dallas County voted 741 to 237 in favor of secession. Many county residents joined Confederate military units and, after a 516 to 3 vote on the issue, Dallas County donated $5,000 in gold to the Confederate cause. The Dallas area provided foodstuffs to the Confederate army, and in 1862 a small arms and ammunition factory opened in Lancaster, south of Dallas. Although the fighting never reached North Central Texas, the region was gradually impoverished by the war. Many of the commodities that were imported to the region became difficult to obtain and expensive, while the price of food had risen between two and four times its 1861 levels by September 1863. The *Dallas Herald* was forced to cease publication between September 30, 1863, and July 2, 1864, due to a lack of newsprint. Following Lee's surrender, the Federal Army occupied Texas and announced the emancipation of Texas' slaves on June 19, 1865 (WPA 1992:55-58).

Although the Dallas area suffered economically in the aftermath of the Civil War, it was not as badly affected as other areas of the former Confederacy. This greater economic vitality was fueled in part by streams of immigrants from the rest of the country, who were hoping to make a fresh start in the as yet unsettled West. Other elements in the economy included Dallas' location near one of the cattle trails to Kansas and its role as a center of the buffalo hide market. In 1872, the Dallas economy received a major boost when the Houston & Texas Central Railroad reached the city from the south, while, in 1873, the Texas & Pacific Railway provided important access to points east. After the arrival of the railroads, Dallas began to acquire many of the trappings of a major city, including the beginning of a water distribution system (1873), gas lighting (1874), a private telegraph company (1875), the telephone (1880), and electricity (1882) (WPA 1992: 60-70).

An early dream of the Dallas business community was to gain water transport along the Trinity River. The problems associated with this effort included the seasonal fluctuations in the level of the Trinity River, as well as the many snags and rafts that had to be removed. The first effort in this respect occurred in 1866, when the state legislature chartered the Trinity Slack Water Navigation Company to provide the improvements required for navigation from Galveston to Dallas. Under the terms of the charter, the company was to receive 5,000 acres of public land for every lock and dam completed. Unfortunately, the company never started work on the project. In 1867, Captain J.M. McGarvey agreed to bring his *Job Boat No. 1* from Galveston to Dallas. The journey required seven months, with much of the time being spent removing obstructions from the river channel. Although Captain McGarvey claimed that the Upper Trinity was superior to both the upper Red River and the upper Mississippi River, his proposal to provide regular service to Dallas did not prove practical. Following his arrival, construction began in Dallas on the steamer *Sallie Haynes*, which made three trips down river before being sunk; there are no records, however, of the *Sallie Haynes* making the voyage all the way to Galveston. After the railroads arrived in Dallas, interest in river navigation began to wane, although several small steamers continued to ply the Trinity, some of which are thought to have made the trip from Galveston to Dallas. In 1881, the state government was asked for $75,000 to remove obstructions from the river. During the 1890s interest in Trinity River navigation revived, and the Trinity River Navigation Company was formed in 1891. The company built two steamers, *Dallas* and *The Dallas*, and purchased the *H.A. Harvey, Jr.*, in New Orleans. The *Harvey* made its way up the river in 1893, arriving in Dallas on May 13. A dam was built at McCommas Bluff to provide sufficient water for the steamer, and it spent the next few years carrying cargo between Dallas and the dam. In 1898, the *Harvey* and the remains of *Dallas* were sold to a Galveston firm, and the *Harvey* made a four-month voyage downriver to Galveston. In 1899, the U.S. Army Corps of

The economy of Dallas, and of the nation as a whole, did not begin to recover from the Depression until the mobilization for World War II began. After the war, the Dallas economy continued to grow along with the rest of the nation. Dallas' image was shattered by the Kennedy assassination on November 22, 1963, and it took many years to recover from this blow. A major economic downturn occurred in the late 1980s, when a drop in oil prices and the collapse of the real estate market dealt a severe blow to the Texas economy. This forced the Dallas region to diversify economically, investing heavily in the modern high-tech industries.

PROJECT-SPECIFIC BACKGROUND

Although archeological surveys and archival research show that the Trinity River flood plain was occupied historically, little is known about settlement patterns, land use, social and economic development, historic structures, and the extent to which ethnic diversity may have existed in the area. Resources for historical data which pertain to Dallas County are widely available (see Graff et al. 1977), but data which pertain specifically to the project area are scarce and sometimes difficult to trace. Previous research and archeological surveys indicate that development in this area was limited, due in part to the frequent, unpredictable flooding of the Trinity River and its tributaries (Bennett et al. 1981:31, 38). The historic structures and sites that were present, however, indicate that the river played an important role in the activities that did occur. Miller's Ferry, Cockrell's Bridge, and Lock and Dam No. 1 all indicate that fording and navigating the river were important considerations for earlier inhabitants (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District [USACE-FW] 199; Yates and Ferring 1986:156). Ferries and bridges became venues for connecting settlements that developed on either side of the river--Dallas and Hord's Ridge (which later became known as Oak Cliff). And as the town of Dallas grew to become a mercantile center with county farmers producing marketable crops, such as cotton and wheat, inhabitants dreamed of establishing shipping connections between Dallas and Galveston via the Trinity River. However, in spite of attempts to channelize the river and to maintain a navigable level of water, an established water route between Dallas and Galveston never materialized (Bennett et al. 1981:41; McElhaney 1995; Saunders 1991; WPA 1992:150-153). Since the area was not highly developed, it did not receive the same attention from early chroniclers, as did the more prominent areas. The early history of the downtown district, for example, is well documented as it was the center of social, economic, and political activities and was the site that John Neely Bryan chose for the original town (American Illustrating Company 1922; Greene 1973, 1984:59-61).