CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF SELECTED MANEUVER AREAS AT CAMP BULLIS, BEXAR AND COMAL COUNTIES, TEXAS: THE ARCHEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF 3,255 ACRES ALONG CIBOLO CREEK

by
Gregg C. Cestaro
Martha Doty Freeman
Marie E. Blake
and
Ann M. Scott

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for Public Release - Distribution Unlimited

REPORTS OF INVESTIGATIONS, NUMBER 129
Cultural Resources Survey of Selected Maneuver Areas At Camp Bullis, Bexar and Comal Counties, Texas: The Archeology and History of 3,255 Acres Along Cibolo Creek

Prewitt and Associates, Inc.
7701 N. Lamar, Suite 104
Austin, TX 78752-1012

U.S. Army Engineer District, Fort Worth
Contracting Division
P. O. Box 17300
819 Taylor Street
Ft. Worth, TX 76102-0300

Available for public release

A pedestrian archeological survey covering 3,255 acres (1,317 hectares) was conducted at the Camp Bullis Military Reservation in Bexar and Comal Counties, Texas, during October-December 1999 and April-May 2000, by personnel from Prewitt and Associates, Inc. The investigations resulted in the documentation of 39 new archeological sites consisting of 28 sites with only prehistoric components, 8 sites with only historic components, and 3 sites with both prehistoric and historic components. Twenty-six previously recorded sites were re-recorded and reassessed as well: 17 prehistoric sites, 4 historic sites, and 5 sites with prehistoric and historic components.

Three new historic sites (41BX1355, 41BX1359, and 41BX1394) and one new prehistoric site (the burned rock midden at 41CM242) are considered eligible for National Register listing. In addition, two previously recorded prehistoric sites (the thick deposits at 41BX425 and the burned rock midden at 41BX1044) and two previously recorded historic sites 41BX397 and 41BX1211 are reassessed as eligible. The remaining 35 new sites and 22 previously recorded sites are considered ineligible.
CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF SELECTED MANEUVER AREAS
AT CAMP BULLIS, BEXAR AND COMAL COUNTIES, TEXAS:
THE ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF 3,255 ACRES
ALONG CIBOLO CREEK

by

Gregg C. Cestaro
Martha Doty Freeman
Marie E. Blake

and

Ann M. Scott

Co-Principal Investigators: Ross C. Fields and Ann M. Scott

REPORTS OF INVESTIGATIONS, NUMBER 129

Prewitt and Associates, Inc.
Cultural Resources Services
Austin, Texas

April 2001
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaternary Geomorphology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauna and Flora</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 2: ARCHEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric Period</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paleoindian</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Prehistoric</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Period</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European, Mexican, and Anglo-American Exploration, Settlement, and Ranching</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States Military</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Investigations at Camp Bullis</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 3: METHODS OF INVESTIGATION</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Survey and Site Documentation</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Collected Artifacts</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival Research</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 4: SITE DESCRIPTIONS</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newly Recorded Sites</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1346</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1347</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1348</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1349</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1350</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1351</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1352</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1353</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1354</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1355</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1356</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1357</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1358</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1359</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1360</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1361</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1362</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1363</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1364</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii
Previously Recorded Sites

CHAPTER 5: DESCRIPTION OF ARTIFACTS

Prehistoric Artifacts
Dart Points
Bulverde
# LIST OF FIGURES

1. Project location map ........................................................................................................... 2

   Collins (1995), and Black and McGraw (1985) ......................................................................... 6

3. Survey areas .......................................................................................................................... 18

4. Plan of 41BX1355 ................................................................................................................... 27

5. The West End Shooting Club, or Schuetzenverein, ca. 1913 .................................................. 28

6. Photographs of the clubhouse at 41BX1355 ............................................................................. 29

7. Plan of 41BX1359 ................................................................................................................... 33

8. Photographs of the bunker at 41BX1359 ................................................................................ 34

9. Schematic of battery emplacement such as that at 41BX1360 ................................................ 36

10. Plan of 41BX1394 and photograph of trough cut into bedrock ............................................. 42

11. Plan of 41CM242 ................................................................................................................ 48

12. Photograph of the headstone at 41CM242 ............................................................................ 50

13. Plat of the Maria de la Luz Guerra Survey showing the location of 41CM242 ..................... 51

14. Plan of 41BX397 ................................................................................................................... 59

15. Photographs of standing structures at 41BX397 ................................................................... 60

16. Artesian well and steam engine at 41BX397 ......................................................................... 62

17. Henry Schmidt house at 41BX397 ....................................................................................... 62

18. Photograph of the Lewis Ranch house at 41BX1024 ............................................................. 69

19. Plan of 41CM95 ................................................................................................................... 77

20. Typed dart points .................................................................................................................. 87

21. Untyped dart points ............................................................................................................ 91

22. Arrow points ......................................................................................................................... 95

23. Plat showing tracts associated with the Henry Smith Family and the location
   of 41CM242 ........................................................................................................................ 122

24. Photographs of the Smith Log House ................................................................................... 123

25. Photograph of the second Smith residence .......................................................................... 125

26. Photographs of the third Smith residence .......................................................................... 126

27. Plat of the Harriet E. Savery Nicholson Smith homestead tract ........................................... 127
LIST OF TABLES

1. Metric data for dart points ................................................................. 84
2. Metric data for arrow points ............................................................... 94
3. Metric data for bifaces ........................................................................ 96
4. Provenience of collected historic artifacts ........................................... 99
5. National Register eligibility recommendations for newly recorded sites ........................................... 106
6. National Register eligibility recommendations for previously recorded sites ....................................... 107
ABSTRACT

A pedestrian archeological survey covering 3,255 acres (1,317 hectares) was conducted at the Camp Bullis Military Reservation in Bexar and Comal Counties, Texas, during October–December 1999 and April–May 2000, by personnel from Prewitt and Associates, Inc. The investigations resulted in the documentation of 39 new archeological sites consisting of 28 sites with only prehistoric components, 8 sites with only historic components, and 3 sites with both prehistoric and historic components. Twenty-six previously recorded sites were re-recorded and reassessed as well: 17 prehistoric sites, 4 historic sites, and 5 sites with prehistoric and historic components.

Three new historic sites (41BX1355, 41BX1359, and 41BX1394) and one new prehistoric site (the burned rock midden at 41CM242) are considered eligible for National Register listing. In addition, two previously recorded prehistoric sites (the thick deposits at 41BX425 and the burned rock midden at 41BX1044) and two previously recorded historic sites 41BX397 and 41BX1211 are reassessed as eligible. The remaining 35 new sites and 22 previously recorded sites are considered ineligible.
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INTRODUCTION

From October to December 1999 and April to May 2000, personnel from Prewitt and Associates, Inc., conducted an intensive pedestrian survey of 3,255 acres (1,317 hectares) at Camp Bullis, Texas. This survey covered selected areas as part of the management requirements associated with the Integrated Training Area Management (ITAM) program utilized by the natural resources conservation office at Camp Bullis Military Reservation. Camp Bullis, a subinstallation of nearby Fort Sam Houston, encompasses ca. 28,000 acres (11,200 hectares) of northern Bexar County and southern Comal County (Figure 1). The work presented in this report was conducted in compliance with Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended through 1992 (P.L. 89-665 et seq.).

The remaining portion of Chapter 1 contains information on the environmental background of the survey area, including geology, Quaternary geomorphology, climate, and fauna and flora. This is followed by Chapter 2 with a synopsis of the archeological and historical backgrounds of Central Texas, focusing on the immediate project area, and a description of previous investigations at Camp Bullis. Chapter 3 details objectives and methods for the current investigations, while Chapters 4 and 5 present descriptions of the sites investigated and the artifacts collected. Chapter 6 concludes the body of the report with assessments and recommendations for the sites recorded. The two appendixes present information concerning the history of land ownership by the Henry M. Smith family adjacent to the north edge of Camp Bullis and the development of the film industry in the San Antonio area during the early twentieth century.

GEOLOGY

The Camp Bullis Military Reservation is located in northern Bexar County and extends into southern Comal County. This places it along the Balcones fault zone (which marks the southern and eastern boundary of the Edwards Plateau) adjacent to the Blackland Prairie to the southeast and the south Texas plain to the southwest (Arbingast et al. 1973). The Balcones fault zone is a band of northeast-southwest-trending faults that were active during the Miocene Epoch. Fault blocks generally are downthrown to the southeast, a result of the uplift of the Edwards Plateau with respect to the Blackland Prairie and the Gulf Coastal Plain (Maslyk and Kibler 1998).

Geologic units at Camp Bullis consist of the Lower Cretaceous Edwards and Glen Rose Formations. The Edwards Formation is present in the southeastern portion of the reservation and is composed of fine- to coarse-grained limestones with abundant chert. Solution cavities and collapsed breccia are common (Barnes 1983). The Glen Rose Formation, older than the Edwards, is prevalent in the rest of Camp Bullis and consists of limestone, dolomite, and marl that form the characteristic stairstep or bench topography. This topography occurs because of the alternating resistant and recessive bedding and differing rates of erosion. Chert is lacking in this formation. Elevations within the project area are slightly higher within the area composed of the Glen Rose Formation.

QUATERNARY GEOMORPHOLOGY

The rugged and highly dissected landscape of Camp Bullis is the result of millions of years
Figure 1. Project location map.
of erosion. The uplift of the Edwards Plateau during the late Tertiary created knick points that plateau-draining streams have been wearing down since the Miocene. Two intermittent upland tributaries of the San Antonio River—Cibolo and Salado Creeks—drain Camp Bullis. Cibolo Creek and its tributary Meusebach Creek drain the northern one-third of Camp Bullis, while Salado Creek and its tributaries Lewis Creek and Panther Springs Creek drain the southern two-thirds. Faulting has strongly influenced the development of these drainages by directing groundwater to seeps and springs, exposing formations of varying resistances, and controlling gradients. All but the largest drainages are usually deep and narrow, and they often are scoured to bedrock and devoid of thick alluvial deposits. Overhangs or rockshelters may form along these drainages where more-resistant bedrock units overlie less-resistant units. Karst features, such as solution cavities and sinkholes, are common in the northwestern and southeastern portions of Camp Bullis.

Relatively thick alluvial deposits are present only as discontinuous segments of terrace and floodplain deposits within the valleys of Cibolo, Salado, and Lewis Creeks (e.g., Quigg 1988). Sediments are delivered to these drainages through sheetwash and other colluvial processes acting on the uplands and valley wall slopes. In the larger drainages, colluvial sediments often interfinger with alluvial sediments along the more-distal portions of the valley's floodplain. Depositional environments on the uplands and valley slopes are rare. These surfaces most often are nonaggrading or erosional with thin gravelly soils (Kibler and Gardner 1997).

Soils throughout Camp Bullis belong to the Tarrant-Brackett association (Taylor et al. 1962:2). Though a variety of soil series and types are included in this association, the thin, gravelly, calcareous Tarrant and Brackett soils are predominant. Reddish brown and gravelly Crawford and Bexar soils occupy lower valley slopes, while Lewisville silty clay, Trinity, Krum, and Frio soils occupy the narrow and small alluvial terraces and floodplains.

CLIMATE

The climate in south-central Texas is classified as modified humid subtropical with hot summers and mild winters (Natural Fibers Information Center 1987). Mean daily minimum and maximum temperatures for July are 74°F and 95°F, respectively, while mean minimum and maximum temperatures in January are 39°F and 62°F. The mean annual precipitation for Bexar County is 73.9 cm (29.1 inches), with most of the precipitation occurring from May to June and from August to October (Boyd et al. 1990).

FAUNA AND FLORA

Camp Bullis is located along the southern margin of the Balconian biotic province (Blair 1950). This area is characterized by an intermixture of faunal elements from the Austroriparian, Tamaulipan, Chihuahuan, and Kansan provinces. Because the Edwards Plateau is a physiographically discrete unit, vegetation is different from adjacent provinces. The most characteristic combination of plants is a scrub forest of juniper (Juniperus ashei), Texas oak (Quercus texana), live oak (Q. virginiana), and various other less numerous species that are found throughout the area (Blair 1950). Mesquite (Prosopis sp.) also is distributed throughout the area, and along with live oak, becomes more prevalent to the west. Riparian areas are occupied by mesic forests of live oak, cedar elm (Ulmus crassifolia), hackberry (Celtis laevigata), and pecan (Carya illinoinensis). Some of this vegetation has been noted in ethnographic literature (Texas oak, live oak, pecan, mountain laurel [Sophora secundiflora], and garita [Berberis trifoliolata], among others), while others are more-recent "invader" species (juniper and mesquite) expanding into the area influenced by overgrazing, suppression of natural range fires, and landscape alterations caused by live fire exercises.

The four adjacent provinces—along with the diverse habitats and microenvironments along the edge of the Edwards Plateau—all contribute to the unique faunal assemblage within the Balconian province (Lundelius 1967). Since Camp Bullis has not been open to most types of development, the faunal habitat has not been severely impacted and the area has in many ways acted as a wildlife refuge (Boyd et al. 1990; Freese and Nichols, Inc. 1977). Species currently noted in the area include white-tailed deer (Odocoileus virginianus), coyote (Canis latrans),
gray fox (*Urocyon cinereorargenteus*), bobcat (*Lynx rufus*), raccoon (*Procyon lotor*), turkey (*Meleagris gallopavo*), striped skunk (*Mephitis mephitis*), fox squirrel (*Sciurus niger*), and eastern cottontail rabbit (*Sylvilagus floridanus*), as well as 49 other mammals, 36 species of snake, and 16 species of lizard (Blair 1950). Other species that were present and economically important in prehistoric times include bison (*Bison bison*), pronghorn antelope (*Antilocapra americana*), and black bear (*Ursus americanus*) (Maslyk and Kibler 1998).
ARCHEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

PREHISTORIC PERIOD

The prehistoric cultural sequence for Central Texas can be divided into the three broad periods of Paleoindian, Archaic, and Late Prehistoric, although the terms Neoarchaic (Prewitt 1981, 1985) and Post-Archaic (Johnson and Goode 1994) have been used at times in place of the term Late Prehistoric. Thorough overviews of these periods are provided by Black (1989:25–32), Collins (1995), and Hines (1993), with Hines focusing more on the chronological sequence of the prehistoric cultural resources in the area surrounding Camp Bullis. A prehistoric cultural-historical framework incorporating more-discrete temporal and technological units has been delineated and defined by Prewitt (1981, 1985) (Figure 2). More recently, Johnson and Goode (1994) and Collins (1995) have presented revised cultural chronologies of the region and at the same time discontinued use of the term “phase” to describe each cultural-historical unit; they have opted for named intervals or patterns based on diagnostic projectile point styles and associated radiocarbon assays (e.g., Martindale-Uvalde interval) within each period or subperiod. More applicable to the Camp Bullis area is a series of local prehistoric periods for the upper Salado Creek drainage basin defined by Black and McGraw (1985:321–326) (see Figure 2). Although these sequences chronologically group and order archeological assemblages (primarily projectile point styles) and site components, a common criticism is that these temporal-stylistic units, intervals, or patterns do not specifically address cultural processes, such as the adaptive strategies utilized by certain (ethnic) groups in a particular territory at a certain period of time (Black 1989:35; Collins 1995:362; Ellis et al. 1995). Despite this criticism, the following summary of the three periods of Central Texas prehistory is based on Collins’s (1995) sequence, with appropriate references to the local periods of Black and McGraw (1985).

Paleoindian

The Paleoindian period (11,500–8800 B.P.) represents the earliest known cultural manifestation in North America. Sites and isolated artifacts from this period are fairly common across Central Texas. This period often is described as having been characterized by small, but highly mobile bands of foragers who were specialized hunters of Pleistocene megafauna. However, a more accurate view of Paleoindian lifeways probably includes the utilization of a much wider array of resources. Recent investigations at the Wilson-Leonard site (41WM235) support this view and have challenged the fundamental defining criterion of the period, that of artifacts in association with late Pleistocene megafauna (Masson and Collins 1995).

Environmental conditions during the Paleoindian period presented early inhabitants with a much different array of resources than presently available. Nordt et al. (1994) view this period as a transition between cooler and moister late Pleistocene conditions and warmer and drier Holocene conditions. They estimate that grasses tolerant of more-arid conditions steadily increased throughout this period. Toomey et al. (1993) also see this time as a period of transition, with summer temperatures increasing rapidly but still 2–3°C below modern values. Toomey et al. (1993) suggest that effective moisture decreased around 14,000 B.P.
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and then increased, peaking at ca. 10,500 B.P.
Collins (1995) divides the Paleoindian period into early and late subperiods. The early subperiod consists of two projectile point style intervals, Clovis and Folsom. Clovis chipped stone artifact assemblages—including the diagnostic fluted lanceolate Clovis point—were produced by bifacial, flake, and prismatic-blade techniques on high-quality and oftentimes exotic lithic materials (Collins 1990). Along with chipped stone artifacts, Clovis assemblages include engraved stones, bone and ivory points, stone bolas, and ochre (Collins 1995:381; Collins et al. 1992). Analyses of Clovis artifacts and site types suggest that Clovis peoples were well-adapted, generalized hunter-gatherers. They had the technology to hunt larger game but they did not solely rely on it. In contrast, Folsom tool kits consisting of fluted Folsom points, thin unfluted (Midland) points, large thin bifaces, and end scrapers are more indicative of specialized hunting, particularly of bison (Collins 1995:382).

Spanning the end of the early and initial late Paleoindian subperiods are several projectile point styles for which temporal, technological, or cultural significance is unclear. Included are Plainview points, a type name typically given any unfluted, lanceolate dart point. However, Collins (1995:382) has noted that these points do not parallel Plainview points from the type site in thinness and flaking technology. Also problematic are the chronological position and cultural significance of Dalton and San Patrice dart points. The succeeding late Paleoindian subperiod includes three projectile point style intervals spanning the period from ca. 10,000 to 8800 B.P.: Wilson, Golondrina-Barber, and St. Mary’s Hall. Components and artifact and feature assemblages of these three intervals appear to be Archaic-like in nature and in many ways may represent a transition between early Paleoindian and succeeding Archaic periods (Collins 1995:382).

Archaic

The Archaic period (8800 to 1300–1200 B.P.) generally is believed to represent a shift toward the hunting and gathering of a wider array of animal and plant resources and a decrease in group mobility (Willey and Phillips 1958:107–108), although such changes probably were well under way by the beginning of the Archaic. Throughout the ca. 7,600-year-long period, major climatic changes probably presented Archaic populations with varying subsistence challenges. The Archaic generally is divided into Early, Middle, and Late Archaic periods (Black 1989; Collins 1995; Story 1985:28–29). Each subperiod includes several temporal-stylistic units or intervals based on diagnostic projectile point styles and associated radiocarbon assays (Collins 1995).

Early Archaic (8800–6000 B.P.) sites are small and their tool assemblages are diverse (Weir 1976:115–122), suggesting that populations were highly mobile and densities low (Prewitt 1985:217). It has been noted that Early Archaic sites are concentrated along the eastern and southern margins of the Edwards Plateau (Johnson and Goode 1994; McKinney 1981). This distribution may be indicative of climatic conditions at the time, as these environments have many more-reliable water sources and a diverse subsistence base. Microfaunal records and sedimentary evidence from stream valleys and along the eastern Edwards Plateau depict a climatic regime in flux, from mesic conditions during the beginning of the Early Archaic to extremely xeric and back to mildly xeric conditions at the end of the subperiod (Collins et al. 1990; Toomey et al. 1993).

Three projectile point style intervals are recognized: Angostura; Early Split Stem, including Gower and Jetta; and Martindale-Uvalde. Manos, metates, hammerstones, Clear Fork and Guadalupe bifaces, and a variety of other bifacial and unifacial tools are common to all three intervals. The construction and use of rock hearths and ovens reflect a specialized subsistence strategy (exploitation of roots and tubers?) during the Early Archaic. These burned rock features most likely represent the technological predecessors of the larger burned rock middens extensively used later in the Archaic period (Collins 1995:383).

During the Middle Archaic period (6000–4000 B.P.), the number and distribution of sites, as well as site size, increased due to probable increases in population densities (Prewitt 1981:73; Weir 1976:124, 135). Macrobands may have formed at least seasonally, or an increased number of small groups may have utilized the same sites for longer periods of time (Weir 1976:130–131). A greater reliance on plant foods
is suggested by the presence of burned rock middens toward the end of the Middle Archaic, although tool kits still imply a strong reliance on hunting (Prewitt 1985:222–226). Three projectile point style intervals make up the Middle Archaic: Bell-Andice-Calf Creek, Taylor, and Nolan-Travis. The Bell-Andice-Calf Creek and Taylor intervals reflect a shift in lithic technology from the preceding Martindale-Uvalde interval (Collins 1995:384). Johnson and Goode (1994:25) suggest that the Bell-Andice-Calf Creek interval represents an influx of bison hunting groups from the Eastern Woodland margins into the Central Texas region during a slightly more-mesic period. Bison disappeared as more-xeric conditions returned during the later Nolan-Travis interval. The style change represents another shift in lithic technology (Collins 1995:384; Johnson and Goode 1994:27). Prewitt (personal communication 1997) postulates that the production and morphology of Travis and Nolan points are similar to projectile points from the Lower Pecos region. Such characteristics as beveled stems and overall morphology may have originated in the Lower Pecos, since their presence there predates their appearance in Central Texas. The accompanying change to more-xeric conditions bears witness to the construction and use of burned rock middens. Johnson and Goode (1994:26) believe that the dry conditions promoted the spread of xerophytic plants, such as yucca and sotol, and that these plants were collected and cooked in large rock ovens by late Middle Archaic peoples.

Both Collins (1995) and Johnson and Goode (1994) recognize a period of extreme aridity in Central Texas during the Archaic period and postulate that the construction and use of burned rock middens were probable responses to these xeric conditions. However, Collins (1995) (as well as Nordt et al. [1994] and Toomey et al. [1993]) views these xeric conditions as the culmination of a continual decrease in effective moisture since the end of the Pleistocene, while Johnson and Goode (1994) do not. In addition, Johnson and Goode (1994) believe the period of aridity (their Edwards interval) occurred slightly later, at ca. 4250–2550 B.P., compared to Collins’s (1995) much longer Altithermal climate at 5500–6800 and 5500–3000 B.P. (also cf. Nordt et al. [1994] and Toomey et al. [1993]).

During the succeeding Late Archaic period (4000 to 1300–1200 B.P.) populations continued to increase (Prewitt 1985:217). The establishment of large cemeteries along drainages suggests strong territorial ties by certain groups (Story 1985:40). Xeric conditions continued, but became more mesic ca. 3500–2500 B.P. The Late Archaic period consists of six projectile point style intervals (Collins 1995:376): Bulverde, Pedernales-Kinney, Lange-Marshall-Williams, Marcos-Montell-Castroville, Ensor-Frio-Fairland, and Darl. Johnson and Goode (1994:29–35) divide the Late Archaic into two parts, Late Archaic I and Late Archaic II, based on increased population densities and evidence of Eastern Woodland ceremonial rituals and religious ideological influences. Middle Archaic subsistence technology, including the use of burned rock middens, continued into the Late Archaic period. Collins (1995:384) states that during the Pedernales-Kinney interval the construction and use of burned rock middens reached its zenith and that their use declined during the latter half of the Late Archaic. However, mounting chronological data suggest that midden formation and use culminated much later, during the Ensor-Frio-Fairland and Darl intervals, and that this high level of use continued into the early Late Prehistoric period (Black et al. 1997; Kleinbach et al. 1995:795). A picture of prevalent burned rock midden use in the eastern part of the Central Texas region after 2000 B.P. is gradually becoming clear. This scenario parallels the widely recognized occurrence of post-2000 B.P. middens in the western reaches of the Edwards Plateau (see Goode 1991). The use of burned rock middens appears to have been a major part of the subsistence strategy as a decrease in the importance of hunting—inferrred from the low ratio of projectile points to other tools in site assemblages—may have occurred (Prewitt 1981:74).

Late Prehistoric

The Late Prehistoric period (1300–1200 to 300 B.P.) is marked by the introduction of the bow and arrow and, later, ceramics into the region, probably from the north (Prewitt 1985:228). Population densities dropped considerably from their Late Archaic peak (Prewitt 1985:217). Subsistence strategies did not differ greatly from the preceding period, although bison became an important economic resource.
during the latter part of the Late Prehistoric period (Prewitt 1981:74). The use of burned rock middens for plant food processing continued throughout the Late Prehistoric period (Black et al. 1997; Goode 1991; Kleinbach et al. 1995:795). Horticulture came into play very late in the region but was of minor importance to the overall subsistence strategy (Collins 1995:385).

In Central Texas the Late Prehistoric period generally is associated with the Austin and Toyah phases (Jelks 1962; Prewitt 1981:82–84); however, both phases have a much wider application. Austin and Toyah phase horizon markers—Scollorn-Edwards and Perdiz arrow points, respectively—are distributed across most of the state. The introduction of Scollorn and Edwards arrow points into Central Texas often was marked by evidence of violence and conflict, as many excavated burials from this period indicate that these points were the cause of death (Prewitt 1981:83). Subsistence strategies and technologies (other than arrow points) did not change much from the preceding Late Archaic. This continuity is recognized by Prewitt’s (1981) use of the term “Neoarchaic.” In fact, Johnson and Goode (1994:39–40) and Collins (1995:385) state that the break between the Late Archaic and the Late Prehistoric could be easily and appropriately represented by the break between the Austin and Toyah phases.

Around 1000–750 B.P., slightly more-xeric climatic conditions returned to the region and bison returned in large numbers (Huebner 1991; Tomney et al. 1993). Utilizing this vast resource were Toyah phase peoples equipped with Perdiz tipped arrows, end scrapers, four-beveled-edge knives, and plain bone-tempered ceramics. The technology and subsistence strategies of the Toyah phase represent a completely different tradition than the preceding Austin phase. Collins (1995:388) states that burned rock middens fell out of use as bison hunting and group mobility obtained a level of importance not witnessed since Folsom times. While the importance of bison hunting and high group mobility can hardly be disputed, the cessation of burned rock midden use during the Toyah phase is tenuous. A recent examination of Toyah-age radiocarbon assays and assemblages by Black et al. (1997) suggests that their association with burned rock middens represents more than a thin veneer capping Archaic-age features. Black et al. (1997) claim that burned rock midden use, while not as prevalent as in preceding periods, played a role in the adaptive strategies of Toyah peoples.

HISTORIC PERIOD

Native Americans

Historical accounts of Native Americans and their interactions with citizens of Spain, the Republics of Mexico and Texas, and the United States throughout the region are provided by Campbell and Campbell (1981), Campbell (1988), Hester (1989), and Newcomb (1961). Collins (1995:386) divides this period into three subperiods. The first subperiod, beginning in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, was an era of more-permanent contact between Europeans and Native Americans as the Spanish moved northward out of present-day Mexico to establish settlements and missions on their northern frontier. There is little available information on aboriginal groups and their ways of life except for fragmentary data gathered by the Spanish missionaries. In the San Antonio and South Texas areas, these groups have been referred to collectively as Coahuiltecans because of an assumed similar way of life. However, many individual groups may have existed (Campbell 1988). One particular Coahuiltecan group, the Payaya, has been identified as occupying the Camp Bullis area in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Campbell 1988:108–110). The Camp Bullis and San Antonio areas also served as points of contact between the southward-advancing Apaches and the Spanish, with other native groups often caught in between. Simultaneously, Native American groups such as the Jumano, Cholome, Caynaaya, and Cibola were moving into the area in reaction to the intrusion of Apaches into the Trans-Pecos area (Campbell 1988:74, 144; Ricklis and Collins 1994:24). The inevitable and disastrous impacts to native social structures and economic systems by disease and hostile encounters with Europeans and intruding groups, such as the Apache, already were under way at this time.

The second subperiod extends from the establishment of the mission system in the 1720s to its ultimate demise around 1800. Some indigenous groups moved peacefully into mission life, giving up their nomadic hunting and
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gathering ways. Others were forced in or moved in to escape the increasingly hostile actions of southwestern-moving Apaches and Comanches. The southern Camp Bullis area was near Monte Galvan, an extensive ranch associated with Mission San Antonio de Valero (the Alamo) (McGraw 1991:149–151) tentatively identifies 41BX160, ca. 6.7 km south of Camp Bullis, as the ranch headquarters for Monte Galvan. Many of the Payaya lived at Mission San Antonio de Valero, but, due to a high mortality rate, their numbers declined rapidly (Campbell 1988:106). By the end of the eighteenth century, many Native American groups had been decimated by European expansion and disease, and by intrusive Native American groups. The small number of surviving Payaya were acculturated into mission life. The last reference to the Payaya was recorded in 1789 in the last days of Mission San Antonio de Valero (Campbell 1988:98).

Meanwhile, intrusive groups such as the Tonkawa, Apache, and Comanche had moved into the region to fill the void. Few sites attributable to these groups, outside of mission sites, have been investigated. Many aboriginal ways of life continued even after contact with the Spanish. For example, the manufacture of stone tools continued for many groups even after settling in the missions (Fox 1979). The third subperiod, from 1800 to the latter half of the nineteenth century, witnessed the final decimation of the Native American groups and the defeat and removal of the Apaches and Comanches to reservations by the United States.

European, Mexican, and Anglo-American Exploration, Settlement, and Ranching

European exploration and settlement of the Central Texas region began in the early eighteenth century with the establishment of missions by the Spanish. Settlement by Mexicans, Anglo-Americans, Germans, and others followed. All of these groups had a profound and unique impact on the history of the area, which is summarized by Fox (1989). Studies pertaining to exploration and settlement of the Camp Bullis area are provided by Boyd et al. (1990), Freeman (1994a), and Gerstle et al. (1978).

Spanish exploration into the Camp Bullis area began as early as 1716, when Don Domingo Ramon explored the headwaters of the San Antonio River. In 1718, the Mission San Antonio de Valero was established downstream along the San Antonio River. Between 1720 and 1731, the Missions San José and San Miguel de Aguayo, Nuestra Señora de la Purisima Concepción de Acuña, San Juan Capistrano, San Francisco de la Espada, Villa San Antonio de Bexar, and presidio San Antonio de Bexar also were founded along the San Antonio River (Campbell 1988:82; Hudson et al. 1974:9). Collectively, these settlements were the beginning of modern San Antonio. By the middle of the eighteenth century, there was a considerable Spanish presence and movement throughout northern Bexar County along the Camino Real. The Pinta Trail, which ran northwest from San Antonio to the San Saba River (following the Salado Creek valley for a portion of the trail’s distance), may have been used by Spanish and Native American groups as early as the mid-eighteenth century (Freeman 1994b:93).

Interest in the Camp Bullis area was signaled by land surveys made by John C. “Jack” Hays for Madison James and Nathaniel Lewis in the late 1830s. Lewis subsequently sold a portion of his land in the Salado Creek–Comanche Springs area of Camp Bullis to John O. Meusebach in 1847. Meusebach sold the property in 1853 to Henry Habermann, who constructed the Comanche Springs house (41BX420). Meusebach moved to a new location north and farther up the Salado Creek valley, into what is today the Outer Cantonment of neighboring Camp Stanley (Freeman 1994a:47). By 1853, Meusebach had been instrumental in laying out a road that led from his new home eastward through modern-day Camp Bullis to New Braunfels (Freeman 1994a:49–50). Meusebach’s Road, as it became known, served as an important route for German immigrants moving into the region.

The end of the Civil War, a subsequent boom in the livestock industry, and the removal of the Comanches to reservations had a major impact on settlement in the Camp Bullis area (Freeman 1994a:55). During the latter half of the nineteenth century, land north and south of Cibolo Creek in the Camp Bullis area was occupied by several cattle, sheep, and goat ranches (some with absentee landowners) as well as by stock farms. German families included the Henry Habermanns at Comanche Springs...
(41BX420); Robert and Maria Pfeiffer and, later, William Gerfers in the eastern part of present-day Camp Bullis (41BX820); Gustavus Hoerle and Henry Fink at 41BX432; and George and Christoph Pfeiffer at 41BX397 (Freeman 1994a:51, 56–57, 59–64). In addition, a number of Anglo-Americans settled in the area. The Henry Smith family, for example, established the Dripping Springs Ranch in Comal County immediately north of present-day Camp Bullis (Appendix A), while William Parrish developed a ranch to the south in the vicinity of 41BX432 that he later sold to Hoerle and Fink. Nathaniel Lewis, while a resident of San Antonio, probably had hands living on his ranch in Lewis Valley; and John Wesley Eckles operated a ranch in the vicinity of 41CM95 on the Cibolo in the 1880s (Freeman 1994a: 50–51, 55–56, 64–65).

By the turn of the century, many of the large ranches had failed and/or were subdivided and sold, leading to the establishment of more small German family farms in the area. In addition, one Anglo-American operation was owned by Bassie Yates Hudson, who was attracted to the picturesque qualities of the Hill Country and whose financial backing derived from the new oil industry of the 1920s (Freeman 1994a:68, 80). Numerous small family farms or larger ranches within the current Camp Bullis boundaries date from the last quarter of the nineteenth century up to the 1940s and are known from the archeological and archival records (see Boyd et al. 1990; Freeman 1994a; Gerstle et al. 1978). Associated archeological sites include the Panther Springs Ranch house (41BX820), P. Doppenschmidt housesite (41BX434), E. Georg housesite (41CM97), C. Grossner housesite (41BX394), A. Schmidt housesite (41BX398), Pfeuffer-H. Schmidt housesite (41BX397), and W. Schmidt housesite (41BX433). Archeological remains at these sites consist of foundations and the remains of houses, sheds, water troughs, wells, and other outbuildings and structures, along with ceramic and glass sherds, wire nails, and other metal artifacts. Records suggest that these individuals were engaged in ranching or small-scale farming activities. In addition, some families contracted with the Leon Springs Military Reservation to break and train horses and to provide cordwood and hay for the facility (Freeman 1994a:75). By the 1940s, their properties were acquired by the military, bringing an end to the ranching and farming history of Camp Bullis.

**The United States Military**

United States military activity in the Camp Bullis area began in 1906 with the purchase of over 17,000 acres from all or parts of six ranches (Freeman 1994c:9). The largest acquisitions came from the Oppenheimer and Schasse Ranches in the northern and western portions of Camp Bullis. This area was designated the Leon Springs Military Reservation and was to be used as a maneuvers and training area for troops based at Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio. Leon Springs was praised for its sparse population and varied terrain (Manguso 1990:5). Use of the new training area began almost immediately. In July and August 1907, the target ranges (41BX118 and 41BX123) in present-day Camp Stanley were used for the Southwestern Rifle and Pistol Competition. The first major maneuvers were held in 1908, involving regular army and National Guard infantry, cavalry, and field artillery units (Manguso 1990:11, 17). In 1909, the Leon Springs Military Reservation witnessed the first documented firing of artillery. Mobilization of troops in response to upheavals in Mexico in 1911 led to large-scale maneuvers at the Leon Springs Military Reservation. With the increased tensions along the United States–Mexico border between 1912 and 1916, however, activity at the Reservation decreased as troops from Fort Sam Houston were deployed along the border. Activity increased again in 1916, as large numbers of troops were called up for training after the raid of Columbus, New Mexico, by Pancho Villa. Also in 1916, a large remount station was built near Anderson Hill in present-day Camp Stanley (Manguso 1990:21).

In February 1917, the facilities at the reservation were renamed Camp Funston in honor of Major General Frederick Funston. In preparation for World War I, Camp Funston established the First Officers Training Camp (FOTC) in May 1917 (Manguso 1990:23). Drills and training at the FO TC included practice marches, target practice, and trench warfare training. Remnants of training trenches are present at sites 41BX1163/1189 and 41BX1235 in present-day Camp Stanley (Kibler et al. 1998; Scott et al. 1998), and more World War I-era trenches recently have been identified at
41BX1322 on Camp Bullis (Cestaro et al. 2000). Officers of the FOTC graduated in August 1917, after which a Second Series Officer Training Camp began (Manguso 1990:23, 33). Facilities or improvements presently located within Camp Bullis and related to this period of training consist of bombproofs, earthen and heavy timber shelters, and bullrings overlooking the Salado Creek valley (Freeman 1994c:18).

To avoid confusion with another base of the same name, Camp Funston was renamed Camp Stanley in October 1917; additional land to the south was leased and named Camp Bullis in honor of Brigadier General John Lapham Bullis (Manguso 1990:33). The Camp Bullis cantonment was located across Salado Creek from the old Scheele Ranch. Training facilities at Camp Bullis included cavalry camps, maneuver grounds, and target ranges (Freeman 1994c:14). Construction of permanent facilities was limited to a camp headquarters, an administrative building, and spaces for rows of mess halls and tents. The 315th Engineer Regiment of the 90th Division constructed rifle ranges and a pistol range between Hogan Ridge and Salado Creek that could easily accommodate 3,000–4,000 men (Manguso 1990:33).

Between World Wars I and II, Camp Bullis grew significantly in size. The leased properties of Camp Bullis and additional adjacent properties were purchased. In addition, 1,760 acres of Camp Stanley (primarily the inner cantonment of present-day Camp Stanley) were transferred to the Chief of Ordnance for the San Antonio Arsenal, which was located in the City of San Antonio to the south. The remaining area, formerly known as the Leon Springs Military Reservation, was transferred to Camp Bullis (Freeman 1994c:58; Manguso 1990:47). During this period, infantry and engineering units of the 2d Division and other troop units in the San Antonio area used Camp Bullis. Training and drills by the Citizens Military Training Camp (CMTC) and the Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) also took place at Camp Bullis. Troops took part in target and combat practice, firing Stokes mortars, and maneuvering in regiment-sized units (Freeman 1994c:18).

Starting in 1937, the 2d Division tested new divisional structures meant to increase mobility and flexibility through mechanization and motorization (Manguso 1990:63). These tests, featured in LIFE Magazine (14 August 1939:46–47) and employing the use of antitank units and the 6th Infantry Regiment, lasted through 1939. The resulting concept, known as the Triangular Division, was built around three infantry regiments and gave commanders at each level of organization, from platoon to division, three forces to face enemy units: one to confront the enemy, one to maneuver and outflank the enemy, and one to exploit enemy failures or weaknesses and act as a reserve. In 1939, Army Chief of Staff General George C. Marshall ordered that the triangular division design be adopted for all infantry divisions (Hawkins and Carafano 1997:4). The formal reorganization of the 2d Division included the addition of the 38th Infantry Regiment, two artillery battalions, and a change from 75-mm to 105-mm howitzers (Manguso 1990:67). In 1942 and 1943, the Triangular Division was replaced when the need for tank and other armored units became essential parts of division-sized units (Hawkins and Carafano 1997:5, Appendix C). Evidence of an intense period of training between World Wars I and II is evident in numerous training devices constructed across the base, including enclosed concrete or stone masonry bunkers (41BX824, 41BX1028, and 41BX1036) and artillery practice structures (41BX822, 41BX826, 41BX827, 41BX828, 41BX1237, and 41BX1238).

Camp Bullis also hosted a number of non-military activities prior to World War II. In 1926, portions of two movies—The Rough Riders and Wings—were filmed at the installation (Manguso 1990:57). The Rough Riders was filmed using troops of the 1st and 5th Cavalry regiments as extras. Palmtree Hill, which was stormed by the troops, was planted with palm trees to resemble San Juan Hill in Cuba. The flying fields at Camp Bullis were used in the production of Wings, the winner of the first Academy Award for best picture.

In the early 1930s, Camp Bullis was one of many military installations across the country used for the organization of Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) personnel (Freeman 1994c:19). Personnel from the CCC, as well as the Works Progress Administration (renamed Work Projects Administration in 1939 [WPA]), took part in the construction of some of the camp’s facilities during this period (Freeman 1994c:22).

As the war in Europe began, more and more
troops trained at Camp Bullis. This increased the need for a larger training facility that could accommodate more than one division. Properties to the east along Blanco Road and to the northwest were acquired by condemnation, and additional acreage north of Cibolo Creek was leased (Freeman 1994c:64–65; Manguso 1990:67; Rogers et al. 1940). Facilities constructed reflected changes in technology, tactics, and increased range of weapons. In addition, adding more tent slabs (Manguso 1990:75) increased the capacity of the cantonment area. A prisoner of war camp with a capacity for 200 prisoners was established north of the headquarters, and access to the camp was improved by the completion of Military Highway. Division-sized units trained at Camp Bullis until November 1943, after which the army did not activate any new divisions. Smaller units continued to train at Camp Bullis until the end of World War II (Manguso 1990:82). Toward the end of World War II, the Provost Marshal General School, including the Military Police Officer Candidate School, moved to Camp Bullis from Fort Sam Houston (Manguso 1990:82, 83).

After World War II there was less demand for the ranges and maneuver areas at Camp Bullis. The postwar period brought changes in infantry division weaponry that were incompatible with the size and location of the facility. Divisions used late-model M-4 Shermans and M-26 Pershings as well as antiaircraft artillery, which “could not be fired safely at Camp Bullis with service ammunition” (Manguso 1990:99). However, other developments at the end of the war made Camp Bullis an ideal facility for different activities. Personnel attached to the Government Tire Test used Camp Bullis and its shop facilities to invent and test tires, fuels, vehicles, and tanks for the military (Freeman 1994c:80–81). Medical training also became increasingly important, as Fort Sam Houston became the new home of the Medical Field Service School. Remote training facilities were set up at Camp Bullis so that personnel could practice field medical skills. Camp Bullis continues to train medical personnel in field procedures, as well as provide training facilities for army, army reserve, air force, and Texas National Guard personnel from the San Antonio area and outside the region.

Since the end of World War II, several land transfers have occurred. In 1953 ca. 2,040 acres (the majority of the outer cantonment of present-day Camp Stanley) were transferred from Camp Bullis to Camp Stanley, which in 1949 had become assigned to the Red River (Arsenal) Army Depot near Texarkana, Texas, as a support facility. An additional 204 acres were transferred to Camp Stanley in 1970. Since then, 464 acres have been transferred to the City of San Antonio and Bexar County for parks and roads.

**PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS AT CAMP BULLIS**

The earliest archeological investigations at Camp Bullis involved the excavation of 41BX36 in 1959 by Thomas C. Kelly (Gerstle et al. 1978:36). The site is a large burned rock midden that had been extensively looted prior to the controlled excavation of a 10x10-ft unit by Kelly. Site 41BX36 was again the subject of investigation when Thomas R. Hester recorded it in 1969 prior to its partial destruction by the construction of sewage settling ponds in the early 1970s. Preliminary analysis of the materials recovered indicated that the site was utilized from the late Paleoindian to the Late Prehistoric periods. Although much of the site had been destroyed, it was later deemed potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) (Gerstle et al. 1978:341).

The construction of two flood control dams at Camp Bullis on Salado and Lewis Creeks by the Soil Conservation Service prompted an archeological reconnaissance by the Texas Archeological Survey, The University of Texas at Austin (Dibble 1979). Two prehistoric sites consisting of scattered lithic debitage, burned rocks, and Perdiz, Scalorn, and Froo points were recorded. A third prehistoric site consisted of two small mounds of burned rocks, lithic debitage, and a Froo point. None of the sites were assigned trinomials.

The first of a number of large-scale archeological surveys occurred in 1977, when the Center for Archaeological Research, the University of Texas at San Antonio, conducted a stratified sample survey covering approximately 20 percent of Camp Bullis (5,604 acres) (Gerstle et al. 1978). Emphasis was placed on the documentation of prehistoric and historic nonmilitary sites. Sixty-two prehistoric and 9 historic sites were recorded. Nine of the prehistoric sites,
including 41BX377, witnessed limited subsurface testing.

A second archeological survey was conducted by Prewitt and Associates, Inc. (PAI), in 1988 (Quigg 1988). This survey covered 729 acres along portions of the Salado Creek valley and recorded eight prehistoric sites. In addition, 41BX36 was revisited and a prehistoric component at the Comanche Springs site (41BX420) was documented. Geomorphological investigations were also conducted during the survey, revealing that thick, fine-grained Holocene alluvial deposits in the Salado Creek valley are rare. Because this survey was limited to the Salado Creek floodplain, off-site shovel tests were employed as a method of site detection. Due to the nature of the thin deposits and sparse cultural materials, the shovel tests proved to be an ineffective and inefficient method for site detection.

The third major archeological survey was conducted by PAI in 1989 (Boyd et al. 1990). This survey covered 1,530 acres and recorded 18 prehistoric and 6 historic sites. Archival research about early settlement, military acquisition of the area, and the establishment of Camp Bullis in the early twentieth century also was conducted. In addition, two previously recorded prehistoric sites (41BX322 and 41BX420) were reinvestigated and three historic sites (41BX820, 41BX827, and 41BX828) outside of the designated survey areas were recorded. Eight of the sites investigated during this survey were military training facilities (e.g., defensive bunkers and grenade practice sites).

In 1994, PAI conducted a fourth large-scale archeological survey consisting of 3,688 acres (Kibler and Gardner 1997). This survey recorded 48 new sites and revisited and assessed 11 previously recorded sites. These 59 sites consisted of 45 prehistoric and 18 historic components. Fifteen of the 59 sites were recommended as potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. Preliminary geomorphological investigations were conducted to understand the role of depositional and erosional processes in site formation and the late Quaternary alluvial stratigraphy of Lewis and Cibolo Creeks. In addition, test excavations were conducted at 41BX377 along Cibolo Creek; these excavations delineated Early-Middle Archaic, Late Archaic, and Late Prehistoric components. Also during 1994, two historic contexts were produced for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers by Komatsu/Rangel, Inc., (Freeman 1994a, 1994b). These reports described the development of agriculture and ranching in the eastern Edwards Plateau (1845–1941) and the development of Camp Bullis as a military base from its inception in 1906 through the end of World War II. They also identified a number of previously unrecorded historic localities.

The fifth large archeological survey was conducted by PAI in 1996 (Maslyk and Kibler 1998). This survey covered 2,450 acres and recorded 20 new sites and revisited 4 previously recorded sites. Of the 24 sites investigated, 22 were prehistoric and 2 were historic military sites. One of the prehistoric sites (41BX1220), containing a double mound burned rock midden, was considered potentially eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. The project also noted the locations of chert sources, karst features, and seeps within the survey areas.

The sixth large survey was done by PAI in 1998 (Scott et al. 1999). About 1,925 acres were covered, and 20 new sites and 2 previously recorded sites were visited. These 22 sites contained 18 prehistoric components and 6 historic components. Of these, 3 were recommended as eligible or potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. Multicomponent site 41BX432 consisted of a prehistoric burned rock midden and a nineteenth-century ranch site. Two military bunkers (41BX1276 and 41BX1277) are associated with work by WPA personnel between 1938 and 1940 and probably were used for testing new battlefield tactics of the Triangular Division in 1939.

The latest large survey, of 2,302 acres, was done by PAI in 1999 (Cestaro et al. 2000). This survey recorded 25 new sites and revisited 2 sites. These contained 17 prehistoric components, 7 historic components, and 3 sites with both prehistoric and historic components. Sites 41BX1338 (a lithic scatter with a burned rock midden), 41BX1344 (a rockshelter), and 41BX1322 (World War I-era training trenches) were recommended as being eligible or potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. The remaining sites were considered ineligible.

Other smaller surveys conducted by PAI on Camp Bullis covered 125 acres (Scott 1997), 63 acres (Scott 1998), and 400 acres (Maslyk 1999). Of the 11 new sites and 3 revisited sites examined during these surveys, none were recommended as eligible for listing in the NRHP.
Three multidisciplinary studies of caves and karst features located on Camp Bullis also have included archeological investigations, resulting in documentation or revisiting of 16 archeological sites, of which 10 are historic and 8 are prehistoric (Veni et al. 1998a; 1998b; 1999).

Also completed recently by PAI at Camp Bullis were two seasons (December 1996–February 1997, and January–July 1998) of data recovery excavations at the Cibolo Crossing site, 41BX377 (Kibler and Scott 2000). The Cibolo Crossing site is a deeply stratified site situated on a terrace of Cibolo Creek. The artifacts, features, and other materials recovered represent seven defined components spanning the Paleoindian to Late Prehistoric periods. The site was used as a short-term, task-specific (possibly hunting) camp during the Paleoindian period and the first part of the Early Archaic period. Frequent flooding during the early Holocene rendered the locality undesirable in terms of a base camp or habitation site. By the middle Holocene, the terrace had aggraded to a level beyond the reach of all but the highest floods. At that time, late Early Archaic hunters and gatherers using Martindale dart points were occupying the site on a relatively long-term basis. Soon after, the surface of the site was severely eroded and subsequently occupied by early Middle Archaic hunters using Bell-Andice dart points, who also utilized the locality as a base camp. After a ca. 2,000–3,000-year absence, hunter-gatherers returned to the site during the Late Archaic period, using it in much the same way as the earlier occupants (i.e., as a habitation site where a variety of activities were conducted).

Archeological investigations also have been conducted recently at neighboring Camp Stanley (see Kibler et al. 1998; Scott et al. 1998). These archeological surveys covered ca. 3,116 acres, documenting 40 sites consisting of 21 prehistoric and 23 historic components. The prehistoric sites consist of 15 open campsites and 6 lithic scatters, while the historic sites are comprised of 18 sites related to military training and other activities. The remaining historic sites are associated with late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century agricultural and ranching activities. In addition to the archeological surveys, mapping and test excavations were conducted at 41BX1180 (a multi-component prehistoric site featuring a small burned rock midden) and 41BX1163/1189 (a network of World War I training trenches) (Scott et al. 1998).
METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

FIELD SURVEY AND SITE DOCUMENTATION

The investigations reported here consist of a 100-percent pedestrian survey of ca. 3,255 acres (Figure 3). Prior to fieldwork, archival research was conducted at the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory. Topographic maps, site reports, and site forms of previous investigations were reviewed to locate previously recorded sites within the project area. Site locations and areas to be surveyed were then recorded on photocopies of USGS 7.5-minute topographic maps to aid the field crews. Additional maps and information were obtained from personnel at Camp Bullis, assisting in the identification and interpretation of the cultural resources discovered during survey.

The survey areas included Training Areas 1A, 2A, 2C, 2D, 3C, and 5B. Site 41BX1048, an area of trenches and structures used for filming the 1926 Rough Riders movie also was examined. A crew of four people covered the areas by walking parallel transects at intervals of 30 m. On occasion, additional crew of one or two people aided in survey. The survey areas were divided into smaller, more-manageable parcels for surveying, with the orientation of the transects varying according to the shape and size of the parcel. The Project Archeologist kept a photocopy of an aerial photograph (1 inch = 660 ft) and a corresponding portion of a USGS 7.5-minute topographic map on which to plot each transect walked and any archeological sites, isolated artifacts, or natural features encountered. Additional copies of the survey area maps and aerial photos were provided to all the crew members to assist them during survey. Interpersonal communication was enhanced by the use of walkie-talkies provided to each member of the crew.

The definition of a prehistoric site for this survey is similar to those of previous investigations at Camp Bullis (e.g., Boyd et al. 1990; Kibler and Gardner 1997; Maslyk and Kibler 1998). If three or more artifacts were recovered within a 25-m-diameter area, the locality was recorded as an archeological site. Isolated finds of one or two artifacts were documented (but not collected) only if they were diagnostic (e.g., projectile points).

During the course of survey, new archeological sites were marked with biodegradable toilet tissue and then revisited for recording after the area survey was complete and the full extent of the site had been determined. When new sites were revisited for recording, the surrounding area was examined extensively for cultural materials.

Generally, each member of the crew was sent out to find flakes, tools, features, and other items of archeological interest. Each artifact was flagged with a piece of biodegradable tissue while diagnostic artifacts were collected and their locations highlighted by labeled flagging tape. Recording sites consisted of filling out a State of Texas Archeological Site Data Form, drawing a pace-and-compass sketch map, taking black-and-white photographs, and making various notes on site features. Artifact collections were limited to diagnostics found on the surface and all artifacts recovered from on-site shovel testing. Shovel tests were dug on sites with appreciable accumulations of sediment to determine site extent and integrity. The shovel tests were excavated in 20-cm levels and averaged 30x30 cm. All sediments were passed through 1/4-inch-mesh hardware cloth. A form
Figure 3. Survey areas.
was completed for each test, recording the presence or absence of artifacts, approximate artifact counts by level, and the nature of the sediments. Off-site shovel testing was not utilized extensively as a method of site detection, as most of the areas surveyed have good ground surface visibility and consist of ancient, eroded upland surfaces with little or no accumulations of Holocene sediments that could host buried archeological remains. However, shovel testing was done where Holocene deposits were observed, and some areas were identified where thick alluvium with the potential to contain deeply buried sites is present. As discussed in Chapter 6, trenching would be needed to identify any buried sites in these areas.

In recording lithic scatters, lithic materials were documented based on flake or tool type, use modification, material color, and location. Locational information was communicated to the map maker who highlighted artifact concentrations within the site boundary. Previously recorded sites were re-located when possible and plotted on 7.5-minute USGS topographic maps, and any changes were recorded on State of Texas Archeological Site Data Forms or General Data Forms. Newly discovered scatters or areas within a previously recorded site were analyzed and recorded in similar fashion to new sites.

All collected artifacts were bagged, labeled with the appropriate provenience, and returned for temporary curation to the laboratory facilities at PAI where the artifacts were washed, cataloged, and analyzed. As with previous Camp Bullis projects, all field records were kept in a standard format including survey area maps and aerial photographs, daily journals kept by the Project Archeologist, shovel test records, photograph logs, and State of Texas Archeological Site Data Forms.

ANALYSIS OF COLLECTED ARTIFACTS

A variety of chipped stone artifacts were collected during the survey. These were categorized as projectile points, bifaces, unifaces, cores, and debitage. Projectile points were categorized as arrow points and dart points, which were then identified typologically by Elton R. Prewitt with reference to the type or projectile point descriptions by Turner and Hester (1993). Eight projectile point attributes—maximum blade width, blade length, maximum thickness, base width, haft length, neck width, heat treatment, and material color—were recorded when applicable, with tool completeness also being noted. Tool completeness was identified as intact or nearly complete, proximal, stem, medial, distal, longitudinal, barb, wedge, or indeterminate edge fragments. Bifaces were categorized by their stage of reduction (early, middle, late, finished, or indeterminate) and tool completeness, while unifaces were categorized by type of uniface (or location of modification) and tool completeness. Metric attributes (maximum length, width, and thickness) also were measured when possible for both bifaces and unifaces. Debitage was counted and listed by provenience.

Early stage reduction bifaces are those that exhibit the nature of the blank from which they were made. Large deep percussion flake scars, irregular cross sections, and irregular margins are all attributes of an early stage of reduction. In the middle stage of reduction, initial percussion thinning is evident. Percussion flake scars are more evenly spaced and tend to run nearly all the way across the biface. A regular margin is accomplished with fine percussion flaking, and platform preparation is more distinct and carefully undertaken. Late stage reduction bifaces exhibit final percussion thinning and margin regularizing, with well-spaced percussion flake scars that overlap only slightly and tend to terminate at the medial ridge of the biface. These often are terminated with step or hinge fractures, which are met by similar flaking from the opposite edge. Evidence of careful platform preparation is present, with many of the platforms having been isolated, possibly by pressure flaking. Finished stage bifaces exhibit careful, selective pressure flaking along the margins. A sharp and regular margin has been created by removing the high ridges between percussion flakes. The tool is carefully pressure thinned across both faces, and use wear is evident.

The chipped stone artifacts overwhelmingly are of fine-grained, translucent to opaque cherts of various brown, tan, and gray hues. Archeologists have ambiguously and loosely referred to such cherts from Central Texas, the Edwards Plateau, and stream valleys draining these areas as Cretaceous-age Edwards chert, even
though visually similar cherts are present within older formations (e.g., Permian Elm Creek Formation, Lower Cretaceous Travis Peak Formation [Banks 1990]; Pennsylvania Marble Falls limestone and Lower Ordovician Honeycut Formation [Barnes 1983]) of Central Texas. The term “Edwards chert” is proper when applied to those cherts derived from Lower Cretaceous Edwards Group limestones and their correlative strata (e.g., Devil’s River Formation in southwest Texas and undivided Fredericksburg and Washita Groups in north-central Texas) (Kibler and Gardner 1997). The Lower Cretaceous Edwards Group is present in the southeast part of Camp Bullis and likely was a primary source of chert for the area. It should be noted, however, that chert-producing lag gravels are found in the northwest part of Camp Bullis and also were used as a resource for making stone tools (Maslyk and Kibler 1998).

The historic artifacts were analyzed by historic archeologist, Marie E. Blake. They were classified based on their material and function using the appropriate published references.

ARCHIVAL RESEARCH

Archival research by historian Martha Doty Freeman addressed several topics. One was a possible housesite and grave that might be associated with local resident Henry M. Smith, researching property and other records such as those developed by local historian Harvey Schaefer and examining a structure located north of Camp Bullis for its associations with the Smith family. The second main topic concerned the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) potential of a possible movie site location associated with the production of The Rough Riders. Finally, research was conducted to provide information about new archeological sites recorded during the survey.

Archival research to resolve the identity of an apparent house site and grave rumored to be associated with Henry M. Smith began with a visit to the site (41CM242) and review of legal documents related to the property in Bexar and Comal Counties. Research was followed by visits to the Ruben and Martha Klar Ranch during which a nineteenth-century residence there was photographed, a meeting with descendants of Henry Smith, and visits to buildings located at the Schaefer Ranch and with Mr. Harvey Schaefer. More archival research then followed to clarify issues raised during the field trips, and copies of a draft history pertaining to 41CM242 and other properties in Comal County were sent to Mr. Schaefer, members of the Smith family, and Dusty Bruns at Camp Bullis for comment.

Research to assess the NRHP eligibility of 41BX1048, a site believed to be associated with filming of The Rough Riders, began with an examination of the W. D. Smithers Collection at the Humanities Research Center at The University of Texas at Austin. Smithers served as a guide to movie director Victor Fleming, who sought locations for filming in summer 1926. He also provided 5x7-inch action shots during the filming. Unfortunately, the Smithers Collection in Austin, as well as portions of his collection at the El Paso Public Library, did not include any appropriate images, which apparently were purchased and retained either by Famous Players-Lasky Corporation or by Paramount. Supplementary research to resolve the identity and eligibility of 41BX1048 occurred at the Institute of Texan Cultures in San Antonio, which holds files concerning the history of movie production in San Antonio, the history of the Rough Riders, and the photo archives of The San Antonio Light; and at Trinity University in San Antonio, where the historian read all issues of the San Antonio Express from July through October 1926 and copied pertinent articles that described the production of The Rough Riders.

Finally, the historian visited six previously recorded historic archeological sites at Camp Bullis and eight sites recorded in 1999 and 2000. Field visits were supplemented by additional research about most of the sites, as well as an interview with former Camp Bullis resident Henry Schmidt, who provided photographic and archeological evidence of the West End Shooting Club (41BX1355).
The current investigations resulted in the documentation of 39 new archeological sites consisting of 29 sites with only prehistoric components, 8 sites with only historic components, and 2 sites with both prehistoric and historic components. These are described and assessed in this chapter. Thirty-seven previously recorded sites were encountered as well. Of those, 26 were reassessed and are described below, with most of these recorded originally in 1977 by Gerstle et al. (1978) and assessed using notions of site significance that are now outdated. In some cases, sites documented during previous PAI projects were revisited, resulting in the expansion of site boundaries and/or addition of previously unrecognized components. These sites also are described and reassessed below.

Eleven previously recorded sites are within the survey areas examined during this project but are not described or assessed further in this report. Four sites (41BX375, 41BX386, 41CM243, and 41CM244) currently are being assessed in another report (Veni et al. 2000). Three sites (41BX381, 41BX1210, and 41CM212) have been assessed by other recent PAI survey projects (Kibler and Gardner 1997; Veni et al. 1998a). At two sites (41BX1045 and 41CM102), diagnostic artifacts were collected, but no other information that might change their National Register eligibility status was recovered (see Kibler and Gardner 1997). One site at which a diagnostic artifact was collected, 41BX377, was previously subjected to data recovery excavations (see Kibler and Scott 2000). Finally, 41BX372 is still considered to be of unknown eligibility (see Cestaro et al. 2000), since most of it lies outside the project area. While sites 41BX377, 41BX1045, and 41CM102 are not redescribed here, the diagnostic points collected from them are included in the artifact descriptions.

NEWLY RECORDED SITES

41BX1346

Description: Multicomponent site 41BX1346 is situated on a gently sloping rise between the confluence of two unnamed tributaries in Training Area 1A. The associated intermittent streams flow into Cibolo Creek located 800 m to the north. The site is bounded by County Road to the south and the Camp Bullis boundary and firebreak road to the west. The southern edge of the site (highest elevation) is approximately 1,300 ft amsl. The site is 210 m north-south by 110 m east-west. Junipers, oaks, and native grasses abound upon a sandy grayish surface of eroded pebbles and exposed limestone bedrock. These are characterized as Crawford and Bexar stony soils by Taylor et al. (1962:13). The exposed bedrock and associated flora provided 70 percent ground surface visibility. Due to the exposed bedrock, only one shovel test (negative to 25 cm) was dug in an area indicated by shovel probes to contain sediment. Soils in the shovel test were a light gray silty loam with limestone inclusions to bedrock. As a result, the cultural materials are probably surface deposits.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected: The site is a dense scatter of biface fragments and thinning flakes of brown, pink, and reddish purple chert. Density appears to lessen toward the north. A single Ensor point dating to the Late Archaic was collected. Burned rocks were observed, but no prehistoric features were noted. A feature that may be an agricultural check dam associated with previously recorded
historic site 41BX394 or a large defensive position used by World War II-era soldiers in training is present. Site 41BX394 is 300 m east of the dam and dates from ca. 1908 to 1941, when it was condemned by the government and absorbed into the expanding military base. Two coins with dates of 1928 and 1942 were found together approximately 35 m southwest of the dam. The historic component is restricted to the northern part of the site.

Assessment: Site 41BX1346 lacks the potential to yield important archeological data. The thin soils are not adequate for isolating components, and no cultural features are present. Therefore, it is recommended that 41BX1346 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX1347

Description: Site 41BX1347 is a heavily disturbed prehistoric lithic scatter located along County Road and a dirt road that bisects Training Area IA. About 14 nondiagnostic chert artifacts were noted. The site is 80 m north-south by 50 m east-west and lies in a large cleared area interspersed with junipers, elms, oaks, native grasses, and cacti. The cleared area offered 90 percent ground surface visibility and seems to be a product of recent road work, since small spoil piles are present. The terrain slopes gradually down to the northwest. The site lies at an elevation of 1,250 ft asml and is 1,000 m south of Cibolo Creek. The nearest water source could be a small intermittent stream located 300 m to the west.

Soils are a thin brown to brownish red silty sandy loam with many pebbles and cobbles giving the appearance of exposed limestone bedrock in some areas. According to Taylor et al. (1962:13), they are typed as Crawford and Bexar stony soils. An on-site shovel probe encountered bedrock at 6 cm. Two negative shovel tests were dug near the edge of the clearing where disturbances seemed minimal. Both encountered brownish orange silty sand in the first 5–15 cm. Brown silty clay loam comprised the second level. Bedrock was encountered at 15 to 20 cm.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected: Four projectile points were collected. One is typed as an Early Archaic Gower point, two are untypeable dart points, and the fourth is an untypeable Late Prehistoric arrow point fragment. Additionally, three primary flakes, four tertiary flakes, five biface-thinning flakes, seven bifaces, three cores, and several unifacial tools were observed. No prehistoric cultural features were seen. More-recent artifacts include tin cans, wire, 5.56-mm casings, and .30-06-caliber casings.

Assessment: Site 41BX1348 is located in the center of a large heavily disturbed area. As a result, it is doubtful any intact deposits remain, making it impossible to isolate the Archaic and Late Prehistoric components. The site is unable to contribute important archeological data.
Therefore, it is recommended that 41BX1348 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX1349

Description: This small lithic scatter is located along the east side of the westernmost firebreak road in Training Area 1A, about 600 m south of Cibolo Creek. It measures 70 m east-west by 80 m north-south and lies on an east-facing slope of exposed bedrock with patchy juniper/oak woods that become denser close to an unnamed stream 50 m east of the site. The site lies at 1,290 ft amsl. Some minor disturbances associated with road construction are present on the western margin of the site.

Soils, mapped as Crawford and Bexar stony soils Taylor et al. (1962:13), are thin, gray or white silty clay loam upon exposed bedrock. Ground visibility was 50 percent. Due to the extensive exposed bedrock, no shovel tests were dug.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:
This sparse lithic scatter consists of fewer than 10 pieces of debitage, 4 bifaces, 2 complete points, and 1 point fragment. An Early Archaic component is indicated by a Martindale point and a Gower point. The point fragment is untypeable but appears to be heat treated.

Assessment: Site 41BX1349 is a small lithic scatter. Discrete components cannot be isolated given the lack of intact, artifact-bearing deposits on the exposed bedrock rise. Furthermore, no cultural features are present. Because of its inability to yield important archeological data, it is recommended that 41BX1349 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX1350

Description: Prehistoric site 41BX1350 lies upon a small escarpment overlooking the east side of a small unnamed stream in Training Area 1A that empties into Cibolo Creek 200 m to the north. The site is 200 m north-south by 160 m east-west. The highest point is located on the heavily disturbed south end at approximately 1,300 ft amsl. The edge of the escarpment is 1,250 ft amsl. A two-track road bisects the site. North of this track, dense woods of juniper and oak trees with pockets of native grasses exist upon a patchy brown silty loam interspersed with exposed limestone bedrock.

This area had up to 75 percent ground surface visibility. Three shovel tests were dug in areas of dense lithics or elevated relief. Shovel Test 1 had no recovery, but Shovel Tests 2 and 3 each yielded a single flake in Level 1 (0–20 cm). Soil from the upper levels of Shovel Tests 1–3 was a brown to dark brown sandy clay loam with small limestone inclusions. Shovel Test 2 continued another 20 cm through a reddish brown sandy clay before reaching bedrock at 40 cm. These tests confirm the assessment by Taylor et al. (1962:13), which types the area as containing Crawford and Bexar stony soils. South of the two-track road, the area is bulldozed and burned with increased ground visibility of 90 percent. Pieces of broken chert are present, but it is not known whether they are artifacts. Only a small number of flakes (n = 8) have the necessary morphological characteristics to be considered artifacts.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:
A fairly dense scatter of 4 primary, 16 secondary, and 31 tertiary flakes; 2 unifacial tools; 2 bifacial fragments; 1 chert chunk; and 2 points were recorded in the north part of the site. Chert colors included brown, orange, gray, pink, and red, with brown materials representing 55 percent of the chert used. To the south, only 8 secondary/tertiary flakes were observed. The two projectile points were found near the edge of the escarpment. One is an untypeable Late Prehistoric arrow point. The other is a glassy light brown Frio point dating to the Late Archaic. One of the bifaces is a possible Late Prehistoric Pipe Creek biface made of glassy light brown chert. Two flakes were found during shovel testing. No cultural features were observed.

Assessment: Site 41BX1350 has been extensively disturbed, which has greatly affected its ability to yield important archeological data. Shovel testing has shown that cultural deposits are restricted to the upper 20 cm, however, no cultural features were discovered. Given the lack of well-stratified intact deposits, isolating the Archaic and Late Prehistoric components is impossible. Therefore, it is recommended that 41BX1350 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX1351

Description: Site 41BX1351 is situated on a flat area ranging from 1,200 ft amsl in the
west to 1,230 ft asml in the east. It is bounded by a small stream and escarpment just to the west, Cibolo Creek and its high escarpment to the north, and a small dirt road to the east. The site is bisected by a 1940s-era fence near the border for Training Areas 2A and 2C. The site is 240 m north-south by 200 m east-west and has four distinct lithic concentrations. A 15x15-m burned rock midden, at least half of which has been disturbed by road construction, is in the far northern part of the site.

The proximity of the creek gives rise to large areas of exposed bedrock covered with thin, brown sandy clay loam. This fits well with the mapping of Taylor et al. (1962:30), who refer to this area as having Tarrant Association soils. The site area is typified by taller junipers and oaks, which provide a relatively open understory, except for occasional patches of native grasses and cacti. The exposed bedrock and leaf litter offered 70 percent ground surface visibility. Three shovel tests were placed in three of the lithic concentrations, and one test sampled the burned rock midden. Shovel Test 1 penetrated 20 cm into the midden before reaching eroded bedrock. The soils within the midden were grayish brown silty sands, and up to 25 fire-cracked rocks and 1 Rabdatus snail shell were observed. Shovel Tests 2 and 3 were stopped by bedrock at 8 cm and 6 cm, respectively. Soils observed in these two tests were brown sandy silts. Shovel Test 4 was excavated to 40 cm before ending at bedrock. Soils were brown clayey sands that changed to brown silty clays at ca. 20 cm.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected: In addition to the six artifacts collected (see below), 101 artifacts of eight different colors of chert were recorded on the surface: 2 primary, 11 secondary, 13 tertiary, and 27 biface-thinning flakes; 19 unifacial tools; 14 bifaces; and 15 core fragments. It appears that locally gathered chert cobbles with cortex were reduced throughout the site and that “imported” or “heat-treated” materials were reduced elsewhere and brought to the site as fully decorticated bifaces. These are believed to be imported since the flakes tend to be of a later reduction stage and because there are no bifaces or cores of pink or orange chert.

Secondary and tertiary flakes are most common in the northern and south-central parts of the site. Biface thinning flakes are most common in the northern part. Most unifacial tools are in the site center, while bifacial tools are more prevalent in the northern part. Like secondary and tertiary flakes, cores are most frequent in the northern and south-central parts of the site.

The collected artifacts consist of a large biface fragment, a smaller biface, a Late Archaic(?) corner-notched point, an untypeable dart point, a Middle Archaic Travis point, and a Hare biface. The latter two were found near the burned rock midden.

Assessment: Site 41BX1351 represents a mixture of cultural components resting on eroded bedrock. Since all of the components appear to be restricted to the surface, none of them can be isolated for further study. Furthermore, the burned rock midden is thin and disturbed, as demonstrated by Shovel Test 1. Because of its inability to yield important archaeological data, it is recommended that 41BX1351 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX1352

Description: Site 41BX1352 is located on a slope past the northeast corner of an unnamed hill in Training Area 2C. Measuring 115 m north-south by 110 m east-west, it lies at an elevation of 1,205 ft asml and is partially disturbed on the south side. A two-track road runs east to west dividing the bulldozed southern area of the hill and the denser juniper and oak tree line where a small drainage exists. This unnamed creek runs roughly west to east about 60 m north of the two-track road. Cibolo Creek lies 300 m to the east and west of the site. Vegetation includes dense junipers and oaks with small occasional growths of cacti and a native grass understory. Ground surface visibility was 50 percent due to leaf litter. The site does not appear to extend to the south side of the road, but it does continue northward to a small escarpment overlooking the small drainage, as well as to 41BX1353.

Soils are thin light gray silty sandy loam with many small to medium-sized gravels covering an eroded limestone bedrock surface. According to Taylor et al. (1962:30), the soils are the Tarrant Association, rolling variety. Four negative shovel tests were dug in the site area. One was near the edge of the disturbed area.
and revealed the previously mentioned pebble-filled gray silt to bedrock at 30 cm. The remaining three tests were in the wooded northern part of the site, where disturbances are minimal. These tests went to 10 to 20 cm until they reached bedrock. Soils were an orange brown silty sand in Shovel Test 2 and a dark brown silty clay in Shovel Tests 3 and 4. Two probes into a dark humus layer in the northeastern part of the site came upon bedrock almost immediately.

**Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:**
A single Late Prehistoric Edwards point was collected. It is made from a homogenous fine-grained tan chert. Other observed materials are one unifacial tool, one bifacel fragment, two bifaces, two primary flakes, four secondary flakes, and three tertiary flakes. The materials ranged from gray to mostly dark brown, with no tan material represented except for the arrow point. Some minor historic activity is evidenced by a glass milk bottle with an embossed toy soldier and a metal spring trap. No cultural features were noted.

**Assessment:** Thin and culturally sterile soils have been demonstrated at 41BX1352. While a Late Prehistoric component is suggested, components are not isolable. The sparse scatter of lithic materials and lack of cultural features indicate that the site has little potential to yield important archeological data. Therefore, it is recommended that 41BX1352 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

**41BX1353**

**Description:** Site 41BX1353 is a medium-sized prehistoric lithic scatter located in Training Area 2C at an elevation of 1,185 ft amsl. The artifacts include all flake types, bifaces, and unifaces in three small discrete concentrations within a larger light scatter covering an area of 120 m north-south by 180 m east-west. The site is located within a setting of dissected and rounded bedrock features along a deeply cut, unnamed seasonal stream running west to east into Cibolo Creek 120 m to the east. Flora includes large oaks and junipers except on the east and west boundaries where small clearings begin to form. Patches of native grasses and small yuccas abound on a gravelly gray sandy loam. The distribution of flora and the eroding bedrock contributed to good ground surface visibility (70 percent). Historic or recent disturbances are minimal. However, erosion seems to have affected much of the terrain. According to Taylor et al. (1962:31), the soils are of the Tarrant Association, rolling variety. Three negative shovel tests were dug 9–11 cm to bedrock.

**Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:** Artifacts are distributed in a light scatter on the north side of the stream. Within the light scatter are three concentrations of artifacts. In total, 1 projectile point, 1 primary flake, 17 secondary flakes, 9 tertiary flakes, and 3 bifacial fragments were observed. The point, which was from near the edge of the stream, was collected and is a Late Archaic (?) corner-notched dart point. No cultural features were observed.

**Assessment:** Site 41BX1353 contains a thin veneer of sediment over bedrock. Furthermore, all of the artifacts are restricted to the surface, and no cultural features are present. While an Archaic component is observable, the lack of appreciable sediment precludes isolating discrete components. Since 41BX1353 lacks the capacity to contribute important archeological data, it is recommended that it be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

**41BX1354**

**Description:** Site 41BX1354, in Training Area 2C, contains four main concentrations of lithics within the site boundary. It measures 220 m north-south by 240 m east-west and is on the northeast slope of an unnamed hill at approximately 1,200 ft amsl, 200 m southwest of Cibolo Creek. The site is bisected by a two-track road that defines the disturbed western half and the undisturbed eastern half. The western half was bulldozed in 1979, and military A-frame structures are on the south end of the site. The bulldozing seems to have uprooted only junipers, leaving oaks behind. A small area of possible explosive demolition in the south end of the site contains small cylindrical holes with upturned bedrock boulders. The east end is typified by dense juniper and oak woods with two escarpments and three washouts into Cibolo Creek. Ground surface visibility was 60 percent in the disturbed area and less in the wooded areas. A small sinkhole is located in the southernmost corner of the site just across from the A-frame structures. According to Veni et al. (2000:182), no archeological remains were observed in the sinkhole.
Soils generally are brown gravelly sandy loam with many areas of exposed bedrock. According to Taylor et al. (1962:31), they are of the Tarrant Association, rolling variety. Four shovel tests were dug, one in each concentration to determine the depth of deposits. A fifth was placed in the area of the sinkhole and A-frames. The five shovel tests went to 7–20 cm. All tests hit bedrock and all were negative. Shovel Test 1 encountered brownish gray silt with pebbles and cobbles of eroding bedrock. Shovel Test 2 started with light gray brown silt to 3 cm and then continued with the addition of eroded pebbles and cobbles until bedrock was reached. Shovel Test 3 was typified by brown silt with small inclusions resting just above bedrock. Shovel Test 4, located near the sinkhole, contained grayish brown silt with white limestone inclusions to bedrock. Finally, Shovel Test 5 contained grayish silty loam with eroding limestone gravels to bedrock.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:
Two Guadalupe biface, 2 projectile points, 1 ovate biface, and a point base were collected from the site. The projectile points consist of a medial fragment of an untypeable dart point, a Late Prehistoric Edwards arrow point, and an unidentifiable contracting-stemmed dart point. Sixty-six other lithic artifacts were enumerated from the surface: 8 primary, 4 secondary, 12 tertiary, and 2 biface-thinning flakes; 14 unifaces; 18 bifaces; and 8 cores. No prehistoric cultural features were noted.

Assessment: Site 41BX1354 exhibits disturbance through bulldozing and has shallow soils, both of which affect the ability to isolate the possible Archaic and Late Prehistoric components. Furthermore, the site lacks any cultural features and all of the artifacts are restricted to the surface, as demonstrated by negative shovel tests. Because the site lacks the capacity to yield important archaeological information, it is recommended that it be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX1355

Description: This site is the location of the West End Shooting Club. It measures 120 m north-south by 80 m east-west in Training Area 2D, near the junction of Blanco Road and County Road. The area is approximately 50 m south of a large previously cultivated field, while Cibolo Creek is 1,000 m to the north. A rock wall runs along the northern edge of the site along the open field. A portion of the site is within a tree line with occasionally dense junipers and more prominent oak stands, at an elevation of 1,140 ft msl. Greenbriers, cacti, and grasses also are present. Survey identified elements of the shooting range, including rock structures used to hold targets at the north end of the site, a concrete slab associated with the clubhouse at the south end, and a series of depressions believed to be latrines (Figure 4).

Soils are brown clay loam with a dense leaf litter cover, which produced 10 percent ground surface visibility. According to Taylor et al. (1962:31), the soils are of the Tarrant Association, gently undulating variety. Three shovel tests were dug. Shovel Test 1, which reached bedrock at 15 cm, was negative. Shovel Test 2 went to 20 cm before encountering bedrock and appears to have sampled a trash deposit; at 10 to 20 cm, two metal cans, four metal can lids, and two crown caps were found, along with three large filters of unknown function and paper. Shovel Test 3 yielded five metal cans and a fence staple in the 40 cm of sediment above bedrock. Some of these artifacts likely are associated with the shooting club, while others may be military in origin.

History: The West End Shooting Club, or Schuetzenverein, now located at 41BX1355, originally was located on land owned by Henry Schmidt between 41BX397 and 41BX433 and south of County Road (Figure 5). According to local informants (Henry Schmidt 1992; Oscar Schmidt 1992; Stahl 1992), the community formed the Schuetzenverein in 1913, building the facility against a hill that was partially excavated. The club included a frame building that measured approximately 20x20 ft and a stone target house that consisted of two free-standing stone walls located approximately 100 yds from the positions where men shot with .22-caliber rifles. A pile of rocks behind each target stopped the bullets.

Use of the club at the 1913 location continued until the early 1920s, when it was moved a short distance northeast to 41BX1355 near the northwest corner of County Road and Blanco Road. There, the club erected a tin building that measured approximately 37x38 ft (Figures 6a–b), a rock target house (consisting of the rock structures north of the slab), and two toilets of
Figure 4. Plan of 41BX1355.
galvanized iron (probably associated with the depressions believed to be latrines). Unlike the earlier building to the southwest, the new shooting club at 41BX1355 was used for dances as well as for target practice, and during Freischut families came to eat, drink, and watch the men and boys compete.

According to Henry Schmidt (Schmidt 2000), who participated in shoots and worked the targets, the tin building was oriented so that its long axis ran east-west. There were three concrete slabs on the north end where shooters stood and fired toward targets. There were places for four shooters to stand, and they supported their guns on wooden stands that had notches cut in them at regularly decreasing heights.

Shooters fired toward any of four targets. The targets were located adjacent to two stone target butts that shared a common roof. The space between the two butts was twice as wide as the spaces at either end of the butts. Each butt was 5–6 ft high. A boy sat behind each butt, facing north, and controlled one or two targets, sliding them back and forth in the space between the butts or at the end of each butt. The targets were paper squares that were placed in wooden frames (Figure 6c).

After a shooter fired, a target boy signaled the location of the bullet hole. If the shot was a bull’s-eye, the boy waved a red flag. If the shot hit between the numbers 10 and 19, the boy would use a stick that was white on one side and black on the other to make an up-and-down motion before pointing to one of the numbers on the outer edge of the target. If the shot hit between the numbers 20 and 24, the boy would use the same stick, making a circular motion with it on the target and then pointing to one of the numbers on the outer edge.

A berm was located north of the targets to stop bullets that missed the targets. North of the berm was a rock wall that delineated a field between the wall and Cibolo Creek.

The 1941 government acquisition of the Schmidt Ranch on which the shooting club was located meant the end of the Schuetzenverein on Blanco Road. At that point, the government inventory listed improvements valued at $1,000 that consisted of a community shooting gallery with pine floor and galvanized walls and roof; a rock target house; and two galvanized toilets.
Figure 6. Photographs of the clubhouse at 41BX1355 being dismantled (a–b) and Henry Schmidt with one of the targets (c). Historic photographs (a and b) courtesy of Henry Schmidt.
The community disassembled the clubhouse, and Henry Schmidt, Richard Specht, and Arnold Klabunde each purchased one-third of the building (Schmidt 2000). Some members joined the club at Vogel's Valley, but the West End Shooting Club never met again (Henry Schmidt 1992; Oscar Schmidt 1992; Stahl 1992).

According to a local informant (Oscar Schmidt 1992), the vicinity of the intersection of County Road and Blanco Road also was the location of a convict camp authorized by the Bexar County Commissioners. County jail work details under the supervision of boss George Bacon worked on Blanco Road in the vicinity of the Schmidt property between about 1913 and 1915. During the time it was located on the property, the camp consisted of some 30–40 convicts, a number of trustees, the camp boss, 2–3 cooks (one of whom was Chinese), and various other civilians such as Ed Toepplerwein, who was a blacksmith. According to a member of the Schmidt family who visited the location often, the camp was a complete community that consisted of tents arranged in an elongated diamond pattern. Eight to 10 men slept in the tents on steel cots, each of which had a locked container at the head where the convict could keep his personal belongings. Each tent had a cast iron heater and lanterns for light. Separate tents housed a latrine, bathing facilities that consisted of galvanized tanks, and baking facilities. Food was prepared in a long shed-like tent with one open side and two tables that could seat about 30 men. Every morning a truck would deliver ice, fresh meat, and fresh vegetables from San Antonio.

On Sundays, preachers from various churches in San Antonio drove out to the camp to provide Sunday services. During the week, the convicts were allowed to play baseball, all of them hobbed with a ball and chain or by leather straps and buckles that were placed around their ankles. Musical entertainment was provided by a small convict orchestra, and a local ranch boy who took cornet and violin lessons from Ed Toepplerwein at the camp remembered that the convicts played banjos, guitars, and jew's harps (Oscar Schmidt 1992). The road work detail remained at the Schmidt Ranch site from about October 1913 until March 1915, after which it probably was disbanded. While the associated camp is believed to have been located in the vicinity of 41BX1355, descriptions are not sufficiently detailed to conclude if the camp was in the location later occupied by the West End Shooting Club, or if the camp was located elsewhere on the Schmidt Ranch. There is no archaeological evidence for the convict camp at 41BX1355.

**Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:**
Historic materials observed on the surface include metal fragments (tin siding/roofing), bottles, glass, fencing, cut stones, and cans. A square nail was observed near one of the stone targets. Collected materials consist of seven tin cans, four metal can lids, two crown caps, and a fence staple.

**Assessment:** The West End Shooting Club, or Schuetzenverein, originally was located south of County Road on land that belonged to Henry Schmidt. The Verein moved to 41BX1355 in the early 1920s and erected a tin building and targets at the northwest corner of County and Blanco Roads. During the 1920s and 1930s, the Schuetzenverein continued to fulfill an important function within the German community that was located in the eastern part of present-day Camp Bullis, along Cibolo Creek, and in the vicinity of Catalie Prairie. Men regularly came to practice shooting, and families gathered for Freischut, when they also ate, drank, and danced. As the location of a once-common but increasingly rare expression of ethnic German activity, the Schuetzenverein at 41BX1355 is recommended eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A as a location where the community “traditionally carried out...cultural practices important in maintaining its historical identity” (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Interagency Resources Division 1992:1). Site 41BX1355 may also be considered eligible for inclusion in the NRHP as a traditional cultural property. While 41BX1355 is important as part of the local history, little information can be recovered through further testing of the site. Therefore, it is recommended that the site be considered ineligible for NRHP listing under Criterion D.

**41BX1356**

**Description:** This lithic scatter covers 160 m north-south by 410 m east-west in Training Area 2D between Cibolo Creek and the Combat Air Landing Strip in a dense juniper incursion
at 1,150 ft amsl. A total of 85 flakes were observed, although more flakes undoubtedly exist. Historic materials associated with adjacent 41BX1211 occur at the western end of the site. Prickly pear cacti and native grasses are common. A small two-track road runs along the tree line. Firing positions in defense of the Combat Air Landing Strip disturb several places within the site. No artifacts were noted on the backdirt from the gun positions.

Soils appeared as orange-brown silty clay loam. Ground surface visibility was 70 percent. Three negative shovel tests were dug to depths of 20 to 25 cm and were stopped by hard reddish clay, which probably represents a Bt horizon developed in Pleistocene terrace deposits. According to Taylor et al. (1962:26), soils in the area primarily are Patrick soils with 1–3 percent slopes; Patrick soils typically consist of ca. 40 cm of clay loam above limestone gravels.

**Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:** Observed materials included 12 primary, 17 secondary, 40 tertiary, and 10 biface-thinning flakes; 2 bifaces; 4 cores; many 5.56-mm and 7.62-mm casings; communication wire; and barbed wire. One sandstone grinding/abrating stone was collected. The western part of the site has the densest lithic concentration, tapering off dramatically in the central and eastern parts. The western and central sections are characterized by late/middle reduction debitage, while primary flakes are most common in the eastern part. There are no prehistoric features.

**Assessment:** Historic agricultural activity by the occupants of 41BX1211, land clearing, and recent military maneuvers have disturbed much of the site. Shovel testing did not identify subsurface archeological materials in this old landscape. Based on the lack of cultural features and the fact that the artifact scatter is restricted to the surface, this site is unlikely to yield important archeological data. Therefore, it is recommended that 41BX1356 be considered ineligible for NRHP listing.

**41BX1357**

**Description:** This World War II-era military encampment covers an area 390 m north-south by 320 m east-west in Training Area 2D. It is in a previously cultivated field that has been bulldozed. The site is similar to 41BX1345 (Cestaro et al. 2000:41–43), except that it has been badly disturbed. Very little evidence exists now except for some scattered flagstones, a concrete bomb “gate,” and an old roadbed. There now is tall meadow-type grass with dense coverage of young mesquite trees in some areas and a few larger mesquite trees, all at an elevation of 1,150 ft amsl. Cibolo Creek is within 100 m and wraps around the northern and eastern sides of the site.

Soils are light brown clay loam and offered 40 percent ground surface visibility. Taylor et al. (1962:25) map the area as Lewisville soils, 0–1 percent slopes. Four negative shovel tests were dug to hard clays or gravelly silts at 35 to 65 cm.

The outline of the encampment at 41BX1357 is delineated on a 1952 map depicting present-day Camp Bullis. A summary of the activities of the 95th Infantry Division at Camp Bullis (Fuermann and Crazn [1947]:n.p.) describes several camps used by the division, including Cibolo, Scheel, Stahl, Panther Springs, and Wilderness; 41BX1357 represents Camp Scheel. According to Fuermann and Crazn, the 95th Division moved to Fort Sam Houston from Camp Swift ca. December 1942, and troops began training at Camp Bullis soon thereafter. Camp Scheel (called “Sheel” in the division’s history) was one of three camps built to accommodate field artillery. The 95th Division trained at Camp Bullis until it was sent to Louisiana for field maneuvers in June 1943. According to Manguso (1990:82), other large-unit users of Camp Bullis from January 1942 through November 1943 were the 2d and 88th Infantry Divisions.

**Cultural Materials Observed:** Historic artifacts include flagstones, concrete bombs, corrugated tin, shrapnel, a single 1-inch-diameter threaded pipe, and three 2–3-inch-diameter threaded pipes. The old roadbed visible on early maps of the Leon Springs Military Reservation exists now as a linear depression with evidence of pea-sized gravels in a heavily wooded area south of the site. A small creek lies to the west, and the current road bed lies east of the old road. An old well (now cemented over) lies to the north along a dirt road and may have served both agricultural and military needs before being plugged. A single prehistoric flake also was noted.

**Assessment:** Site 41BX1357 represents a World War II-era temporary encampment constructed
between fall 1942 and summer 1943 to accommodate field artillery training for the 95th Infantry Division. Only scattered rocks that appear flat or worked and an old roadbed remain. Shovel testing demonstrates that no intact subsurface materials are present. Site 41BX1357 does not appear to have been associated with significant events and does not represent a property significant in national, local, or army history. Therefore, it is recommended that the site be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX1358

*Description:* This lithic scatter covers 140 m north-south by 120 m east-west in a disturbed upland context in Training Area 2D. The site is on a slightly sloping, heavily wooded area of past clearcut, bulldozing, and burning at an elevation of 1,150 ft amsl. Cibolo Creek is 80 m to the west. Native grasses and some cacti are present, producing about 50 percent ground surface visibility.

Soils are reddish brown to brown clay loams. According to Taylor et al. (1962:31), these are Tarrant soils, gently undulating. Three negative shovel tests were stopped at 40 to 50 cm due to hard clays with gravels.

*Cultural Materials Observed:* A total of 132 lithic artifacts were noted on the surface. These include 12 primary, 17 secondary, 29 tertiary, and 25 bifacial-thinning flakes; 16 unifaces; 20 bifaces; 9 cores; and 2 chunks. There are numerous primary, secondary, and tertiary flakes on the west side of the site, while bifacial-thinning flakes are found throughout. Bifaces are more frequent on the east side than on the west side. There is a small area of fire-cracked rocks giving the appearance of an eroding hearth. This is problematic, however, since evidence for modern burning is nearby. Otherwise, no cultural features exist.

*Assessment:* Site 41BX1358 appears to be primarily restricted to the surface in a disturbed context. No diagnostic artifacts or features were encountered. While the soils appear to be thick, shovel tests indicate that no intact subsurface cultural deposits are present. Because the site lacks the capacity to yield important archeological information, it is recommended that it be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX1359

*Description:* This is a 1938 bunker built by the 2d Field Artillery Brigade atop Mehl Hill in Training Area 3C (Figure 7). The site area is 50x50 m, with the bunker being 15x15 m. The site is located at 1,390 ft amsl upon a steep rounded hill of exposed bedrock and thin soils. The area is covered in juniper and oak woods with some areas of native grasses. Lewis Creek is 1,400 m to the east, and Salado Creek is 1,700 m to the west.

Soils are reddish brown clay loam and exposed bedrock. They are mapped as Brackett soils, with 12-30 percent slopes (Taylor et al. 1962:11-12). Ground surface visibility was good at 80 percent. No shovel tests were dug due to the nature of the site and the extensive exposed bedrock.

*Cultural Materials Observed:* Observed artifacts include many 5.56-mm and 7.62-mm casings, shrapnel, grenade spools, camouflage netting, and vehicle debris. The main feature is a bunker (Figure 8). It is semicircular and is made of concrete supplemented with rock construction at the entrance and top. A maze entrance is present as are four thin gun slits. The structure is similar to those at 41BX824 (on Neutze Hill), 41BX1028 (on Sykes Hill), 41BX1036 (on Buck Hill), 41BX1276 (west of Lewis Creek), and 41BX1277 (on Herr Hill) documented during previous surveys. Like the other bunkers, 41BX1359 predominantly is reinforced concrete construction with exterior stone wing walls. The bunker apparently was constructed at the same time as the one at 41BX1036, and the two structures have plaques that are inscribed with the words, "ERECTED BY SECOND FIELD ARTILLERY BRIGADE NOVEMBER 1938." The date of construction suggests that the bunker was used by the 2d Division during field exercises; it may have been associated with development of the army's Triangular Division.

*Assessment:* Site 41BX1359 is similar in construction, age, and design to 41BX1036. The age, integrity, and type of construction materials of the bunker meet the minimum requirements for eligibility defined by Freeman (1994c:106) for military training devices. While 41BX1359 has little archeological potential and is considered ineligible under Criterion D, it is recommended for NRHP listing under Criterion A,
Figure 7. Plan of 41BX1359.
Figure 8. Photographs of the bunker at 41BX1359. (a) General view of the east side; (b) plaque indicating construction in 1938.
Soils are light brown silty sand with bedrock exposures and gravels upon the surface. Taylor et al. (1962:12) describe these as Crawford and Bexar stony soils. Four negative shovel tests ranging from 10 to 20 cm in depth encountered light brown silty sands with gravels before stopping at bedrock. A small escarpment with defining boulders is to the west.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected: Two points were collected from the surface. This first is a Late Prehistoric Scallorn arrow point. The second is a large untypeable dart point fragment and probably dates to the Archaic period. Additionally, 1 secondary flake, 10 tertiary flakes, and 2 biface fragments were observed on the surface. The late reduction of chert as evidenced by the flakes and bifaces may be indicative of retooling or butchering. No cultural features were observed.

Assessment: Site 41BX1363 contains shallow soils with no indication of subsurface artifacts or features. The lack of any appreciable sediment makes isolating components impossible. Since the site is unable to yield important archeological data, it is recommended that it be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX1364

Description: This site measures 70 m north-south by 15 m east-west and is located in an area with some clearings mixed with dense juniper and oak trees. The site is 200 m west of Sewell Road with Meusebach Creek located 200 m to the south. This lithic scatter is located in Training Area 5B, at an elevation of 1,170 ft amsl. It is on a small upland escarpment and does not appear to extend to either the next lower or higher levels. Ground surface visibility was good at 70 percent.

Soils are light brown silty sandy loam. Taylor et al. (1962:12) type these as Crawford and Bexar stony soils. Three negative shovel tests (10–15 cm) revealed dense gravels within brown silty sands.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected: Lithics observed were one primary, four secondary, and eight tertiary flakes; three bifaces; and two point bases, which were collected. The first point base is an Edwards arrow point and dates to the Late Prehistoric. The second is an untypeable, heavily damaged dart point fragment probably dating to the Archaic.

Assessment: Soils are thin, as indicated by shallow penetrating shovel tests; furthermore, the sparse lithic scatter is restricted to the surface making the separation of components impossible. The lack of isolable components and cultural features suggests that the site has no capacity to yield important archeological data. Therefore, it is recommended that it be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX1365

Description: This is a small (8x8 m) historic refuse area in Training Area 5B and is not associated with any nearby structural remains. Juniper and oak woods are present. Cacti and native grasses grow in patches along the area of patchy soil deposition interspersed with exposed bedrock, yielding up to 70 percent ground surface visibility. The site is at 1,185 ft amsl with a gradual slope to the north. Multiple large bedrock limestone boulders rise above the surface of the site center. Meusebach Creek is 800 m to the southeast.

According to Taylor et al. (1962:30–31), the soils are of the Tarrant Association, gently undulating variety. Soils are dark brown silty loam. One positive shovel test in the center of the refuse area went to a depth of 22 cm and yielded seven artifacts.

History: The site is located in the west-central portion of the Juan Rivas Survey (No. 191), a league and labor bisected in the north by Cibolo Creek and in the south by Meusebach Creek. For a legal history of the property on which 41BX1365 is located between 1837 and 1941, see the site history for 41BX397. Site 41BX1365 is located northwest of 41BX398, a farmstead occupied by Henry Schmidt’s son Richard Schmidt and, later by another son, August. It is southwest of 41BX433, a farmstead occupied by Henry Schmidt’s son W. Schmidt (Freeman 1994b:20–21, 31). The refuse at 41BX1365 may be associated with one or both of these twentieth-century farmsteads.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected: This concentrated refuse area contains hundreds of broken glass bottles, as well as decorated glass (two cups and a bowl). Datable bottle fragments include Owen Illinois, Keen Soda, and Jr. Watkins Company—all early twentieth century. Also observed were ceramics, milk
glass, and five tin cans. Eleven artifacts were collected, 4 from the surface and 7 from Level 1 (0–22 cm) of Shovel Test 1. The assemblage is primarily domestic and consists of 7 ceramic sherds, 2 glass sherds, a button, and a bone handle. The artifacts date to ca. 1870s/1880s–1930s.

Assessment: Site 41BX1365, a historic refuse area, is located on property that was owned by Henry Schmidt and occupied by other Schmidt family members. The associations of the materials in the site, which is located near a road, are not clear; nor are Richard, August, or W. Schmidt locally significant individuals. Materials recovered appear to date primarily to the early twentieth century. The site lacks the capacity to yield important historic-period archeological data. As a result, it is recommended that 41BX1365 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX1366

Description: This small (5 m north-south by 9 m east-west) historic refuse area in Training Area 5B is in an upland setting (1,205 ft amsl) and is set amongst dense juniper and oak trees with areas of exposed bedrock. Meusebach Creek is 800 m southeast. It is not associated with any nearby structural remains. Soils are of the Tarrant Association, gently undulating variety (Taylor et al. 1962:30–31) and appeared as brown sandy loams with dense humus and roots which yielded 60 percent ground surface visibility. A single positive shovel test in the slight depression within the refuse area reached bedrock at 25 cm.

History: The site is located in the west-central portion of the Juan Rivas Survey (No. 191). For a legal history of the property on which 41BX1366 is located between 1837 and 1941, see the site history for 41BX197. Site 41BX1366 is located northwest of 41BX398, a farmstead occupied by Henry Schmidt’s son, Richard Schmidt and, later, by his son, August; it is southwest of 41BX433, a farmstead occupied by Henry Schmidt’s son, W. Schmidt (Freeman 1994b:20–21, 31). The refuse at 41BX1366 may be associated with one or both of these twentieth-century farmsteads.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected: Observed artifacts include battery cores, whiteware (plate base and fragments), stoneware (fragments of brown salt glazed jug), porcelain (bowl, cup, and dish fragments), and glass (purple, green, aqua, and hundreds of clear bottle fragments). Seven artifacts were collected, two of which came from Level 1 (0–25 cm) of Shovel Test 1. The other artifacts were from the surface. The assemblage consists of three ceramic sherds, two whole bottles, one glass sherd, and one metal lid. The assemblage dates from the late nineteenth century to the 1920s.

Assessment: Site 41BX1366, a historic refuse area, is located on property that was owned by Henry Schmidt and occupied by other Schmidt family members. The associations of the materials in the site, which is located near a road, are not clear; nor are Richard, August, or W. Schmidt locally significant individuals. While some artifacts date to the late nineteenth century, the majority of materials recovered appear to date to the early twentieth century. The site lacks the capacity to yield important historic-period archeological data. As a result, it is recommended that 41BX1366 be considered ineligible for NRHP listing.

41BX1367

Description: Site 41BX1367, in Training Area 5B, is a tiny scatter of flakes in an upland setting at approximately 1,250 ft amsl. It covers 50 m north-south by 30 m east-west on top of an unnamed hill 1.3 km east of Lewis Hill. It is 1.6 km south of Cibolo Creek and 1.2 km northeast of Meusebach Creek. An old barbed wire fence bisects the site. The hillside is mostly exposed bedrock with small stands of junipers and some oak trees. A few cacti and some grasses cover the ground where there is a small amount of soil deposition providing up to 90 percent visibility.

Soils are very thin, light grayish brown sandy loam interspersed with exposed bedrock. According to Taylor et al. (1962:12), these are of the Brackett-Tarrant Association, hilly variety. Six shovel probes (1–10 cm) were negative and reached bedrock quickly.

Cultural Materials Observed: Five tertiary flakes (one utilized) and one biface indicate a possible butchering or retooling site. A modern “Vicks Vapo-Rub” bottle fragment was found in the site center. No prehistoric cultural features were noted.

Assessment: A thin veneer of sediment
supporting sparse lithic debris defines 41BX1367. The lack of temporally diagnostic artifacts, cultural features, and isolable cultural components indicate that the site has little potential to yield important archeological information. Therefore, it is recommended that it be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX1368

Description: Site 41BX1368 is a large lithic scatter (200 m north-south by 400 m east-west) located along the northern terrace of Meusebach Creek in the southern edge of Training Area 5B. The site lies at 1,170 ft amsl and runs parallel to the creek and Sewell Road. It is concentrated on the first and second terraces north of the creek and most likely extended south of the creek where the road now lies (some flakes were observed on the thin margin between the creek and the road). Very dense juniper and oak trees exist on-site and are interrupted by small clearings with exposed bedrock, especially at the edges of terraces. Some cacti and native grasses cover the ground north of the creek. Cleared pastureland of native grass is south of the creek. The ground surface visibility was good at 70 percent.

Overall, the lithic scatter can be considered of medium density. There is, however, a noticeable increase in lithic debitage in the site center, north of the creek. Upland areas north of the creek seem devoid of debitage. More-recent activity at the site is evidenced by a firing position made of locally gathered boulders. The site is bounded by a barbed wire fence to the west and north with Sewell Road to the south.

Soils along the northern edge of the creek are dark brown clay loam with some areas of thin dark silts with small, eroded limestone pebbles. According to Taylor et al. (1962:32), these are Trinity and Frío soils, which frequently flooded. Since the lithic scatter parallels the creek, 14 shovel tests were dug to investigate the possibility of subsurface deposits. The tests ranged from 10 to 50 cm deep; all were negative and went to bedrock or hard clays. Shovel Test 5 (which reached bedrock at 10 cm) was in a high-density lithic debitage area. The first layer (0–1 cm) was thin light brown sandy silt with pebbles and at 1–5 cm, was brown silty sand. The remainder (to 10 cm) consisted of the same brown silt with the addition of gravels.

Shovel tests nearer the creek went deeper (40–50 cm) and were composed primarily of dark clays. Tests farther from the creek contained thin dark silty sandy loam with gravels or cobbles.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected: Five points and one long biface fragment were collected. One point is typed as a Late Archaic Ensor dart point. The remaining four are untypeable dart point fragments. The long biface appears heat treated. Other observed artifacts include two primary, four secondary, and six tertiary flakes; three cores; four bifaces; and one point fragment. Historic items include .38-caliber casings, tin cans, timber with wire nails (a crate), and a pin. The firing position is the only cultural feature, and it is historic in age.

Assessment: While some sediment is present at 41BX1368, the numerous negative shovel tests demonstrate that intact subsurface cultural deposits with stratigraphically discrete components are not present. All of the artifacts observed were restricted to the surface. Because the site lacks the capacity to yield important archeological information, it is recommended that it be considered ineligible for listing in NRHP.

41BX1390

Description: This small 30x30-m lithic scatters lie along County Road in southern Training Area 2A, among dense juniper and oak uplands north of Harrison Hill. Two small drainages are to the west and northeast; Cibolo Creek is 820 m to the northwest. Flora includes greenbriers, native grasses, and wildflowers. The site lies at 1,275 ft amsl. Ground surface visibility was good at 60 percent.

Soils are a brown silty clay loam. According to Taylor et al. (1962:12), they are Crawford and Bexar stony soils. Two negative shovel tests were dug in the center of the lithic scatter. The first went to 45 cm and encountered tan clay at 20 cm. Shovel Test 2 reached bedrock at 10 cm.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected: A single untypeable dart point was collected in the northern part of the site. Thirty artifacts of varying types were observed on the surface. One primary, 17 secondary, 8 tertiary, and 2 biface-thinning flakes; 1 unifacial blade; 1 utilized flute; and 1 chert chunk compose the surface
finds. No cultural features were observed.

Assessment: This site is a sparse lithic scatter containing no cultural features or intact subsurface deposits. Since components cannot be isolated and chronological indicators are lacking, the capacity of the site to yield important archeological information is low. Therefore, it is recommended that 41BX1390 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX1391

Description: This large (275 m north-south by 250 m east-west) site straddles both sides of a small drainage in central Training Area 2A. Lithic resource site 41BX1393 lies just to the north. The central road for Training Area 2A acts as the western border of the site. The area is in a juniper incursion into an oak savannah, with native grasses and cacti existing in small patches. The site lies at an elevation of 1,210–1,220 ft amsl. Ground visibility was 80 percent.

Soils are thin brown silty clay loam interspersed with exposed limestone bedrock and exposed gravels. These are mapped as Crawford and Bexar stony soils (Taylor et al. 1962:12). No shovel tests were dug due to the lack of sediment.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected: A total of 71 prehistoric artifacts were observed on the surface; 2 dart points were collected. The first point is a Darl while the second is an Ensor. Both projectile points date to the Late Archaic. Other surface finds consisted of 4 primary, 21 secondary, 20 tertiary, and 11 biface-thinning flakes; 4 bifaces; 4 cores; 3 chunks; and 2 utilized flakes. The southwest quadrant of the site had the highest number of flakes (n = 25), followed by the northwest and southeast quadrants (n = 17 each). The northeast portion contained 12 artifacts. Tested lag gravels are common. Late-reduction and decortication debitage occurs mostly in the southern part of the site, especially in the southwest corner. No prehistoric cultural features were noted.

Assessment: Site 41BX1391 contains a moderate density of lithic materials and lag gravels scattered over an exposed bedrock surface. The lack of appreciable sediment makes isolating components impossible. No features were found, which contributes to the assessment that the site has no capacity to yield important archeological data. Therefore, it is recommended that 41BX1391 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX1392

Description: This small (140 m east-west by 100 m north-south) lithic scatter is located in south-central Training Area 2A within a patchy juniper and oak savannah west of a small unnamed drainage. Native grasses abound, especially near the small drainage, which is 20 m east of the flake scatter. A bend in Cibolo Creek is 640 m to the north. The site is at an elevation of 1,240 ft amsl on the northwestern lower slope of Harrison Hill. Recent disturbances include the clearing of vegetation for a deer stand located southeast of the site and the addition of a now-dilapidated military command trailer in the northwest corner of the site. A small two-track road bisects the site.

Soils are thin light yellowish brown clay loam interspersed with exposed and gravelly bedrock. According to Taylor et al. (1962:12), they are Crawford and Bexar stony soils. Good ground visibility (70 percent) was attributed to the lack of soils and tree cover throughout much of the site. No shovel tests were dug due to the lack of any significant deposition.

Cultural Materials Observed: A total of 52 lithic artifacts were observed on the surface. These were 6 primary, 9 secondary, 11 tertiary, and 17 biface-thinning flakes; 2 unifacial tools; 3 bifacial tools; 2 chunks; and 2 cores. Most of the artifacts were in the northeastern part of the site closest to the drainage (n = 34), while 12 artifacts were observed in the northwest quadrant. No more than 7 flakes were observed in the southern half of the site. Late-reduction flakes occur in the northeastern part of the site in great numbers, while early and late-reduction flakes occur in the northwestern part. No diagnostics were collected, and no prehistoric cultural features were observed.

Assessment: Site 41BX1392 is a moderate lithic scatter resting on a thin layer of sediment over bedrock. The lack of any temporal diagnostics or cultural features makes chronological interpretations problematic. Moreover, the lack of appreciable sediment does not allow for isolation of components. Because 41BX1392 lacks the capacity to yield important archeological information, it is recommended that it be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.
in the National Register under Criterion A. No further information can be ascertained through archeological testing of the site. Therefore, it is considered ineligible under Criterion D.

41BX1404

Description: This historic site covers an area 30 m north-south by 50 m east-west and is located 550 m northwest of the intersection of County and Blanco Roads in Training Area 2D. The site area is a flat wooded tract at approximately 1,175 ft amsl. Historic materials straddle both sides of the road with most of the material coming from the south side. Brown clay loam soils are present. According to Taylor et al. (1962:31), they are of the Tarrant Association, gently undulating variety. No shovel tests were dug since this historic site lies upon the surface. Ground surface visibility was approximately 40 percent.

History: Site 41BX1404, the former location of housing occupied by Mexican workers on the Henry Schmidt Ranch, was reported by an informant (Oscar Schmidt 1992) and inventoried by the government in about 1940. The housing was constructed by Henry Schmidt, who employed Mexican laborers on his stock farm after 1906 to cut trees either for clearing fields for crops or for supplying wood to Camp Stanley. According to a grandson (Henry Schmidt 2000), a worker named Alex lived in one of the houses with his wife and children. A second worker named Isbel also lived there. Schmidt remembered that the men were hired to dig up bull nettle and cut firewood.

Schmidt’s workers’ housing was located between his residence (41BX397) and Blanco Road on the south side of present-day County Road. According to a government property inventory, the housing consisted of one 10x14-ft structure and one two-story structure that measured 12x12 ft. Dates of occupation are not known for the buildings, but they could have been constructed soon after Schmidt acquired the property in the Rivas Survey (1906). They very likely were in use during World War I when Schmidt supplied large amounts of cordwood to Camp Stanley; their inclusion in the ca. 1940 government inventory suggests ongoing use.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected: Historic materials were observed on both sides of County Road. Artifacts south of the road include several scattered limestone rocks that may be displaced house footings, a hollowed limestone rock (water basin for chickens), metal, glass, whiteware, and a button (plastic?). Observed artifacts north of the road include brown-glazed stoneware, a bottle, window glass, stove parts, a folding metal seat, rocks, cans, wooden posts, and a Winchester .351-caliber casing (1907–1957). Collected artifacts from the south side of County Road consist of a glass bottle, a bottle base, one window glass sherd, one bone china sherd, and one shell button. There were no structural outlines visible in either location.

Assessment: Site 41BX1404 is the former location of workers’ housing constructed and owned by Henry Schmidt. The site, which is ephemeral, was occupied during the early twentieth century. Because the site is not considered important in the local history or associated with important individuals, it is recommended as ineligible for NRHP listing under Criteria A or B. Furthermore, the site is unable to yield important archeological information and is considered ineligible under Criterion D.

41CM233

Description: This prehistoric lithic scatter in Training Area 1A consists of a wide area (380 m northeast-southwest by 180 m northwest-southeast) of tested lag gravels and flakes which occur in moderate density 400 m north of Cibolo Creek. The site is at 1,250 ft amsl and is covered by juniper and oak woods with an understory of native grasses and cacti. The large open patches of native grasses resulted in ground surface visibility of 60 percent. The terrain is level except for a gradual slope toward the north where an unnamed creek originates and flows eastward. Four karst features and three other smaller sinks are in the north part of the site. Most flakes were recorded as a sample from a large transect from the northern part of the site to the southern part, with the flakes increasing in frequency to the south. Lag gravels abound and obviously were tested throughout prehistory. A series of historic rock structures at 41CM95 abut the northeastern edge of the site.

Soils are orange-brown silty loam on a relatively flat terrain with some bedrock exposures. According to Batte (1984:40–41), this area of Camp Bullis is characterized by Tarpley clays.
Four shovel tests were dug. They were negative and went to 10 to 20 cm. All tests were stopped by bedrock. Shovel Test 1 (north part of the site) revealed a dark orange-brown sandy clay loam throughout, while Shovel Test 2 (site center) revealed an orange-brown silty loam to 3 cm, dark brown silty clay to 10 cm, and reddish brown clay to 20 cm. Similarly, Shovel Test 3 (southeastern part of the site) revealed orange silty sand to 2 cm, dark brown silty clay to 14 cm, and reddish clay to 15 cm. Lastly, Shovel Test 4 (southeast corner) revealed brown silty sand to 10 cm.

**Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:** Only a single complete dart point was collected, however, it is untypenameable. It was found in the northern part of the site. In addition, 7 primary, 17 secondary, and 13 tertiary flakes; 1 biface; 3 biface fragments; 3 thinning flakes; 1 core; and 1 core fragment were observed on the surface. No cultural features were noted.

**Assessment:** This prehistoric lithic scatter offers little in terms of research potential. Soils in the area are shallow and deflated, as indicated by the shovel tests. Since components cannot be isolated and no cultural features were found, the site is unable to yield important archaeological information. Therefore, it is recommended that 41CM233 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

**41CM234**

**Description:** Site 41CM234 (280 m north-south by 240 m east-west) is a moderate-density scatter of flakes and tools surrounding a small sinkhole in Training Area 1A. The sinkhole is located in the extreme north part of the site. A dense lithic concentration is in the northern part of the site, diminishing toward the south. The terrain is fairly level at approximately 1,250 ft msl with a gradual slope to the south toward an unnamed creek. Cibolo Creek is 900 m to the south and 350 m to the east. Dense juniper and oak thickets are interrupted by small silty areas with native grasses and prickly pear cacti. Ground surface visibility was good to excellent, averaging 60 percent. Moreover, chert lag gravels and cobbles are visible throughout the site. These tested lag gravels continue toward adjacent 41CM235. The site is just within the boundary of Camp Bullis and undoubtedly extends onto private property to the northwest. Recent disturbances occur in the northern part of the site where a deer stand, firing lanes, and access road now exists, along with the firebreak perimeter road.

The soils are reddish brown silt or clay loam. According to Batte (1984:40–41), they are Tarpley clay. Four shovel tests were dug, with two in the south (Shovel Tests 1 and 2) and two within a denser lithic concentration in the north (Shovel Tests 3 and 4). These tests went to 14 to 28 cm. All were negative and were stopped by hard reddish brown clays. All shovel tests were similar with an upper level of orange silty clay loam to 20 cm and a lower level of reddish brown clay. Small gravels were present in the upper level of Shovel Test 1.

**Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:** A single Castroville dart point base was collected along the deer stand access road, just south of the sinkhole. A total of 22 other lithic artifacts were observed and range from primary through tertiary flakes, with some biface fragments and chert cobbles.

**Assessment:** Site 41CM234 is characterized by sparse lithic materials scattered over a layer of culturally sterile sediment as demonstrated by the negative shovel tests. Because the sediment is devoid of cultural materials, components are not isolable. Furthermore, no cultural features were observed. Since 41CM234 lacks the capacity to yield important archeological data, it is recommended that it be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

**41CM235**

**Description:** This large prehistoric site (550 m northeast-southwest by 120 m north-west-southeast) overlooks Cibolo Creek in Training Area 1A and is characterized by a scatter of tested lag gravels in the west and chert artifacts, a small area of fire-cracked rocks atop the rise overlooking the creek, and three positive shovel tests on the east side of the site. It is set high above Cibolo Creek on a steep escarpment at 1,225 ft msl, with the Cibolo to the south and another deeply cut streambed to the north. Junipers and oaks dominate the ridge with sotols, prickly pear cacti, small yuccas, and native grasses forming the understory. The flora and exposed bedrock offered 80 percent ground surface visibility.

Soils atop the escarpment are thin brown silty
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clay loam interspersed with exposed bedrock. They are mapped as Comfort soils (Batte 1984:69). Five shovel tests were dug in the eastern fire-cracked rock scatter, with Shovel Tests 1–3 yielding eight artifacts. All artifacts were from Level 1 (0–20 cm). Shovel Test 1 encountered silty sandy loam to 20 cm before hitting bedrock. Shovel Test 2 encountered a dark brown clay loam with limestone inclusions before hitting bedrock at 13 cm. Shovel Test 3 encountered silty loam to bedrock at 21 cm. Shovel Test 4 encountered sandy silt before hitting bedrock at 12 cm. Shovel Test 5 encountered fire-cracked rocks and dark brown clay loam with limestone inclusions to bedrock at 8 cm.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected: Three projectile points were collected from the surface. One is a Late Archaic Ensor point. The others are untypeable dart point fragments. Eight chert artifacts were recovered from shovel testing. These consist of three flakes from Shovel Test 1; a biface, core, and chip from Shovel Test 2; and two flakes from Shovel Test 3. Other materials observed from the entire site area include 8 primary, 13 secondary, and 20 tertiary flakes in the east, and hundreds of tested lag gravels and chunky debris to the west. Historic items include metal fragments and two recent liquor bottles.

Assessment: This site represents a possible habitation area within a lithic resource procurement locality. Shovel testing shows that the cultural materials are restricted to the surface and upper 20 cm. This is considered too shallow to isolate the components represented. Furthermore, no discrete cultural features were observed, only a scatter of burned rocks. It is unclear whether the scatter is a disturbed feature. Since 41CM235 appears to be incapable of yielding important archeological information, it is recommended that the site be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41CM236

Description: This site is a scatter of flakes, points, and tools east of a small intermittent stream in Training Area 1A. Cibolo Creek is 500 m due south, and the Camp Bullis boundary is ca. 60 m to the north. Site 41CM236 is 100 m east of 41CM242 and its burned rock midden. Site 41CM236 is 120 m north-south by 60 m east-west and is situated on level terrain (1,240 ft amsl) with patches of exposed limestone bedrock and a small stream lying to the north. Junipers, oaks, prickly pear cacti, and sparse native grasses dominate the flora and provide up to 50 percent ground surface visibility.

Soils are a thin reddish brown silty loam covering limestone bedrock. According to (Batte 1984:69), these are Comfort soils. Two negative shovel tests were dug to bedrock within the site center and to the east where probes indicated possible soil depth. Shovel Test 1 revealed orange brown silty loam to 5 cm and dark brown silty clay loam to bedrock (20 cm), while Shovel Test 2 revealed brown silty clay loam down to bedrock (15 cm).

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected: A single projectile point base and a biface fragment were collected. The point is an untypeable dart point base fragment. Observed lithic materials indicate late-stage reduction debitage, with few primary flakes. Ten biface-thinning flakes, 2 unifaces, and 3 cores were observed. The three cores were close to each other and the dense central scatter.

Assessment: Site 41CM236 is an ephemeral prehistoric lithic scatter. Shovel testing revealed that the cultural materials are restricted to the surface. No cultural features nor clear temporal indicators were observed. Because potential components cannot be identified due to a lack of appreciable sediment, the site is unable to offer any important archeological information. Therefore, it is recommended that 41CM236 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41CM237

Description: This 240x80-m prehistoric site in Training Area 1A is characterized by a series of artifact concentrations located on two to three terraces north of an intermittent stream that feeds into Cibolo Creek (200 m due south). The site has a fairly dense scatter of lithic materials, especially in the higher northern part where the projectile points were found. Cores were found primarily near the creek at the south end of the site. Flora consists of large juniper and oak trees with native grasses and cacti. Together, the density of flora and bedrock exposures produced ground surface visibility of 50 percent for much of the site.

The site is at 1225 to 1245 ft amsl and consists mostly of exposed bedrock with some areas
of thin soil deposits. These soils are dark brown clay loam. According to Batte (1984:64), they are Comfort soils. Two negative shovel tests to 25 and 21 cm were located in obvious lithic concentrations. Shovel Test 1, located in the northern concentration, encountered homogenous brown silty clay loam to 20 cm followed by brown silty clay loam with small limestone inclusions to bedrock at 25 cm. Shovel Test 2, located in the center of the site, was a consistent brown silty sand to bedrock at 21 cm. The southern end of the site has very thin soils or exposed bedrock.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:
Two dart points were collected. One is a Late Archaic Fri point. The second is a Pedernales point dating to the Late Archaic. A triangular biface also was collected. Other observed materials include 4 primary flakes, 16 secondary flakes, 27 tertiary flakes, 3 cores, and 3 bifaces. No cultural features were found.

Assessment: Site 41CM237 contains a shallow layer of sediment over mostly exposed bedrock. Shovel testing has demonstrated that all of the artifacts are restricted to the surface, and no cultural features are present. The lack of appreciable sediment makes isolating components impossible. Since 41CM237 lacks the capacity to contribute important archeological data, it is recommended that it be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41CM238

Description: Site 41CM238 in Training Area 1A is a small (40 m north-south by 65 m east-west), light scatter of flakes along a small stream that meets Cibolo Creek to the south (ca. 100 m). Junipers and oaks dominate the woodland setting with a light grass and cactus understory in a highly eroding and sloped bedrock exposure at 1,210 ft amsl. Extensive eroded bedrock gravels cover the site, while the stream bank is mostly eroded boulders. Two prominent washouts are on the eastern and western boundaries of the site. Ground surface visibility was 80–90 percent.

The soils are thin brown silty loam interspersed with eroded bedrock. According to Batte (1984:69), they are Comfort soils. Due to the extensive surface bedrock, no shovel tests were dug.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:
Four primary flakes, two secondary flakes, two tertiary flakes, and two biface fragments were observed on the surface. No artifacts were collected and no features were observed.

Assessment: This site is an ephemeral lithic scatter restricted to the surface and containing no cultural features. Since components cannot be isolated and chronological indicators are lacking, the capacity of the site to yield important archeological information is low. Therefore, it is recommended that 41CM238 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41CM239

Description: This site covers 80 m northsouth by 35 m east-west in Training Area 1A. It is in a series of open clearings interspersed with junipers, oaks, prickly pear cacti, and native grasses. The site has three clusters of lithic debris, bifaces, and projectile points along an upland slope, 300 m north of Cibolo Creek (ca. 1,280 ft amsl). There is a firebreak road to the north and east of the site. Ground surface visibility was 60 percent.

Soils are thin dark brown sandy clay loam covering bedrock. According to Batte (1984:69), they are Comfort soils. Two shovel probes encountered bedrock at 2 cm. A third probe in the southern part of the site became a shovel test after a projectile point was found. The test ended at 10 cm when it reached bedrock. Soils uncovered in the test were brown clayey loam.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:
Artifacts observed include 1 primary, 3 secondary, and 14 tertiary flakes; 2 bifaces; 2 biface fragments; and 1 projectile point fragment. In addition, two projectile points were collected: an Edwards arrow point and an untypeable stem fragment from Shovel Test 1. A small triangular biface also was collected. No cultural features were observed.

Assessment: This small lithic scatter offers little research potential. Subsurface examination shows that the lithic materials are restricted to the surface and upper 3 cm of sediment. Due to a lack of appreciable sediments, components cannot be isolated. Coupled with a lack of cultural features, this indicates that 41CM239 is incapable of yielding important archeological data. Therefore, it is recommended that it be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.
41CM240

**Description:** Site 41CM240 is a 60x60-m scatter of lithics, approximately 200 m north of Cibolo Creek in Training Area 1A. Here, at 1,220 ft amsl, the terrain slopes gradually to the south. Limestone bedrock exposures dot the landscape, interspersed with areas containing shallow sediments. Junipers, oaks, native grasses, and cacti make up the floral components of the landscape. Ground visibility was 70 percent in the clearings and 50 percent in the woods.

Soils are thin brown clayey loam among areas of exposed bedrock. According to Batte (1984:69), these are Comfort soils. Extensive bedrock exposure allowed for a single test to 15 cm. The first level was orange silty loam to 2 cm followed by a brown silty clay to 6 cm. An orange-brown clay extended to bedrock at 15 cm.

**Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:** Three secondary flakes, seven tertiary flakes, two biface fragments, and core fragments were found in a light scatter. In addition, a single triangular biface was collected. No cultural features were noted.

**Assessment:** This small ephemeral site lacks appreciable sediment, which makes isolating any components impossible. The lack of temporal indicators, paucity of artifacts, and thin soils argue that the site lacks the capacity to yield important archaeological information. Therefore, it is recommended that 41CM240 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41CM242

**Description:** This multicomponent site, which includes a historic artifact scatter, a stone structure, and an apparent headstone along with a prehistoric burned rock midden and flake scatter, is in the northwestern corner of Training Area 1A (Figure 11). It measures 280 m north-south by 180 m east-west and is located on a slight escarpment with a small spring-fed stream meandering east to west through the middle of the site. This stream is highlighted by green moss-covered boulders and ferns within a small, leaf littered ravine. There is another small, south-running stream to the east that ultimately feeds into Cibolo Creek, 1.4 km to the south. The escarpment at 41CM242 (at 1,240 ft amsl) slopes toward the creek to the south and east. The landscape is covered with dense junipers, oaks, and elms, with native grasses and cacti forming an understory. Areas of exposed limestone bedrock exist throughout the site. The flora and bedrock provided 40 percent ground surface visibility.

Soils are brown sandy clay loam. According to Batte (1984:69), they are Comfort soils. Three shovel tests were dug. Shovel Test 1, placed into the burned rock midden, went down to 38 cm and is described below. Shovel Test 2 (in the northwest corner of the site) consisted of brown silty clay to bedrock at 32 cm, while Shovel Test 3 in the center of the site consisted of brown silty loam to bedrock at 10 cm.
Figure 11. Plan of 41CM242.
An intact burned rock midden (16 m north-south by 8 m east-west) lies in the northern part of the site and is composed of many pea-sized gravels to softball-sized fire-cracked rocks. The midden lies on a slight rise accompanied by many lithic artifacts, including at least 6 projectile points that were collected from the immediate area. Shovel Test 1 in the southern half of the midden went down to 38 cm before reaching bedrock. Five flakes, 13 Rabdotus snails, and 28 fire-cracked rocks were found in Level 1 (0–20 cm), while 15 Rabdotus snails and 39 fire-cracked rocks were found in Level 2 (20–38 cm). Level 1 revealed dark brown to black silty clay loam with many fire-cracked rocks. Level 2 was brown silty loam with many fire-cracked rocks.

To the south of the burned rock midden (ca. 100 m) are a headstone (Figure 12) and a roughly circular historic rock wall structure within 5 m of each other. It is possible that the limestone headstone may not indicate a place of burial, since the surface does not appear to have been disturbed. The headstone was found in three pieces. The base (on the upper right in Figure 12) appears to be in situ. The two body fragments were found fitted together beside the base. The body is 88 cm long by 48 cm wide by 13 cm thick. The inscription is not legible, except for the date 188_, and the last digit has been so damaged that it is possible to ascertain only that it is not a "5," the year of Henry Smith's death. There are a few decorative markings on the headstone, including an incised cross within a diamond shape and a recessed panel containing the inscription. The limestone base into which the stone was set is an oblong octagonal shape 47 cm long by 33 cm wide by 22 cm high. The hole in the center of the base is 20 cm long by 14 cm wide by 8 cm deep. The stone has been moved slightly compared to its position in a 1962 photograph provided by Carlene Smith. It may have been reassembled and propped back up for the 1962 photograph, since the medial crack is present in that image.

The low rock wall feature consists of undressed limestone rocks and boulders in a 5-m-diameter circular shape and is three to four stone courses tall. No mortar appears to have been used in its construction. A small opening is located at the north side of the structure. A small piece of clear, curved bottle glass was found at the northeast side, while two pieces of undecorated whiteware (hollowware) were found on the northwest side. Square nails reportedly had been found in a nearby tree. However, no nails were found during survey. Ferrous wire and a metal can also were associated with the pen.

**History:** The historic component at 41CM242 is located in the east half of the Maria de la Luz Guerra Survey near the north boundary of Camp Bullis (Figure 13). The legal history of the land on which 41CM242 is located is the same as that of 41CM95 (see Previously Recorded Sites section). The property was patented to San Antonio businessmen Enoch Jones and John W. Smith on August 13, 1844 (Bexar County, Deed Record U-2:132), and divided after Smith's death in 1845. The east half of the survey, on which 41CM242 and 41CM95 are located, was set aside to Enoch Jones, and he owned the 2,214 acres on both sides of the Cibolo until 1860 (Bexar County, Deed Record S-1:389). In that year, he deeded the land to his daughter, Olive Ann, who, with her husband, Lieutenant Thornton A. Washington, owned the property until 1867. On April 13, they sold the 2,214 acres to Major John S. Mason (Bexar County, Deed Record S-1:389; U-2:132–133).

Tax records indicate that Mason ran cattle and goats on his ranch, even though he was absent from Bexar and Comal Counties during most of the time he owned the property. During his absence in the 1880s and early 1890s, the 2,214 acres were occupied by Mason's daughter and son-in-law, Kate and John Wesley Eckles, and their children. The Eckles family lived at 41CM95 and ranched the rest of the property, which included the area of 41CM242.

In 1895, Mason sold 1,880 acres of "the ranch formerly occupied by J. W. Eckles" to a partnership consisting of Joseph Simon and Peter Doeppehnsmith of Comal County (Bexar County, Deed Record 138:774–775). The 1,880 acres were comprised of the east half of the Maria de la Luz Guerra Survey, less 250 acres Mason already had sold to Edward Rompel (portion denoted H. Rompel 250 acres on Figure 13), and less 320 acres he had sold to H. H. Toepperwein (portion denoted P. Doeppehnsmith 320 acres on Figure 13), both out of the western portion of the east half of the survey. Mason also conveyed 191 acres to Simon and Doeppehnsmith out of the Socorro Farming Company grant that he had acquired by patent on January 20, 1879. The Socorro Farming
Company Survey bordered the Maria de la Luz Guerra Survey on the east; Mason earlier had sold 129 acres of that company survey to Joseph Becker (also spelled Boecker) (see Figure 13). Thus, 41CM242 and 41CM95 both were located on the portion of the Guerra Survey sold to Simon and Döppenschmidt in 1895.

Five years later, on January 6, 1900, Simon and Döppenschmidt divided the property, and Döppenschmidt received the southern 875 acres that contained 41CM242 and 41CM95 (Bexar County, Deed Record 187:5–7). Peter Döppenschmidt retained the land until August 1, 1911, when he and his wife, Agnes, sold the 875 acres Peter had been deeded in 1900 and an additional 320 acres to the west to C. August Grosser of Comal County for $18,000 in cash and notes (Bexar County, Deed Record 356:327–329). Grosser owned the property intact for 3 years, when he sold 200 acres in the southeast corner of the Guerra Survey to his son, Alwin Grosser, for $4,000 (Bexar County, Deed Record 447:512). He and his wife, Charlotte, retained the balance of the property on which 41CM242 and 41CM95 are located until October 14, 1935, when they sold it to their son for $5,500 in cash and notes (Bexar County, Deed Record 1511:78–79).

Although some suggestions have been made that 41CM242 is associated with the Smith family, and that the headstone at the site marks the burial place of Henry M. Smith, it is clear from the legal history of the Guerra Survey that no member of the Smith family ever owned any part of that survey (see Appendix A for a discussion of the Smiths and their occupation of properties outside the current boundaries of Camp Bullis). Instead, ownership was vested in Major (later General) John S. Mason at the time of Henry Smith's death on June 8, 1885, and for 10 years thereafter. During the 1880s, management of Mason's Ranch was the responsibility.
lateral edge and possible working on the other. The next flake is a broken biface-thinning flake, possibly reddened by heat treatment. The final artifact is a homogenous grayish brown angular chunk. Other prehistoric materials found throughout the site include 3 bifaces, 10 primary flakes, 15 secondary flakes, and more than 18 tertiary flakes. A single biface noted on the south side of the site had the appearance of a Guadalupe biface.

Historic artifacts are scattered sparsely across the site, except for a concentration near the spring in the central part. Materials observed include solarized glass, blue Mason jar fragments, clear container glass, thick clear glass, peach-colored glass, ceramics, and tin cans. Thirteen glass sherds were collected from the surface. They represent containers, tableware, kitchenware, and a lighting fixture. The assemblage dates primarily to the late nineteenth century through the 1940s.

Assessment: The historic component of 41CM242 is comprised of one feature that appears to have been associated with livestock management during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and a second feature that is a headstone. The circular rock feature appears to represent a camping place used on an occasional and repetitive basis by herders and is not considered significant. Furthermore, there is insufficient evidence to assign an identity to the headstone, or to conclude whether it is associated with a burial. Neither feature is recommended eligible for NRHP listing. However, it would be prudent to avoid the area surrounding the headstone in future ground-disturbing activities, given the somewhat remote possibility that it does, in fact, mark a grave.

The prehistoric component of 41CM242 appears to date to the Archaic period, with the six points recovered suggesting that the site was utilized on multiple occasions throughout that
time period. Since most of the site lacks accumulated sediments in which buried deposits could occur, those areas are considered not to have stratigraphic integrity and to lack the capacity to yield important data. Only the burned rock midden itself has research potential. Based on the context and recovery of Shovel Test 1, the midden appears to be intact and to possess artifactual materials as well as faunal remains. Some middens are known to have yielded both floral and faunal remains which offer evidence for interpreting prehistoric subsistence strategies as well as paleoenvironmental reconstruction. Macro- or microscopic floral and faunal remains may be present and recoverable from the midden. Internal features containing datable organic materials may be present as well. Test excavations would be required to determine the true potential of the midden to yield important information (Criterion D). Therefore, it is recommended that only the burned rock midden be considered eligible for NRHP listing, pending testing of its deposits.

PREVIOUSLY RECORDED SITES

41BX371

Description: Originally described by Gerstle et al. (1978:125) as a small (40x30 m) lithic scatter atop a rise in Training Area 1A, this site has been expanded to 750 m northeast-southwest by 290 m northwest-southeast along a rise that parallels an intermittent stream that feeds into Cibolo Creek. The southern and central parts of the site (at 1,320 ft amsl) are typified by dense young juniper stands in previously channeled juniper oak savannah. The northern part (at 1,210 ft amsl) is mature juniper and oak savannah along the terrace overlooking Cibolo Creek. Two east-west two-track roads bisect the northern third of the site. Ground surface visibility is up to 60 percent.

Soils are thin white/gray silty clay interspersed with exposed bedrock. These are Crawford clays (Taylor et al. 1962:12). No shovel tests were dug due to extensive exposed bedrock.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected: Bifaces, biface fragments, scrapers, and a moderate scatter of flakes were observed throughout the site. An untypeable dart point was observed but not collected. Seven dart points were collected. One is an Early Archaic Gower point, while the other six are untypeable.

Assessment: Gerstle et al. (1978:349) originally recommended no further work at 41BX371, citing that the site was eroded and damaged. Reassessment of the site expanded the original boundaries but also noted the lack of any appreciable sediment and some disturbance. Since the debitage and diagnostics are restricted to the surface and no intact stratified deposits are present, components cannot be isolated and 41BX371 lacks the potential to yield important archeological information. Therefore, it is recommended that the site be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX373

Description: This site originally was recorded by Gerstle et al. (1978:126) as a small (40x30 m) lithic scatter overlooking Cibolo Creek in Training Area 2A; it was dated to the Late Paleoindian period by a single Angostura point. This survey revealed a much larger scatter of lithic materials (600x600 m) that reflects habitation along the elevated and relatively level region along the bend in the creek at 1,200–1,230 ft amsl. Cibolo Creek is within 300 m. Vegetation is typical of the region with junipers and oaks dominating the larger flora followed by hackberries and elms. Native grasses and lesser amounts of cacti also are present. A sizable cliff acts as the western boundary of the site. A small drainage abuts the eastern edge of the newly expanded boundary. The small drainage associated with newly expanded 41BX385 is within 50 m of the newly expanded southern boundary of 41BX373. A recent survey marker is in the northwestern corner of the site, while a north-south barbed wire fence bisects the site.

Soils in the area are thin brown silt interspersed with exposed bedrock. According to Taylor et al. (1962:30), these are of the Tarrant Association. Only two shovel tests were dug due to the extensive exposed bedrock. These tests were negative, having penetrated 20–40 cm into brown clay loam before reaching compact reddish brown clay.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected: In addition to the Late Paleoindian component identified originally, 41BX373 now has a Late Archaic component based on two Ensor points
and a Late Prehistoric component evidenced by the medial section of an arrow point. A total of 445 other artifacts were enumerated on the surface: 48 primary, 96 secondary, 105 tertiary, and 96 biface-thinning flakes; 13 unifaces; 13 bifaces; 52 chunks; and 22 cores. Lag gravels are numerous throughout the site. A chopper was found in the site center. Historic materials include whiteware cup fragments in the northeastern corner of the site. No cultural features were observed. 

Assessment: Gerstle et al. (1978:349) originally recommended no further work at 41BX373, citing that the site was eroded. Reassessment of the site expanded the original boundaries but also noted the lack of any intact subsurface cultural deposits. In addition to the Late Paleoindian component, Late Archaic and Late Prehistoric components have been added. Although a wide range of artifacts were observed over a large area, they are restricted to the surface, indicating that isolating components would be impossible. Moreover, the lack of any significant cultural features suggests that little potential for continued research exists. Therefore, it is recommended that 41BX373 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX376

Description: Site 41BX376 originally was recorded by Gerstle et al. (1978:127) as a 320x250-m lithic scatter atop an interfluval ridge associated with the lower north slope of Harrison Hill in Training Area 2A. This revisit found more cultural materials to the north of the original site and to the east toward a small unnamed drainage near the Training Area 2A/2D border. The site now occupies an area of 420x300 m and lies at an elevation of 1,230 to 1,270 ft amsl. Within the new site boundaries, an Archaic component was recorded with the recovery of an untypeable dart point in the northern part of the site. The site lies 500 m south of Cibolo Creek. Currently, the site contains dense junipers and oaks except on the northern slope where larger flora becomes increasingly patchy exposing more ground surface (ca. 80 percent visibility).

Soils are thin silt interspersed with exposed and eroding gray bedrock. According to Taylor et al. (1962:11), the soils are of the Brackett series. No shovel tests were dug due to the lack of sediment.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected: The newly extended site boundary encompasses more than 50 flakes and a single point fragment. Flakes noted consist of 10 primary flakes, 20 tertiary flakes, and over 30 biface-thinning flakes. The projectile point found in the north part of the site is an untypeable dart point fragment basally modified into a scraper. Scattered burned rocks also were observed in some areas. No cultural features were observed.

Assessment: Gerstle et al. (1978:342) recommended that 41BX376 be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP. Although additional artifacts were observed over a large area of the newly extended site boundary, the lack of any appreciable sediment indicates that isolating components is not possible. Moreover, the lack of any cultural features suggests that the site lacks the capacity to yield important archeological information. Therefore, in contrast to the original assessment, it is recommended that 41BX376 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX378

Description: Originally recorded by Gerstle et al. (1978:128), 41BX378 is described as a 5x5-m concentration of chipped stones including scrapers, flakes, and an untypeable point. The site is reported to be along a heavily wooded terrace of junipers and oaks that overlooks Cibolo Creek 100 m to the north. Patches of native grasses, thin soils, and exposed bedrock contributed to ground surface visibility of 50 percent in the mapped vicinity of the site. According to Taylor et al. (1962:30), soils in this part of Training Area 2A are of the Tarrant Association. No shovel tests were dug in surveying this part of Training Area 2A due to extensive exposed bedrock. The site reportedly is at an elevation of 1,190 ft amsl.

Cultural Materials Observed: During this survey, some lag gravels were observed throughout the area, and these could be associated with the materials recorded in 1977. However, the small artifact concentration recorded originally could not be re-located.

Assessment: Gerstle et al. (1978:343) argued for mitigation or avoidance of this small site as a discrete knapping area, although the site form
notes that only 3 cm of sediment are present with bare limestone all around. These characteristics suggest that the site may have been disturbed or destroyed through erosion or other causes, perhaps contributing to the inability to re-locate it during the current survey effort. Regardless, based on its context and the original description, the site appears to be unable to contribute important archeological data. Therefore, in contrast to the original assessment, it is recommended that 41BX378 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX379

_Description:_ Originally recorded by Gerstle et al. (1978:128), 41BX379 is described as a 1x4-m concentration of chipped stones including two Scallorn points, seven Edwards points, and one Frio point. During this survey, lag gravels were observed throughout the site, as well as extending eastward toward the next drainage. As a result, much of the newly extended (360 m east-west by 150 m north-south) site is considered a lithic procurement area. Within the lag gravels, a discrete lithic scatter was discovered and designated Cluster A. It is a 15x15-m lithic scatter between two creeks, 200 m south of Cibolo Creek. No shovel tests were dug due to exposed bedrock.

_Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:_ Seven points were collected from Cluster A. These consist of one Bulverde, one Lange, one Ensor, and a Pedernales, all dating to the Late Archaic. A Middle Archaic Travis point and an unidentifiable Late Prehistoric arrow point date other components. A single untypeable dart point was found. Other tools included scrapers of various types and sizes, preforms, and unifacial tools. Surrounding this cluster are cores, chunks, and the full range of lithic flakes. A small historic bottle was found nearby. The remainder of the area is covered in tested and untested lag gravels.

_Assessment:_ Gerstle et al. (1978:343) recommended that 41BX379 has the potential to contribute important information. Reassessment of the site extended its boundary and discovered a wide range of diagnostic artifacts that were found in a tight cluster. However, cultural features are lacking. Because of this and because the various components cannot be isolated due to the lack of appreciable sediment, the site appears to have a limited capacity to yield important archeological data. Therefore, in contrast to the original assessment, it is recommended that 41BX379 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX380

_Description:_ Site 41BX380 is located on a level upland area along a 7-8-m-high escarpment overlooking Cibolo Creek in Training Area 2C. This site originally was recorded by Gerstle et al. (1978:137) as a Late Prehistoric lithic scatter measuring 30x30 m and later expanded to 150x220 m with a Late Archaic component by Kibler and Gardner (1997:43). Current investigations have, again, increased the site to 200 m north-south by 300 m east-west. This research found more lithic materials 100 m to the east-northeast, which is almost contiguous with 41BX381.

Vegetation consists of junipers, oaks, yuccas, and native grasses. The surface is variable reddish to light brown silt with areas of exposed bedrock. According to Taylor et al. (1962:12), the soils are of the Crawford and Bexar stony series. No shovel tests were dug due to extensive exposed bedrock.

_Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:_ Primarily observed within the extended area, a total of 36 lithics were recorded. These include 4 primary, 12 secondary, and 14 tertiary flakes; 1 core; 1 biface; and 4 biface fragments. A single Late Archaic Frio point was collected from within the area of the previous site boundary.

_Assessment:_ Both Gerstle et al. (1978:349) and Kibler and Gardner (1997:43) recommended that 41BX380 be considered ineligible for listing. Revisit to this site expanded the boundaries and recovered another projectile point. No cultural features were observed, and no shovel tests were dug due to the amount of exposed bedrock. Since the current findings confirm that components cannot be isolated and that the site is unable to contribute important archeological data, this investigation concurs with previous recommendations that 41BX380 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX382

_Description:_ Site 41BX382 originally was recorded as a Late Archaic site on the
southwest side of an unnamed hill in Training Area 2C by Gerstle et al. (1978:139). New findings suggest that the entire hilltop (500 m southwest-northeast by 250 m northwest-southeast) was occupied prehistorically. Though the hill is covered with a light lithic scatter, three moderate-density concentrations are present. The hilltop is covered with patches of oak and juniper trees, and patches of native grasses. The hilltop is at an elevation of 1,250 ft amsl and has been disturbed by juniper removal.

Soils are gray to brown silt loam with areas of bedrock exposure. According to Taylor et al. (1962:11), they are of the Brackett-Tarrant Association. Eight shovel tests were placed throughout the site. They were 10–60 cm deep and encountered gray silty sand with limestone inclusions and dark brown silty loam, stopping at bedrock. Only one test was positive, yielding a single flake from the upper 20 cm. It was in the north part of the site.

**Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:** Artifacts observed on the surface included 15 primary, 39 secondary, 23 tertiary, and 2 biface-thinning flakes; 5 bifaces; 1 uniface; 1 chunk; and 1 core. A single flake was recovered from Shovel Test “1G.” Also collected were an Early Archaic Gower point, a Late Archaic Ensor point, an untyped dart point base fragment, and an untyped expanding-stem dart point.

**Assessment:** Gerstle et al. (1978:349) originally recommended no further work for 41BX382, stating that the site was eroded. Reassessment of the site expanded the original boundaries, noted disturbances, and collected more projectile points. No cultural features were identified. One positive shovel test demonstrated that cultural materials are restricted to the surface and upper 20 cm. This confirms the lack of intact subsurface cultural deposits. Because components cannot be isolated, the site lacks the capacity to yield important archeological data. It is recommended that 41BX382 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

**41BX383**

**Description:** This site originally was recorded by Gerstle et al. (1978:139) as a medium-sized Middle to Late Archaic and Late Prehistoric lithic scatter located along the southern edge of Cibolo Creek in Training Area 2D; the site form notes that historic artifacts (glass, metal, and ceramics) were observed throughout the area as well. New findings suggest that much more of the area saw prehistoric occupations. A large area of moderate-density flake scatter (625 m north-south by 600 m east-west) with three high-density scatter sites is now included in 41BX383. The area consists of uplands in the west and probable Pleistocene terrace deposits on the north and east toward Cibolo Creek. Elevations range from 1,150 ft in the east to 1,210 ft amsl in the west. The west half of the site is dense juniper and oak woods, while in the eastern half, larger flora becomes more patchy. Ground surface visibility was good at 70 percent.

Soils are loose dark brown silty clay loam with limestone cobbles eroding out on the surface. According to Taylor et al. (1962:12), these are Crawford and Bexar stony soils and Tarrant soils; typically, Crawford and Bexar stony soils have up to ca. 1 m of rocky clay above limestone bedrock, while Tarrant soils have ca. 25 cm of clay overlying bedrock. Six shovel tests were dug to 6 to 60 cm throughout the site area, one in the western upland part and five on the terrace to the east. One positive shovel test (Shovel Test GC2) in the northeast corner yielded three flakes—one of which is heat damaged. These flakes were found within the first 20 cm. The soils in Level 1 were brown silty clay. Below this was reddish brown clay. The shovel test ended at 50 cm when it reached hard red clay, which appears to represent a Bt horizon developed in Pleistocene terrace deposits.

**Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:** Among the artifacts observed on the surface were 17 primary, 39 secondary, 52 tertiary, and 18 biface-thinning flakes; 4 bifaces; 1 biface fragment; 3 point fragments; 1 core; and 3 unifacial tools. A 10-cm-long by 6-cm-thick limestone nutting stone (or anvil with pits on both faces) also was found near the site center. Two projectile point bases were collected. One is an untypeable dart point base fragment, and the other is a Late Archaic Ensor point. Historic debris found in the northwest part of the site includes 5 pieces of flat glass and 1 piece of ceramic.

**Assessment:** Gerstle et al. (1978:343) originally recommended that 41BX383 be considered eligible for the National Register. During the reassessment, the site dimensions were greatly increased and two projectile points were
collected. No cultural features were encountered during the revisit. Shovel testing demonstrated that cultural materials are restricted to the surface, except in the northwest corner where sparse artifacts were found to 20 cm in thin Holocene deposits atop Pleistocene terrace deposits. Based on the limited subsurface cultural deposits and the thin to nonexistent nature of the Holocene sediments, it appears unlikely that components could be isolated. Thus, the site lacks the capacity to yield important archeological data. In contrast to the original assessment, it is recommended that 41BX383 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX385

Description: This site originally was recorded by Gerstle et al. (1978:141) as a 5x2-m Late Prehistoric lithic scatter west of a small drainage 100 m south of Cibolo Creek in Training Area 2A. This survey greatly extended the site (400 m east-west by 260 m north-south) beyond the small drainage and into a cleared area. Gerstle observed only the western perimeter of the scatter, which in total occupies much of a slight rise (at 1,220 ft amsl) and an associated escarpment near a small drainage that flows directly into Cibolo Creek. Ground surface visibility was good at 60 percent.

This small rise is covered with a light to dense cover of juniper and oak trees, with an understory of native grasses and some cacti. The soils are thin brown silt interspersed with exposed or gravelly bedrock. According to Taylor et al. (1962:12), they are Crawford and Bexar stony soils. One negative shovel test and one shovel probe were dug in the southern half of the site where some sediment is present. The shovel test encountered rocky brown silty loam and was terminated at bedrock (12 cm). Some disturbances exist in the site area resulting from the creation of four roads and two hunting stands.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected: Previously, Gerstle et al. (1978) discovered 4 Edwards and 2 Scallorn projectile points that date to the Late Prehistoric period. A single Pedernales point dating to the Late Archaic period was discovered during this survey in the lower southern part of the site and collected. Also observed were 8 primary, 26 secondary, 27 tertiary, and 10 biface-thinning flakes; 1 uniface; 10 bifaces; 10 chunks; and 10 cores. The northwestern quarter of the site had 38 flakes with a predominance of secondary decortication and some bifacial thinning. The southwestern quarter had 37 flakes, which were mostly secondary and tertiary. Counts for the northeastern and southeastern parts of the site were 16 and 11 flakes. No cultural features were observed, although Gerstle et al. (1978) noted scattered burned rocks.

Assessment: Gerstle et al. (1978:343) recommended that 41BX385 be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP due to the presence of a Late Prehistoric component. However, they also noted that only 5 cm of sediment are present. Reassessment of the site included expansion of the site boundary and the addition of a Late Archaic component. The lack of any cultural features, the inability to isolate components, and the highly disturbed nature of the site suggest that there is no potential for important archeological information. Therefore, in contrast to the original assessment, it is recommended that 41BX385 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX388

Description: Site 41BX388 reportedly is located along the east side of the westernmost firebreak road in Training Area 1A, about 600 m south of Cibolo Creek. The site was described originally by Gerstle et al. (1978:142) as a small (15x6 m) lithic scatter containing a Bulverde point, biface fragments, a scraper, and flakes. It was described as lying on a terrace consisting of open grassy fields with clumps of junipers and live oaks. The area now is primarily juniper/oak woods that become denser toward a nearby intermittent stream. Near the stream, native grasses and cacti grow in abundance upon limited alluvial deposits. The site reportedly lies at 1,270 ft amsl. According to Taylor et al. (1962:13), Crawford and Bexar stony soils are present.

Cultural Materials Observed: No artifacts or features were encountered in the area described by Gerstle et al. (1978:142), probably because of the small size of the site and the dense woods.

Assessment: Site 41BX388 was recorded by Gerstle et al. (1978:142, 349) as a small, light scatter of artifacts and was considered eroded.
and, therefore, ineligible for NRHP listing. The small size and eroded nature of the site probably contributed to the inability to re-locate it during the current project. Based on the original description and its context, the site appears incapable of yielding important archeological information due to its lack of appreciable sediments. Therefore, it is recommended that 41BX388 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX394

Description: Site 41BX394, in Training Area 1A, is a disturbed historic farmstead located on a small rise (at 1,320 ft amsl) that overlooks Cibolo Creek 500 m to the north. Two small intermittent streams are 200 m to the west and 50 m to the northeast. The area is heavily disturbed by past bulldozing and contains piles of burned junipers, bedrock, and mixed sediment, as well as extensive exposed bedrock. Aerial photographs of the area show a heavily modified terrain that affects ca. 100 acres. What remains are sparse stands of juniper and oak trees with patches of native grasses and cacti. A two-track road forms the western boundary of the site. An east-west-oriented rock wall runs along the southern edge. Modern water tanks are present on-site. Soils in the area are mapped as Crawford and Bexar stony soils (Taylor et al. 1962:13) and are thin gray silty clay loam; a shovel probe reached bedrock at 5 cm. Due to the extensive exposed bedrock, no shovel tests were dug. Ground surface visibility was 70 percent.

History: Site 41BX394, the C. Grosser housesite, is located on the south side of Cibolo Creek in the eastern portion of the Maria de la Luz Guerra Survey (No. 172). A certificate for the survey, which eventually encompassed a league, was issued to Guerra by 1837, when she sold it to San Antonio businessmen Enoch Jones and John W. Smith. One league was surveyed for the two men in March 1840, and it was patented to them on August 13, 1844 (Texas. General Land Office 1844b).

The history of the land on which 41BX394 is located is identical to that of 41CM95, the Washington-Mason Housesite, until June 1895 when General John S. Mason sold 1,880 acres "formerly occupied by J. W. Eckles," and known as the Oakland Park Ranch, to Joseph Simon and Peter Doeppenschmidt (Bexar County, Deed Record 138:774–775; Eckles 1885). The land included 41CM95 where the Eckles family had lived. However, there is no evidence of improvements at 41BX394, and Doeppenschmidt, who acquired Simon's interest in 1900 (Bexar County, Deed Record 187:5–7), was a nonresident taxpayer between 1901 and 1907 (Texas. State Comptroller 1901–1907).

Ad valorem tax records indicate that the acreage on which 41CM95 and 41BX394 are located increased in value from $1,380 in 1907 to $1,960 in 1908, suggesting the construction of improvements, perhaps the residence at 41BX394. Three years later, Doeppenschmidt sold the Guerra Survey land to Carl August Grosser of Comal County (Bexar County, Deed Record 356:327–329), who was born in Schliesen, Germany, on November 20, 1859, immigrated to Texas in 1883, and married Charlotte Saur of New Braunfels. The couple settled in Comal County in the Bergheim area where they raised cotton. In 1910 they moved to Van Raub (The Boerne Star, February 17, 1949).

The Grossers may have lived briefly at 41BX394, but on November 30, 1914, they sold 200 acres surrounding the site to their son, Alwin Grosser, who was born on May 6, 1892, and married Ida Georg, sister of Ernst Georg whose farm and home were located a short distance to the east at 41CM97 (Grosser Family n.d.; New Braunfels Herald, March 31, 1966; The Boerne Star, September 9, 1971).

Between 1914 and 1935, Alwin and Ida (Georg) Grosser lived at 41BX394, farming their acreage on the south side of Cibolo Creek. On October 13, 1935, they purchased an additional 438.8 acres from Alwin's parents, C. A. and Charlotte Grosser (Bexar County, Deed Record 1511:78–79). They continued to farm the land until 1941, when it was condemned by the United States government to allow for the expansion of Camp Bullis (Bexar County, Deed Record 1847:351–355).

Cultural Materials Observed: Very little remains of the farmstead. Several mounds of limestone blocks and building debris were observed on the surface, and some whiteware fragments were observed 40 m to the north in an area of new juniper growth. The tipping trough described by Gerstle et al. (1978:266) could not be re-located. Some foundation outlines were seen, but no pattern could be discerned. No artifacts were collected.
Assessment: Site 41BX394 is an early-twentieth-century homestead originally recorded by Gerstle et al. (1978:266) and noted as severely damaged through bulldozing. No further action was recommended (Gerstle et al. 1978:349). Revisit to the site concurs with the original findings. Sediments are thin, and no intact cultural features were observed. Since the site lacks the ability to yield important archeological data, it is recommended that it be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX397

Description: This large historic site is located along the northern side of County Road in Training Area 2D. This survey updated the original map created by Gerstle et al. (1978:263) and extended the boundary to encompass an area of 180 m north-south by 220 m east-west (Figure 14). The site is at an elevation of 1,200 ft asml. The area is sparsely wooded with junipers and oaks and large areas of native grasses and cacti. Ground surface visibility was good at 80 percent. Two standing structures are present, as are the remains of the main house and, to the west, the scattered remains and foundations of at least six agricultural outbuildings. A cistern, a square stock tank, a carved limestone trough, and a concrete dipping trough also were observed.

Soils are thin rocky gray silty loam with areas of exposed bedrock. According to Taylor et al. (1962:30), these are of the Tarrant Association, gently undulating variety. No shovel tests were dug due to extensive exposed bedrock.

Structure 1 is a rectangular poured concrete structure designated as "the garage" (Figure 15a). The west wall has no openings, while the north and south walls feature small rectangular windows. The east part of the garage is open except for the top 0.75 m. Three concrete beams support an east-west sloping poured concrete ceiling. A poured concrete floor completes the structure.

Structure 2 is a round concrete structure 4 m in diameter and almost 10 m tall (Figure 15b). A single 2x1-m door opens to the south. Two pipes are visible inside the structure. A ledge runs around the interior circumference to a height of 1 m. The ceiling is slightly domed with some metal rebar visible. The thickness of the poured concrete for the structure is 36 cm. Of interest is a small niche to the inside left of the entrance. Here are located the ink impressions of an old newspaper that was used to form the niche. The impressions date to World War II. A map is visible with the term "AXIS" on it. Associated with the map are pictures of stylized bombers surrounding it. Part of a visible article mentions "Italy," "Japan," and "Britain." A small advertisement also is visible which appears to be selling football-related gear. An old-style leather football helmet is depicted with the word "PLAY FOOTBALL" along the top of the ad. This structure appears to be the milk house. Adjacent to the milk house are two walls, one of which was the artesian well with a steam engine constructed for the Pfefflers in about 1877.

History: Site 41BX397 is located in the northwestern portion of the Juan Manuel Rivas Survey (No. 191), a tract of 1 league and 1 labor, or 4,605.5 acres. The grant is bisected on the north by Cibolo Creek and on the south by Meusebach Creek. For the most part, the grant historically consisted of well-watered, gently rolling land and a broad valley framed by low hills on the north and south that provided numerous opportunities for farming.

On April 8, 1837, Juan Manuel Rivas of Bexar County assigned his rights to the league and labor to William H. Steele and Ludovic Colquhoun, authorizing the two men to locate the grant (Bexar County, Deed Record A-2:23). Steele may have been the participant in the Battle of San Jacinto who also received a grant on Greens Bayou in Harris County (Dixon and Kemp 1932:262; Ensor et al. 1990:17). Colquhoun was a native of Virginia (born November 26, 1803) who was a commission agent in New Orleans and immigrated to Texas in 1837 as secretary for a Virginia company to purchase and locate land (San Antonio Express, December 5, 1882). He settled in San Antonio where he began to purchase certificates and patents. Within fewer than 2 decades, acting alone or with partners, Colquhoun acquired 225 assignments of claims and certificates, relinquishments, transfers, and patents. Typically, he acted as attorney for eligible individuals, supporting them in their applications and then purchasing the certificates after they were awarded by the Republic of Texas.

During the 1830s and 1840s, Colquhoun represented San Antonio as a senator in the
Sixth Congress. He lived briefly in Eagle Pass and then returned to San Antonio where he was taken prisoner with other citizens by General Adrian Woll. He was incarcerated in Perote Prison for approximately 18 months before being released. He returned to San Antonio in 1842 where he lived until his death on December 3, 1882 (San Antonio Express, December 5, 1882).

On February 14, 1873, Colquhoun sold the Rivas league and labor to George and Christoph Pfeuffer of the firm, George Pfeuffer and Brother of New Braunfels (Bexar County, Deed Record W-2:409–410). The Pfeuffers had
Figure 15. Photographs of standing structures at 41BX397. (a) Garage; (b) milk house.
immigrated to Texas from Obernbreit, Bavaria, in 1845, arriving in Galveston on November 25, 1845. Under the direction of the Adelsverein, the family traveled to Indianola and then to New Braunfels. George Pfeuffer went to work for the merchant John F. Torrey and later moved to Corpus Christi where he worked for businessman Charles Ohler during the Mexican War. During the Civil War, he moved back to New Braunfels and worked for a San Antonio firm, William Mann & Co. (The American Historical Society 1914:233–235; Daniel 1890:573–577; Johnson 1914:III:1440–1441; The Lewis Publishing Company 1907:II:151–152).

After the Civil War, George and Christoph joined to form the mercantile firm, George Pfeuffer & Brother. The firm eventually pursued a wide variety of economic interests, including land speculation, lumbering, and stockraising (The American Historical Society 1914:236). The Rivas Grant, which lay astride a cattle trail leading from San Antonio to Blanco, had plentiful water and relatively good soils. It probably represented an opportunity for the Pfeffers to engage in livestock production.

Early efforts to improve the Rivas Grant occurred in December 1877 when the Pfeffers contracted with B. Frank Titus and Jesse S. Cox of San Antonio to drill an artesian well (Bexar County, Deed Record 13:277–278). Work apparently occurred during 1880, when the U.S. census noted the presence of two artesian well workers and two laborers in the general vicinity. The well, with its steam engine, was located in the northwestern portion of 41BX397 in the same general vicinity as a ranch headquarters constructed by the brothers (Figure 16). According to one informant (Oscar Schmidt 1992), who saw the headquarters, artesian well, and steam engine, the headquarters was a commodious home used by the Pfeffers in the summer. It stood until sometime after January 1906, when it was replaced with a new residence constructed by the Henry Schmidt Sr. family.

Between 1873 and 1884, the Pfeffers sold portions of the Rivas Grant to various German families who wanted to acquire farm land in the hills west of New Braunfels. In February 1884, they decided to divide what remained of the grant and some adjoining property. George received land to the east of a north-south-running line, and Christoph received land to the west, much of it on present-day Camp Bullis. Christoph also agreed to pay George $1,500 for his interest in “the Artesian Well tools, ropes, . . . Engine, Casing, boiler and in fact every thing [that] pertains to the said Well and to be used for the digging of the same” (Bexar County, Deed Record 32:592–594).

Christoph Pfeuffer retained much of the western portion of the property until May 2, 1905, when he sold 829 acres out of the southwestern portion of his ranch (location of 41BX398, 41BX433, and an unrecorded historic property associated with the Pfeuffer brothers and Albert Stahl) to Henry C. Schmidt for $6,632 (Bexar County, Deed Record 239:232). On January 1, 1906, Pfeuffer sold another 1,500 acres to Schmidt for $12,000 in a transaction that included 873 acres in the northwestern portion of Survey No. 191 (locations of 41BX397 and 41BX1044), 117 acres in the eastern portion of Survey No. 801, 150 acres in the eastern portion of Survey No. 802, and 360 acres in the eastern portion of Survey No. 420 (location of an unrecorded historic property associated with Herman Schmidt) (Bexar County, Deed Record 239:232; 245:287).

Henry Schmidt, who was a highly successful farmer and stockman, was born on August 6, 1866, in Comal County to Gustav and Karolina Uecker Schmidt (Brown 1880:618; Loftus 1985:83). The family lived on a farm on the south side of the Cibolo east of the St. Paulus Evangelistic Lutheran Church and Cemetery. They moved to the farm in about 1875, and Gustav Schmidt built a home and a horse-driven cotton gin that he operated with his brother-in-law, Frederick Reinartz (Henry Schmidt 1992; Oscar Schmidt 1992).

In about 1885, Henry Schmidt married Therese Ludwig, who had emigrated from Germany with her family and settled in New Braunfels in 1874; they lived first on the north side of the Cibolo near Specht’s Store. Eventually, they had 11 children born between 1886 and 1905 (Oscar Schmidt 1887, 1992). In about 1906, the Schmidts moved to 41BX397, living first in the house constructed by the Pfeffers, then in a spacious T-shaped frame house constructed by Henry Schmidt (Figure 17). According to one of the Schmidt children (Oscar Schmidt 1992), the eight-room house faced north and had two large L-shaped porches, each of which was 16–18 ft deep and 20 ft or more long. On the west side were the kitchen and
Figure 16. Artesian well and steam engine at 41BX397. The well has been capped, and a concrete elevated cistern and milk house replaced the wooden structure adjacent. Photograph courtesy of Henry Schmidt.

Figure 17. Henry Schmidt house at 41BX397. Photograph courtesy of Henry Schmidt.
dining room, and on the east side were the boys' rooms. The girls' room was next to the dining room, while the parents had a large bedroom at the end of the "T." The Schmidts raised cotton and corn at first on fields that had been grubbed and cleared by itinerant Mexican workers (see also 41BX1404). They raised oats that they fed to three teams of mules and horses; any extra oats were sold in San Antonio to Mistletoe Creamery. They raised sugar cane hay for roughage, and they operated a community sugar cane press that was located ca. 100 yds southwest of the house and was used by numerous families to make molasses. Later, in about 1920, Schmidt began to raise wheat, but the main crop remained cotton, which he grew every year and ginned at Specht's. Average production was 20 bales, but at one time Schmidt made 57 bales (Oscar Schmidt 1987, 1992).

Schmidt also kept an average of about 400 sheep. He sold the wool to Charles Schreiner of Kerrville, who made regular buying trips to Boerne. He sold mutton lambs to butchers in San Antonio, where Jewish families provided a steady demand. Angora goats were of minor interest, with an initial purchase being made after World War I from a man named Meyer near Rock Springs (Oscar Schmidt 1992).

Schmidt not only raised substantial numbers of sheep, but he also kept a herd of about 50–60 cattle. He improved the herd by joining with two other breeders named Herman Pfeiffer and Frank Edge to purchase a purebred Devonshire bull from a northern breeder. The men took turns using the bull, each one keeping the animal for a year, and the last one having the privilege of using the bull and then selling it. Usually cattle were taken to San Antonio to sell. But sometimes, San Antonio butchers such as Schelper and Meier would visit the Schmidt Ranch and select calves that were delivered to their shops.

The Schmidts supplemented their income by working for the government at Camp Stanley on a contract basis. During World War I, for example, three Schmidt boys (Herman, Oscar, and Bill) were hired by the camp commander, Colonel Thompson, to break and train horses that could be used by Pershing on the Punitive Expedition to Mexico. Bill was a bronco buster; Oscar and Herman joined other men from all around central and southwestern Texas to train horses that were brought to the camp from Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, and Wyoming. At one point, Oscar Schmidt saw approximately 800 horses brought in, and he helped drive them into the Camp Stanley remount, after which they were broken and trained (Oscar Schmidt 1992).

Henry Schmidt, like a number of his neighbors, had a contract to supply Camp Stanley with cordwood, some of which was used to burn the manure generated by the horses. Schmidt employed Mexicans to cut wood, and he hired Charlie Schwartz who had a steam engine and four wagons. The Schmidts would load the wagons with wood, which Schwartz then took to the camp (Oscar Schmidt 1992).

Finally, the family was hired to supply hay to Camp Stanley. Oscar and his brothers, Richard, Bill, and August, would go to a hay camp between their house (41BX397) and Leon Springs. Richard and his father would mow the hay and let it lie to dry for several days. Oscar then used a windrake to rake the grass into windrows. After another day or two, Herman would scoop the hay up with a sweep rake and take it to a baling machine operated by Bill and August. Neighbors who helped included Emil Georg and a man named Otmar. The government paid the Schmidts 23 cents per bale, and they got to keep the bales the government could not use (Oscar Schmidt 1992).

The Schmidt family worked together on their farm from 1905 to 1941, several of the sons returning to run their own farms after they married (see 41BX398, 41BX433, and 41BX1044). In 1940, the government decided to expand the military reservation, and the following year the Schmidts were forced to move to a farm they owned closer to Specht's Store. Mrs. Schmidt died 3 years later on July 31, 1944; Mr. Schmidt died on June 9, 1948 (Loftus 1985:83).

At the time of the government taking, the Henry Schmidt property was highly improved. The Schmidts' 1,100 acres included three different sets of improvements, one of which was the location of 41BX397. At that site, the main residence was an eight-room frame house with a cedar post and rock foundation, shingle roof, and porch; a "fancy concrete fence and side fence" were located in the area of the residence. A 20x20-ft solid concrete garage was listed by the government appraisers, as were an 8x11-ft blacksmith shop, a 32x41-ft feed house with a metal roof, a 22x125-ft goat and sheep shed, two
50x50-ft frame feed and grain barns with metal roofs, a 33x37-ft two-story barn with metal roof, a 9x24-ft Delco light system house with attached frame shed, a 13x14-ft two-story rock smoke house, a 30x12-ft chicken house with metal roof, an 8x10-ft engine house with metal roof, and a 57x22-ft galvanized machinery house. Additional features were a well, windmill, pump and jack, and concrete tank over a milk house; an abandoned well; a low, 12x12-ft concrete tank with four troughs and a pipeline; two hog pens; and one dipping vat. More-remote improvements were 12 miles of fences, a molasses oven, a 120x200-ft earthen tank ca. 8 ft deep, and an orchard of peach, plum, and pear trees.

Cultural Materials Observed: No artifacts were collected.

Assessment: Site 41BX397 represents an early improvement in northern Bexar County that has strong associations with community leaders in New Braunfels and along Cibolo Creek. George and Christoph Pfeuffer, who owned the property on which 41BX397 is located from 1873 to 1906, were German entrepreneurs who are documented in numerous historical texts and were instrumental in encouraging German immigration to western Comal County and northern Bexar County. They were among the first entrepreneurs to develop the area's underground water resources, and one of their artesian wells is located at 41BX397, which also was the location of a frame house they occupied.

Henry Schmidt, who occupied and developed 41BX397 between 1906 and 1941, was a highly successful stock farmer; his farmstead still includes most of the elements of a prototypical turn-of-the-century German stock farm including a smokehouse, milk house, wells, watering tanks, and dipping vat. In addition, Schmidt and his family were community leaders. He operated a community sugar cane press that was used by numerous families to make molasses, and he sponsored the West End Shooting Club or Schuetzenverein (41BX1355), which was located on his property for approximately 30 years. Site 41BX397 is considered eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A for its associations with German Hill Country agriculture. The site is unlikely to be eligible under Criterion D unless deposits associated with the late-nineteenth-century Pfeuffer residence can be identified and isolated. As originally assessed (Gerstle et al. 1978:349), 41BX397 was considered ineligible for National Register listing.

41BX425

Description: Site 41BX425 originally was recorded by Gerstle et al. (1978:188–189) as a "special activity" site located on a terrace of Cibolo Creek. One shovel test and six 1x1-m test units were excavated to depths of 15 to 90 cm below the surface, recovering Nolan, Marcos, Perdz, and Pedernales projectile points as well as bifaces, ground stone tools, numerous pieces of debitage, burned rocks, and mussel shell fragments. In addition to completing a site map, the profile of a road cut or jeep trail that traverses the western edge of the site was cleaned, recorded, and sketched. Numerous burned rocks were observed eroding out of the profile.

The site measures 40x20 m and occupies the remnant of a small Holocene alluvial terrace of Cibolo Creek. The terrace is housed in an alcove or recess in the limestone valley wall that is formed by an intermittent tributary of Cibolo Creek (the tributary forms the eastern boundary of the site). Exposures of the terrace deposits observed along the tributary show that the alluvial deposits are up to ca. 4 m thick. The northern part of the terrace surface displays a small rise or knoll that stands ca. 1–2 m higher than the terrace surface at the southern end of the site. To the west and south, the terrace surface meets the limestone valley wall of the tributary channel, which rises several meters above the terrace surface. Vegetation includes a dense stand of junipers, scattered mesquites, live oaks, Texas oaks, chinkapin oaks, cedar elms, and an understory of short grasses and agaritas. The ground surface was largely obscured by vegetation and leaf litter but ranged from 25 to 50 percent. Soils are mapped as part of the Trinity and Frio series (Taylor et al. 1962). The elevation ranges from 1,160 to 1,180 ft amsl.

Cultural Materials Observed: Scattered burned rocks, a few pieces of lithic debitage, and a core fragment were observed on the surface during the revisit. The road cut profile originally recorded by Gerstle et al. (1978) was relocated and photographed. Numerous burned rocks were observed eroding out of this profile. No subsurface investigations were carried out during the revisit.
Assessment: The subsurface investigations by Gerstle et al. (1978) yielded cultural materials to a depth of 90 cm below the surface. Temporally diagnostic artifacts suggest the site was occupied from the Middle Archaic through Late Prehistoric periods. While a large number of artifacts and cultural materials were recovered in the upper 90 cm, the context and the integrity of the deposits are suspect, i.e., possibly mixed and compressed based on the provenience of the projectile points recovered. In addition, an old jeep trail or road cut has adversely impacted the western edge of the site, but only to a depth of ca. 60–80 cm. The revisit revealed that the terrace at 41BX425 is up to ca. 4 m thick. A similar setting at 41BX377, which is located across the unnamed tributary from 41BX425, yielded stratified archeological components from the surface to ca. 3 m below the surface (see Kibler and Scott 2000). Though rather small in size and limited to the small Holocene terrace, the depth and thickness of the terrace deposits suggest that discrete and deeply buried archeological components may be present. If so, the site is likely to be eligible for National Register listing. Deeper excavations, including backhoe trenches and test units, are needed to fully evaluate the site.

41BX426

Description: Originally recorded by Gerstle et al. (1978:158), 41BX426 is described as a 20x20-m concentration of flakes, biface fragments, preforms, cores, one Nolan dart point, and two Edwards arrow points. The site reportedly is along a heavily wooded upland of junipers and oaks, 250 m south of Cibolo Creek in Training Area 2A. Patches of native grasses, thin soils, and exposed bedrock contribute to ground surface visibility of 60 percent in this area today. According to Taylor et al. (1962:30), soils are of the Tarrant Association. The site is reported to lie at 1,210 ft asml. No shovel tests were dug in the area during this survey due to the thin soils and extensive exposed bedrock.

Cultural Materials Observed: During this survey, some lag gravels were observed throughout the area, but no concentration of cultural materials identifiable as 41BX426 was found.

Assessment: While Gerstle et al. (1978:343) argued for testing of this small site, the authors observed that only about 25 cm of sediment are present. A revisit to the site vicinity revealed thin sediments over exposed bedrock. The small size and the eroded nature of the site probably contributed to the inability to re-locate it during the current survey. Based on the original description, the site appears incapable of containing important archeological information due to its lack of appreciable sediments and inability to yield isolable components. Therefore, in contrast to the original assessment, it is recommended that 41BX426 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX434

Description: Site 41BX434 is a historic farmstead originally identified by Gerstle et al. (1978:278) and described by Freeman (1994b). The site also was encountered in another recent survey (Cestarino et al. 2000:44), which added a historic agricultural structure to the northeast. This survey encountered the west end of the World War II-era camp, 41BX1345 (Cibolo Camp), which intrudes into the 41BX434 boundary in Training Area 1A/1B. The site lies at an elevation of 1,250 ft asml and is 300 m southeast of a bend along Cibolo Creek. Large oak, juniper, and mesquite trees are dense along the periphery of cleared fields while cacti and native grasses abound in the fields. Ground surface visibility was 60 percent. Soils are mapped as Crawford clay (Taylor et al. 1962:12). No shovel tests were dug.

To the north of the main house at 41BX434 lies the western edge of the World War II-era camp. The camp consists of a series of rock alignments and latrine features in a 400x175-m area east of 41BX434. These alignments are made of flagstones and were probably sidewalks or boundaries demarcating living areas. In some cases, pea-sized gravels were placed between parallel rows of flagstones.

A revisit to 41BX434 discovered a northward-running alignment of stones that ends in a turnaround 220 m from the main east-west axis of the camp at 41BX1345. Scattered pea-sized gravels are present along much of the alignment. An apparent road bed runs parallel to the alignment. The 30-m turnaround consists of a circular array of flagstones with large oaks in the center.

Cultural Materials Observed: No artifacts were observed.
Assessment: The historic farmstead and related livestock management features of 41BX434 previously have been recommended as ineligible for NRHP listing (Cestaro et al. 2000:44; Gerstle et al. 1978:349; Veni et al. 1998a:155). A new historic military component associated with nearby 41BX1345 was added during the current investigation. Previously, the World War II-era camp at 41BX1345 was considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP (Cestaro et al. 2000:41–43). Although troops of the 95th Infantry Division undoubtedly stayed there, the site was not associated with any significant event in national, local, or army history. Much of the site remains intact, but the level of workmanship, materials, and design do not meet the requirements for listing in the NRHP. Furthermore, no important archaeological information can be obtained from testing the site. Therefore, it is recommended that the new historic military component of 41BX434 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41BX1024

Description: Parts of 41BX1024 were encountered in Training Area 3C. Previously recorded historic structures at this site are east of Lewis Valley Road (Kibler and Gardner 1997:24). This survey identified a light scatter of historic debris on the west side of the road. Hence, the site has been expanded to encompass an area of 90 m east-west by 160 m north-south west of the road. Junipers, live oaks, cacti, and native grasses cover the disturbed extension, which lies at an elevation of 1,200 ft amsl. Ground cover visibility was good at 50 percent, although much of the materials were encountered in heavily wooded margins of the road cut. Soils are of the Brackett series, 12–30 percent slopes (Taylor et al. 1962:11).

History: Site 41BX1024, the Lewis Ranch site, spreads across the northeast corner of the 1,006-acre Felipe Rivas Survey (No. 379), 160-acre Simon Cassanova Survey (No. 70), and 160-acre Antonio Cruz Survey (No. 71). The site is located in a broad, well-watered valley that opens into the valley of Salado Creek ca. 2 miles to the south.

Nathaniel Lewis, owner of the Lewis Ranch for almost 30 years, was born in Falmouth, Massachusetts, on June 11, 1806, and immigrated to Texas in 1830. He first established a mercantile and trading business in Indianola and then moved to San Antonio, where he opened a store on Main Plaza in the early 1830s. During the siege of the Alamo, he carried supplies to the Texan troops. He apparently decided to leave the city before the final battle, salvaging what he could of his wares (Huthmacher 1986:17; The Lewis Publishing Company 1907:1:92–93). He served briefly in the Army of the Republic during summer 1836 (Texas General Land Office 1844a), after which he returned to San Antonio, where he again entered business.

In 1839–1840, Lewis represented Bexar County in the House of the Fourth Congress (Anonymous 1941:125). Upon returning to San Antonio, he became involved in purchasing land certificates. With individuals such as Ludovic Colquhoun (see 41BX397), William Steele, and scores of lawyers and other entrepreneurs, Lewis assisted Texas-born Hispanics in proving their eligibility to receive land certificates from the Republic and then purchased the certificates for relatively nominal prices. By the mid-1840s, Lewis had acquired more than 22,000 acres in 14 surveys, approximately 13,000 acres of which were located along Salado Creek, up Lewis Valley, and on the slopes and uplands adjacent to those waterways.

Lewis’s sale of 2,577 acres surrounding Comanche Springs to John O. Meusebach in 1847 (Bexar County, Deed Record F-2:382–385) appears to have signaled a withdrawal from the Salado Valley-Pinta Trail area, and after that date, he concentrated his energies on the land lying on both sides of Lewis Valley, on the uplands to the east, and on numerous other tracts he owned outside of the present-day Camp Bullis area.

Between 1848 and 1852, Lewis ran a mercantile business in San Antonio where he also operated a mill on the river. He was involved in freighting, at one time operating “one thousand carretas and a large herd of oxen... between San Antonio and El Paso” (The Lewis Publishing Company 1907:1:93), an activity that may explain the configuration of the rock walls located to the southeast of 41BX1024 near Salado Creek. He became increasingly involved in the livestock business as well, running cattle, sheep, and goats on 23 surveys that were located on the waters of the Guadalupe, Salado, San-
tonio, Leon, Atascosa, Chupadera, Leona, and Cibolo (Texas. State Comptroller 1852). By the mid-1850s, however, Lewis seems to have decided to focus on raising cattle, and his herds grew from ca. 1,000 in 1853 to ca. 10,000 in 1870 (Texas. State Comptroller 1853–1870). It probably was these numbers that led one biographer to describe Lewis as being “the first cattleman operating on a large scale in Southwestern Texas” (The Lewis Publishing Company 1907:1.93).

According to a descendant of later occupants (Schaefer n.d.:15), Nathaniel Lewis constructed some improvements on his ranch on present-day Camp Bullis, property that represented only a portion of the real estate he owned in Bexar, Comal, Kerr, DeWitt, Goliad, and Atascosa Counties at the time of his death in October 1872 (Bexar County, Probate File 984).

After Lewis’s death, his family kept the Camp Bullis land intact until 1883, when his widow, Mary, filed suit against his sons, Dan and Nat, to partition the assets of the estate (Bexar County, Deed Record 27:423–428). Dan Lewis received 12 tracts of land totaling 9,235 acres in the vicinity of Lewis Valley as a result of the partition.

On May 3, 1883, the same day the partition suit was settled, Dan Lewis sold his holdings on present-day Camp Bullis to Gustaf Adolph Hoerle and Henry Fink (Bexar County, Deed Record 27:414–416), partners in the livestock business, Fink & Co. Hoerle of Orange County, New York, and Fink of Crockett County, Texas, had formed a partnership on April 11, 1883, in which they agreed to associate themselves “in the art and trade of sheep and general stock raising” (Schaefer n.d.:9). They also agreed that Fink would manage and control the property and livestock, which included 700 Angora goats, 8 Angora billies, 118 Merino sheep, 5 Merino bucks, and 40 Cotswold sheep (Schaefer n.d.:10). The animals would run on the former Lewis Ranch and on the Parrish Ranch to the north, which had been purchased by Hoerle and deeded to his wife, Frances, in December 1882 (Bexar County, Deed Record 21:311–314). The two ranches comprised an area of almost 14,000 acres.

According to records kept by Henry Fink, the main ranch headquarters was the old Parrish Ranch house where Fink lived (41BX432). The Lewis Ranch site (41BX1024) represented an improvement of secondary importance that was occupied by Richard Mecke. Mecke was a former partner of Fink when they were in the sheep business in West Texas, and he had joined the Fink & Co. partnership on October 1, 1884 (Schaefer n.d.:13, 15). From the house in Lewis Valley, Mecke helped supervise large herds of sheep, horses, cattle, and Angora goats marketed by the company. He also oversaw the clearing of adjacent valley areas, planting of Johnson grass and millet, and harvesting of hay. Indeed, so much hay was cut in the spring of 1884 that “a new barn was built on the Lewis Ranch to accommodate the big crop” (Schaefer n.d.:23).

Fink & Co. met with considerable success between 1883 and 1885. But by July 1886, a severe drought began to take its toll. Within 12 months, Lewis Creek, which represented the ranch’s main water supply, had dried up, and the partners rented 12,000 acres of pastureland in McMullen County (Schaefer n.d.:34).

The partners apparently explored the idea of selling the company land and livestock as early as 1892 when they mortgaged the property to San Antonio bankers D. & A. Oppenheimer (Bexar County, Deed Record 107:440–449). But they continued to stock the property with considerable numbers of animals despite a drought and general decline in markets; ad valorem tax records indicate the presence of 800 cattle, 3,000 sheep, and 700 goats in 1892; 500 cattle, 2,000 sheep, and 1,000 goats in 1893; and 300 cattle, 2,000 sheep, and 1,000 goats in 1894–1895.

In 1896, unable to repay their debt to the Oppenheimers, the Hoerles and Henry Fink signed over the ranch. The Oppenheimers assumed possession on December 1, 1896 (Bexar County, Deed Record 159:49–51), and the former partners of Fink & Co. went their separate ways. Much of the stock appears to have been moved off the ranch, which carried a small herd of ca. 300 cattle between 1896 and 1899 (Texas. State Comptroller 1896–1899). Under the management of Henry Fink, who had been asked to stay on by the new owners, goats were reintroduced in about 1901 (Texas. State Comptroller 1901–1905). However, with the sale of 11,840 acres to the U.S. government on December 1, 1906 (Bexar County, Deed Record 258:158–161), ranching on a large scale became impractical, and operations were shut down. A photograph
of the Lewis Ranch house made by the government after acquisition depicts a one-story, wood-frame, board-and-batten, gable-roofed residence with what appear to be six-over-six, double-hung windows (Figure 18). The roof appears to have been wood shingle, and a porch extended the length of the front façade. A small yard was marked by a fence with a narrow gate and a walk that led to the porch.

**Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:**
Observed artifacts during this survey include whiteware fragments, a “Coke” bottle fragment, brown bottle glass, cans, a washtub, pink glass, dark green glass, aquamarine glass, window glass, a threaded pipe, cobalt-blue glass, a hatchet head, milk glass, decorative cast iron, green glass, clear glass “Orange Crush” bottle fragments, a horseshoe, and a purple glass coaster. Seven artifacts were collected from the surface. They consist of five ceramic sherds and two glass sherds and date to the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the first quarter of the twentieth. A Montell dart point was observed but not collected.

**Assessment:** Site 41BX1024 originally was recorded by Kibler and Gardner (1997:24) and recommended as ineligible for NRHP listing. The current investigation expanded the boundary of the site boundary to include the historic debris discovered during the pedestrian survey. This site is the former location of improvements associated with the Nathaniel Lewis Ranch (ca. 1840s–1883), the Hoerle-Fink Ranch (1883–1896), and the Oppenheimer Ranch (1896–1906). The individuals who owned the property and were associated with the site were locally and regionally significant historic figures who were engaged in important agricultural activities. However, 41BX1024 is not the location of improvements most commonly associated with those individuals. Lewis’s and Oppenheimer’s primary residences were in San Antonio, and the headquarters of the Hoerle-Fink Ranch was at 41BX432. Furthermore, the new portion of the site lacks the capacity to offer important archaeological information. As a result, it is recommended that 41BX1024 be considered ineligible for listing in the National Register.

41BX1044

**Description:** Originally recorded in 1997 as a small prehistoric scatter with a burned rock midden (Kibler and Gardner 1997:36), 41BX1044 has been expanded to a 450 m north-south by 700 m east-west series to contain prehistoric lithic scatters and a large historic farm complex located along Cibolo Creek’s south bank. Current investigations did re-locate the burned rock midden. The site area is located on a broad alluvial terrace (1,150 ft asml) along the south side of Cibolo Creek in Training Area 2D. The flora generally is characterized by dense junipers and oaks throughout with a cleared grassy area in the northeast section of the site. A firebreak road runs past the north part of the site. Ground surface visibility was poor at 30 percent.

Soils are Venus loam in the north half of the site, while the more elevated south side (which includes the historic complex) is of the Tarrant Association, gently undulating (Taylor et al. 1962:30–32). Exposed bedrock prohibited testing in the south, however, two negative shovel tests were placed in the grassy clearing to the north. Both shovel tests went to 60 cm. Shovel Test 1 encountered dark brown sandy clay loam to 40 cm, with the same soil with limestone inclusions continuing to 60 cm. Shovel Test 2 encountered compact black clay loam to 40 cm, which continued with added limestone inclusions to 60 cm.

The newly recorded historic component contains several standing structures and a variety of other features within a 200-m area in the elevated southeast corner of 41BX1044. The following are descriptions of the more-prominent features.

**Feature 1:** This standing structure is an octagonal above-ground milk house made of sandy, pebbly concrete. There is one metal pipe in the southern part of the structure. A 1-m-wide by 2-m-high door is located on the south side. Four timber beams run along the top of the wall. The structure is ca. 3 m in diameter and about 3 m tall. Wall thickness is 12 cm. The remains of a windmill foundation set above a well head are 2 m to the west. According to Freeman (1994b:65), this complex consisted of a steel windmill set above a 303-ft-deep well associated with a concrete milk house with a cypress tank superstructure.

**Feature 2:** This small, square structure with a gabled roof is made from poured concrete and limestone cobbles and gravels with metal-reinforced...
walls. The overall size of the structure is 3 m north-south by 2.5 m east-west. A door faces due east and is framed by wood timbers on the top and sides. Small wood-framed windows are located on the north and south sides. The north window is 60x60 cm, while the south window is 95 cm high by 62 cm wide. There are remnants of a timber roof. According to Freeman (1994b:65), this may be the 8x9-ft stone and concrete power house.

Feature 3: This feature measures 20 m east-west by 7 m north-south and is a low rectangular alignment of limestone blocks forming the east, west, and north foundations for a structure. Around the entire foundation are cedar posts spaced 3 m apart. The south wall is incorporated into Feature 4 and is made of concrete. A septic tank is located along the south edge. The septic tank is bell-shaped and 1 m deep with two large limestone slabs covering a 2.0x1.5-m oval opening. Two pipes extend from the tank into the center of Feature 4.

Feature 4: This is the main house, measuring 30 m east-west by 20 m north-south. It features two concrete slab walkways (1.2x4.5 m) on the west and east sides. The east sidewalk has three concrete steps leading to the back door area. Short posts in the ground in the western half of the area may indicate a porch. Along the edge of the porch is a line of concrete and posts indicating a fence line at the front of the house. South of the concrete stairs is a small, rectangular, concrete, linear feature that may have been a decorative garden border. The south side of the house area is disturbed, and the concrete border is broken and scattered. According to Freeman (1994b:65), this was a six-room frame house with hardwood floors, bath, two porches, and shingled roof. The house was considered modern due to its interior bath. The house area is connected to a septic tank in Feature 3 by metal pipes.

Feature 5: This is a rectangular foundation consisting of a poured concrete perimeter beam along the outer edges and evenly spaced limestone blocks in the center, covering 9 m north-south by 8 m east-west. The northern 4 m of the foundation lack the limestone blocks. Possibly a wooden floor was placed over these blocks.

Feature 6: This rectangular foundation is 3 m east-west by 13 m north-south and is made of large slabs of limestone held together by poured concrete. Timbers are scattered all around Features 5 and 6, which may indicate a wooden superstructure. There are also wood posts along the eastern edge. Post impressions occur throughout the edges of the foundation. There is a 20-cm change in elevation in the foundation in the northern 3 m.

Feature 7: This small foundation measures 2 m east-west by 3 m north-south, is U-shaped, and is made primarily of limestone cobbles held together with concrete. The open end of the structure is on the southern end.

Feature 8: This rectangular structure measures 5 m east-west by 7 m north-south and is built upon a slope in the northern part of the farmstead. The northern end is 60 cm above the ground while the southern end meets the ground surface. The structure is made of limestone cobbles and larger pieces of limestone held together by concrete.

Feature 9: This feature is 100 m southwest of Feature 1. It measures 4 m east-west by 6 m

Figure 18. Photograph of the Lewis Ranch house at 41BX1024 (from the National Archives, Record Group 394, Box 36).
north-south and is a limestone block foundation with concrete stairs on the western lower half of the structure. A large pile of limestone cobbles (6.0x3.0x1.5 m) is along the eastern edge of the foundation [structural debris?]. Cedar posts are located along the south, east, and north parts of the structure. A 1.5-diameter depression is in the outer northeast corner. "Elgin Load Bearing" and "Alamo" bricks lie scattered about the area.

Feature 10: This dipping vat is aligned in a north-south direction. The northern half is a trough with steps and the southern end is a platform. The total length is about 4 m. The trough portion is 2.3 m long and 80 cm wide. The platform is 1.7 m long and 1.4 m wide. There is a depression in the platform with six steps leading into the trough. The tank appears to have been cemented into limestone and is surrounded by larger pieces of limestone. The area around the tank may have been built up. The overall height of the platform is 16 cm.

Feature 11: This concrete livestock water tank is 8 m south of the barn complex (Features 5 and 6). It is rectangular in shape (4 m north-south by 3 m east-west) with the drinking area facing to the south. The date "1927" is inscribed on top of the tank.

History: The historic component at 41BX1044—the Herman Schmidt Farmstead—is located in the northwestern portion of the Juan Manuel Rivas Survey (No. 191) on the south side of Cibolo Creek. Until the late 1920s, the history of the tract of land on which the site is located is identical to that of 41BX397, the Henry Schmidt Farmstead, having been associated with the Pfeffer Brothers of New Braunfels between 1873 and 1884, and with Christoph Pfeffer from 1884 to 1906, when the property was acquired by Henry Schmidt. By that date, Schmidt's stock farm encompassed 829 acres in the southwestern portion of the Rivas Survey, and 873 acres in parts of three surveys (Nos. 420, 801, and 802), as well as the northwestern portion of the Rivas Survey (No. 191).

Henry and Therese (Ludwig) Schmidt, who lived at 41BX397 a short distance to the south, had 11 children born between 1886 and 1905 (Oscar Schmidt 1987, 1992), all of whom worked on their parents' farm. As they grew to adulthood, they married, and ties with the family appear to have been so strong that many of them decided to remain on the Schmidt farm. In several cases, the children lived in houses constructed for them by Henry Schmidt (see 41BX398 and 41BX433). In the case of Herman Schmidt (the sixth child), a marriage into a prosperous family provided him with the means to buy land from his parents (Henry Schmidt 1992). On January 2, 1926, Herman and his wife, Louisa (Dueo) Schmidt, paid Henry and Therese Schmidt $7,431 for 247.7 acres out of Survey No. 191. Located just north of the Henry Schmidt house (41BX397), the farm included 69 acres on the north side of the Cibolo in Comal County and 178.7 acres on the south side in Bexar County (Bexar County, Deed Record 853:613–614).

A relative remembered that Herman and Louisa Schmidt's home was "more modern" than those occupied by other members of the Schmidt family, for it had an inside bathroom (Henry Schmidt 1992). A picture of modern prosperity also is reflected in an inventory of the farmstead in the early 1940s. The family lived in a six-room frame house that measured 52x29 ft and had an inside bath, hardwood floors, two porches, and a shingle roof. Outbuildings included a 12x10-ft frame shed with shingle roof and concrete porch floor; a 9x9-ft frame outhouse; a 15x20-ft galvanized iron garage with concrete foundation; an 8x9-ft stone and concrete power house; a water complex that consisted of a 303-ft-deep well with a 12-ft wheel and windmill, steel tower, and cypress tank over a concrete milk house; a two-story barn that had two rooms for hay and four rooms for grain; a metal-roofed, 20x34-ft sheep shed with dipping vat; a 52x21-ft goat and cattle shed; six pens; an 8x30-ft chicken house; a 9x11-ft hog house; and a wash kettle furnace.

Herman and Louisa Schmidt lived at 41BX1044, raising a variety of grains and livestock and cultivating ca. 80 acres nearby. They also acquired additional land to the southwest in Guadalupe College Survey No. 420 where a son lived (see unrecorded historic property "M" in Freeman 1994b:72–73), recreating a family pattern that began with Henry and Therese Schmidt and their children. However, the government took the farm in 1941. The family moved, and improvements at 41BX1044 were demolished.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected: Four projectile points, two bifaces, and one sandstone mano/abrader fragment were collected from the surface. A Late Archaic component is
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represented by a Montell point and a Pedernales point, while a Late Prehistoric component is represented by a Scallorn point and a Granbury point. A concentration of artifacts, which included the Pedernales point, the two triangular bifaces, and the mano/abrador, was found in a clearing roughly 200 m south of the old 41BX1044 boundary and 200 m west of the historic farmstead. The Montell point was found just north of the farmstead, while the Granbury point was found just to the northwest of it. The Late Prehistoric Scallorn point was found 200 m southwest of the old 41BX1044 boundary. Eighty-three other lithics were observed: 8 primary, 18 secondary, 18 tertiary, and 6 biface-thinning flakes; 10 unifacial tools; 14 bifacial tools; and 9 cores. Historic artifacts observed included tin cans, metal bands, clear bottle glass, dark blue glass, light blue glass, metal pipes, small timbers, windmill parts, white ceramic fragments, brown bottle glass, wire, and large metal rings. One piece of metal (utensil handle) was collected from the surface.

Assessment: Site 41BX1044 originally was recorded by Kibler and Gardner (1997:36), and the possible burned rock midden was recommended as eligible for NRHP listing pending testing. The current investigation expanded the boundary of the site to include more lithic materials as well as a large historic component, which had been known but not recorded previously. Site 41BX1044 is the former location of improvements that were constructed and occupied by Herman and Louisa Schmidt between ca. 1926 and 1941. The relatively brief period of occupation suggests that the site was not intensively developed and thus probably is not an outstanding example of a Hill Country German farmstead (Criterion A). Additionally, the site is not associated with individuals who were locally significant (Criterion B). The historic component lacks the capacity to yield important archeological information, and as a result it does not appear to be eligible for NRHP listing. Given that intact buried cultural deposits are present in the burned rock feature, the burned rock midden of the prehistoric component is still considered eligible pending further testing.

41BX1048

Description: As originally recorded, 41BX1048 was located on the upper western slopes of Palmtree Hill in Training Area 4A (Kibler and Gardner 1997:38). It contained both prehistoric and historic components and measured 440 x 360 m. The prehistoric component is an open campsite consisting of small amounts of debitage and burned rocks, bifaces, a drill, and four dart points typed as Gower, Uvalde (n = 2), and Bell; these materials are restricted to the surface in the southern part of the site. As originally recorded, the historic component consisted of four rock alignments, a shallow trench, sheet metal, shell casings, and exploded ordnance and shrapnel thought to be associated with filming of the 1926 movie The Rough Riders.

The site was revisited during this survey in connection with archival research and recording to assess its NRHP eligibility. Kibler and Gardner (1997) assessed the historic component of 41BX1048 as potentially eligible. This revisit identified an associated historic trench along the eastern slope of adjacent Liscum Hill to the west in Training Area 3A. The trench is 65 m long and 1.5 m wide; it was dug into bedrock. The new trench lies at an elevation of 1,400 ft amsl. The new site area is roughly 550 m east-west by 440 m north-south. Vegetation includes junipers, oaks, and native grasses. The ground surface is primarily eroded bedrock covered with thin, silty, rocky soils. Ground surface visibility was poor at 50 percent.

History: Site 41BX1048, and the new trench, appear to be one of the locations selected for filming of The Rough Riders (see Appendix B for a more-complete description of the movie’s production). Between August and October 1926, stars such as Mary Astor, Frank Hopper, Colonel Fred Lindsay, Noah Beery, and Charles Farrell worked with director Victor Fleming on location at the old International Fair Grounds in south San Antonio and at Camp Bullis and Camp Stanley to make one of the two largest pictures produced by Famous Players-Lasky Corporation in 1926.

Particular emphasis was placed on historical accuracy in the filming of both The Rough Riders and the corporation’s companion film, Wings, which was filmed simultaneously at Fort Sam Houston and Camp Stanley. Paramount, as the studio in charge, employed its extensive research department to spend months collecting information about all aspects of the historic Rough Riders organization, including military.
equipment used by the troops. They contacted former members of the organization in California, Arizona, and Texas, and they hired Theodore Roosevelt’s biographer, Hermann Hagedorn, as a consultant.

Special attention was paid, as well, to the movie sets. The International Fair Building was reconstructed, and the Hill Country landscape at Camp Stanley was transformed into a tropical setting. Carloads of palm trees and other tropical vegetation were transplanted so that, when the Rough Riders charged up “San Juan Hill” and leapt the trenches in front of a “blockhouse” on the hill, “tall feathered palms” provided the backdrop (San Antonio Express, October 13, 1926:11).

Attention to authentic detail appears to have extended to the weapons used by the stars and members of the First and Fifth Cavalry Regiments. The presence of .30-40 caliber Krag-Jorgensen blanks at 41BX1048 is particularly noteworthy, and the site is the only place on present-day Camp Bullis where such cartridge brass has been found (Dusty Bruns, personal communication 1999). According to Bruns, the War Department adopted the .45-70 caliber cartridge with the single-shot “trap door” Springfield rifle in 1873, and it remained in service until 1892, when it was replaced by the .30-40 Krag-Jorgensen. While almost all Spanish-American War regiments continued to be equipped with the .45–70 Springfield rifle, Roosevelt’s Rough Riders were the exception. According to Thompson et al. ([1970]:n.p.), Roosevelt demanded that his troops be issued the newer Krag carbines.

Cultural Materials Observed: The only artifacts observed in the area of the newly recorded trench were shell casings. These casings match the .30-40 Krag casing sample provided by Dusty Bruns.

Assessment: Ordnance found at 41BX1048 strongly suggests that the site was the location of filming associated with the production of The Rough Riders. In 1926, when The Rough Riders was filmed at the International Fair Grounds in San Antonio and at Camps Bullis and Stanley, local enthusiasm dubbed the production one of the most important produced by Famous Players-Lasky Corporation and Paramount, while newspapers predicted that San Antonio would become a center for movie-making in the United States. However, unlike Wings, The Rough Riders was not well received, and San Antonio failed to develop its potential as a mid-continent Hollywood. For this reason, and because 41BX1048 lacks the capacity to yield important archeological information, the historic component is considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP. As indicated by Kibler and Gardner (1997:38), the prehistoric component is ineligible because there is no evidence of buried intact cultural deposits.

41BX1211

Description: Originally described as a rock wall along a terrace of Cibolo Creek in Training Area 2D (Veni et al. 1998a:79), the site now includes a large historic farmstead attributed to Fritz Scheel. The site encompasses an area 500 m north-south by 300 m east-west and is located at 1,150 ft amsl. The historic complex (240x160 m) is located in the southern half of the site, ca. 180 m southwest of Cibolo Creek. Large oak trees remain on the site, while junipers grow along the periphery. Native grasses and cacti dominate the site area.

Soils are thin dark brown sandy clay loam with some bedrock exposures. According to Taylor et al. (1962), they are Lewisville silty clay in the field area in the north and Crawford and Bexar/Patrick soils in the historic complex. Approximately 70 percent of the ground surface was visible. No shovel tests were dug due to thin soils.

The farmstead contains the remains of multiple buildings, animal pens, a cellar, a water trough, two cisterns, and a refuse area. An orchard was located southwest of the cisterns. Five features representing structures are described below.

Feature 1: This southernmost feature is a rectangular foundation ca. 10 m in length and 4 m in width. There are three large cut limestone blocks nearby that appear to have been moved from their original locations. The foundation is made of concrete mixed with larger pea-sized gravels and has been broken up in some areas.

Feature 2: This rectangular, raised, poured concrete foundation is approximately 2.7 m north-south by 3.4 m east-west. Eight post molds appear along the perimeter. Directly behind the foundation is a subterranean structure also made of poured concrete that is
ca. 1.7x2.2 m. Depth is unknown because the cellar is partially filled with sediment. The top of a doorway is visible, though almost entirely filled with sediment. Concrete fragments are present throughout the area. An acetylene generator and its concrete foundation lie just to the southeast. A rock alignment also is visible near the foundation. Bricks and stones are found in great numbers to the southwest, toward Feature 1.

Feature 3: This raised, poured concrete foundation is rectangular and measures 10x7 m. The concrete is mixed with pea-sized gravel and is broken in many pieces. Fence posts are at the ends and midsection. The foundation is associated with the corral in the western part of the site. A circular piece of concrete is located in the eastern corner of the structure.

Feature 4: This is a 5x5-m square alignment of poured concrete that is oriented southeast-northwest. It is located in the center of the site.

Feature 5: This is a series of seven square, poured concrete post holes each measuring 50x20 cm. This feature is located near the concrete and limestone water tank near the center of the site.

History: Site 41BX1211, the Fritz Scheel Farmstead, is located in the central portion of the Onesene Pevoteaux Survey (No. 234), a 640-acre grant in an irregular shape. The grant is bisected by Cibolo Creek and consists of a relatively level area on the north side of County Road and low hills in the southernmost portion of the grant.

Pevoteaux resided in Harris County when he received a headright certificate. He sold the certificate to Ingham S. Roberts of Harris County on January 19, 1846, and had the land on the Cibolo surveyed 6 months later. On October 6, 1846, the state issued a patent to Roberts (Texas. General Land Office 1846), who held the 320-acre grant for 12 years before selling it and two other grants to J. D. Giddings (Bexar County, Deed Record R-1:182–183).

Giddings, a prominent Washington County lawyer who helped build the Washington County Railroad, sold his interest in the Pevoteaux Grant to George and Christoph Pfeuffer of New Braunfels on May 24, 1878 (Bexar County, Deed Record 11:108–109). The Pfefflers had immigrated to Texas from Bavaria in 1845 and arrived in Galveston on November 25, after which they traveled to Indianola and New Braunfels under the direction of the Adelsverein. By 1878, the Pfeiffer brothers owned large tracts of land east of the Pevoteaux Grant, including the fertile Manuel Rivas league and labor (see 41BX397). Acquisition of the Pevoteaux and other grants to the west and south of Rivas gave them a massive land holding on which they colonized German families from New Braunfels and probably cultivated crops and raised livestock.

In February 1884, the Pfefflers decided to divide their holdings along the Cibolo. George received land east of a north-south line that followed approximately present-day Blanco Road, while Christoph received the land west of that line. As a result of the division, Christoph acquired a small portion of the Rivas Grant, all of the Pevoteaux Grant (Survey No. 234), and portions of the Jaeger (No. 235), San Antonio Ditch Company (No. 801), E. Wahr mund (No. 802), and Guadalupe College (No. 420) Surveys (Bexar County, Deed Record 32:592–594).

Christoph Pfeuffer kept much of his share of the divided lands until 1905, when he sold portions of it to local residents Henry Schmidt and Fritz Scheel. Schmidt purchased 829 acres out of the southeastern portion of the Pfeuffer Ranch, while Scheel purchased land in the western portion of the Christoph Pfeuffer Ranch. Tracts purchased by Scheel on May 2, 1905, included 395.5 acres in Survey No. 234 (future location of 41BX1211) and 37 acres in Survey No. 191 (Bexar County, Deed Record 221:494; 239:27). On June 22, 1905, Pfeuffer sold Scheel 93.5 acres in Survey No. 234 (Bexar County, Deed Record 239:114). On December 1, 1905, he sold Scheel 142.5 acres in the southernmost portion of Survey No. 234 and 204 acres in the northern portion of Survey No. 801 (Bexar County, Deed Record 253:4) (see 41BX1335). As a result of the three transactions, Scheel owned most of the Pevoteaux Survey (No. 234), the eastern portion of the San Antonio Ditch Company Survey (No. 801), and a small portion of the Rivas Survey (No. 191). The land was a mixture of relatively level pastures and fields, some bottomlands along the Cibolo, and uplands to the south.

Fritz Scheel, who made his home on the Pevoteaux Grant after 1905, was born on March 27, 1872. His parents were Ruperts Scheel, who immigrated to Texas from Michelsroombach, Hessen, Germany, in 1857, and Anna Marie
Luersen who was born onboard the ship Solon when her parents emigrated from Germany in 1850. Fritz was 1 of 15 children (see history for unrecorded property “R,” the Otto Scheel Ranch headquarters, in Freeman 1994b:83–85). The couple settled in Anhalt where they remained until Rupertus died in 1914 (Holzmann and Bolton 1992).

Around the turn of the century, the Scheel children apparently began to move away from Anhalt, intending to establish their own farmsteads. Coincidentally, Christoph Pfeffer had decided to divest himself of his large holdings on the Cibolo, and so Fritz Scheel was able to acquire a farm in the area. According to a daughter, the family moved first to a large frame house that the Pfeffers had built on the Rivas Survey (see 41BX397). They then moved to 41BX1211 where Fritz Scheel had built a spacious frame home (Fischer 1992). Eventually, the farmstead included an L-shaped, plastered frame residence with screened porches; and two large, two-story barns, one of which had a dance floor upstairs, the other of which was a feed barn. There was a wash house and cellar where the Scheels made sausage, butchered meat, and made soap. Water was stored in a cypress tank mounted on a stone base; an “ice box” was located below. There also was a large rock cistern and a variety of outbuildings and pens (Fischer 1992).

The Scheels farmed and ranched, running what would have been classified as a stock farm. Livestock included white-faced Herefords that Scheel marketed in San Antonio, sheep, and a combination of Angora and Mexican goats, the Mexican goats being used to keep the place clean of brush. Crops included corn, oats, wheat, millet, sweet potatoes, and beans that were grown in several fields. One of the fields was located south of the house, while the others were north of the Cibolo. One 60-acre field was planted completely in oats that the Scheels used to feed their livestock.

Fruit and vegetable cultivation was emphasized heavily, and Mrs. Scheel kept a garden near the house where she grew green beans, turnips, beets, and radishes—everything, in fact, except okra, because Mr. Scheel didn’t care for it. South of the house was a large orchard where they grew pears, peaches, and plums; the family canned the fruit. A second orchard was located in Survey No. 801.

Farm income was supplemented by contracts with the government, which paid the Scheels for wood. Indeed, in most respects, their relations with the government and with the personnel at Camp Stanley were cordial and mutually beneficial. Officers often came to the Scheel place to visit and play pool in a large room that was at the end of the house. The family also made friends with game wardens who stayed at the Oppenheimer place where the children would go to pull watercress at a spring. The Scheels and wardens visited back and forth, playing cards and visiting on a regular basis.

By the 1920s, the Scheel children—Benno, Otmer, Bessie, and Alice—had begun to move away, leaving their parents to carry on the farm work. In the 1930s, Fritz Scheel suffered a series of small strokes, so he and his wife bought a home in New Braunfels. Shortly before the government condemned their farm on the Cibolo, they moved to town where Fritz Scheel died in 1940; his widow died in 1964 (Fischer 1992). At the time of the government purchase, their farmstead consisted of what the appraisers mistakenly described as a rock residence. The 47x67-ft house, which was stuccoed on the exterior, had six rooms, a bath, and two porches. Also present was a 10x25-ft blacksmith house; a 10x12-ft oil house; a 12x17-ft wash house with a concrete floor; a concrete and rock storm cellar; a 7x7-ft carbide light and plant; brick oven; hen house; three chicken houses, including one measuring 6x6 ft, one measuring 6x8 ft, and one with a metal roof measuring 12x16 ft; a two-story wooden barn and garage with a concrete floor measuring 39x41 ft; a two-story cow barn with galvanized metal roof measuring 17x70 ft; a sheep and goat shed with galvanized metal roof and rock wall measuring 17x45 ft; a corn house and hog pen with concrete floor and metal roof measuring 26x21 ft; two concrete and rock water troughs; a dipping vat; four stock pens; and a water complex that included a 400-ft-deep well, a windmill with a 10-ft wheel, engine and jack, and a cypress tank over a milk house that appears to have been stone.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:
Tin cans, clear glass, wire, bricks, dressed limestone, concrete and pea-sized gravel, blue glass, pressed glass, 1/2-inch and 5-inch-diameter metal pipes, a decorated stove part, corrugated tin, old windmill parts, and stucco were observed on-site, especially in the refuse area.
located to the north. Six artifacts were collected from the surface. The assemblage consists of two ceramic sherds, two glass sherds, a glass stopper, and a porcelain doll leg. The artifacts date from the late nineteenth century through the 1940s. Ten tertiary flakes were found in the southeast corner of the site and are likely associated with adjacent prehistoric site 41BX1356.

**Assessment:** The current investigation added the extensive historic farmstead component that is associated with the rock wall originally recorded by Veni et al. (1998a:79) and considered at that time to be of unknown National Register eligibility. Site 41BX1211 is believed to meet the minimal requirements for National Register eligibility under Criterion A as an example of a Hill Country German stock farm (Freeman 1994a). However, the site is not associated with an individual of local significance (Criterion B). Prehistoric items are considered intrusive from a nearby site and, therefore, have little relevance to this historic site. Moreover, the thin soils make isolating any prehistoric or historic components impossible. The site as a whole lacks the capacity to yield important archeological data. As a result, 41BX1211 is considered ineligible for NRHP listing under Criterion D.

**41CM70**

**Description:** This site was identified originally by Gerstle et al. (1978:166). It is described as a small floodplain site with nearby lag gravels located less than 100 m north of Cibolo Creek in Training Area 2A. Reportedly, it contained flakes, burned rocks, one Frio point, one Nolan point, and one Pedernales point. Flora in the area today consists of large junipers and oak trees with native grasses and cacti. Together, the flora and bedrock exposures produce ground surface visibility of 50 percent for much of the area. The site reportedly is at 1,240 ft amsl and consists mostly of exposed bedrock with some areas of thin dark brown clay loam. According to Batte (1984:64), they are Comfort soils. Testing by Gerstle et al. (1978) indicated a soil depth of 13 cm.

**Cultural Materials Observed:** An artifact concentration identifiable as 41CM70 was not re-located during this survey. This survey did encounter a large area of lag gravels in the vicinity, however, and these may be associated with the materials observed in 1977.

**Assessment:** Site 41CM70 originally was recorded (Gerstle et al. 1978:166, 349) as a small lithic resource procurement site, at which no further work was recommended. Approximately 10 cm of sediment were noted by the original recorders. Based on the original description, the context, and a revisit to the site vicinity, the site appears incapable of containing important archeological information due to its lack of appreciable sediments and inability to yield isosalable components. Therefore, it is recommended that site 41CM70 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

**41CM94**

**Description:** This site in Training Area 2A originally was recorded by Gerstle et al. (1978:166) as a 20x20-m Archaic–Late Prehistoric site located along a terrace of an intermittent stream 200 m north of Cibolo Creek. The site yielded biface fragments, unifaces, scrapers, and flakes. Collected artifacts included one Scallorn point and two untypeable dart points. Flora in the area today consists of large juniper and oak trees with native grasses and cacti. Together, the flora and bedrock exposures produce ground surface visibility of 50 percent for much of the area. The site area reportedly is at 1,210 ft amsl and consists mostly of exposed bedrock with some areas of thin dark brown clay loam. According to Batte (1984:64), they are Comfort soils. No shovel tests were dug in the vicinity during this survey due to extensive exposed bedrock.

**Cultural Materials Observed:** Site 41CM94 was not re-located during this survey, probably because of its small size and the dense woods.

**Assessment:** Site 41CM94 was recorded by Gerstle et al. (1978:166, 349) as a small dispersed scatter of lithic artifacts and was considered eroded and, therefore, ineligible for NRHP listing. A portion of the site was completely collected during the original recording process. The small size, the removal of materials, and the eroded nature of the site likely contributed to the inability to re-locate it during the current survey. Based on the original description and its context, the site appears incapable of containing important archeological information due to its lack of appreciable sediments and inability to yield isosalable components.
Therefore, it is recommended that 41CM94 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

41CM95

Description: Examination of this large previously recorded historic farmstead (see Gerstle et al. 1978; Veni et al. 1998:58) added two historic features to the east and west, increasing the overall site size to 700 m northeast-southwest by 600 m northwest-southeast (Figure 19). In addition, a prehistoric lithic scatter was identified in the southern part of the original site; a few pieces of debitage were observed when the site was first recorded, but the site form indicates that there was "not enough evidence to show aboriginal occupation." The site is located at 1,235 ft asl on a broad flat area 200 m north of Cibolo Creek. Dense junipers and oaks with patchy open fields of native grasses and cacti abound. Ground visibility was moderate at 40 percent.

Soils are thin reddish brown clay loam with extensive exposed bedrock. These are Comfort soils (Batte 1984:84). Two shovel probes and one shovel test were dug in the area of the prehistoric component; none contained any artifacts. The two shovel probes were terminated due to bedrock at 5 cm, while the shovel test went to 20 cm before reaching bedrock. Soils in the shovel test went from an orange-brown silty loam to a reddish brown clay. Five additional shovel tests were excavated in the vicinity of the house ruins. All five were excavated to 20 cm below surface, encountering a compacted gravelly reddish brown clay loam at this depth or less. Cultural materials were recovered only from Shovel Test 4, which yielded a small chert flake and a small clear glass fragment at 0 to 20 cm. Neither specimen was collected.

To the northwest of the originally recorded house complex, an array of rock pens with fencing was found near an intermittent stream. Several large and overgrown oak trees have decorative rock walls closely surrounding them. To the southeast of the house complex, two parallel stone alignments and barbed wire fencing forming pens were recorded. All appear to be farm related.

History: Site 41CM95, the Mason-Eckles Housesite, is located on the north side of Cibolo Creek in the eastern portion of the Maria de la Luz Guerra Survey (No. 172). Site 41CM95 has been called the Washington-Mason Housesite in several other reports. The site is referred to as the Mason-Eckles Housesite in this report because Mason was the owner of record when the first improvements appear to have been made to the portion of the Maria de la Luz Guerra Survey on which 41CM95 is located. In addition, the presence of the occupants of longest duration, John Wesley Eckles and his family, was not reflected in previous reports. A certificate for the survey, was issued to Guerra by 1837, when she sold it to San Antonio businessmen Enoch Jones and John W. Smith. One league was surveyed for the two men in March 1840, and it was patented to them on August 13, 1844 (Texas. General Land Office 1844b).

Jones was a prominent San Antonio capitalist whose home was on the Medina River (Goodspeed Brothers Publishers 1894:654–655). Following Smith's death in 1845, Jones received the lower or east half of the Guerra Survey (2,214 acres) which he deeded to his daughter, Olive Ann Washington, in 1860 (Bexar County, Deed Record S-1:389). The term "lower" in the 1860 deed was erroneously interpreted to mean "south" in Freeman (1994:Appendix A:3). The term "lower half" actually referred to the property's location relative to the flow of the Cibolo rather than to cardinal directions. Subsequent examination of deeds describing the east half of the league led to the correction in this report. (See also 41CM242.) Olive Ann was the wife of Lieutenant Thornton Augustin Washington, a Princeton College and West Point Academy graduate who commanded the military escort that accompanied the William H. Emory survey of the United States and Mexican boundary. He saw frontier service (primarily in Texas), and from December 1859 until May 1860, and again from December 1860 to March 1861, he was stationed in San Antonio. In 1861, he was commissioned a captain in the Confederate army. He returned to San Antonio after the Civil War and became a civil engineer (Goodspeed Brothers 1894:655–656; Washington 1888, 1892).

On April 13, 1867, the Washingtons sold their 2,214 acres on the Cibolo to Major John S. Mason who left in the fall to appraise the frontier defense needs of Texas as part of a committee comprised of General Alexander McD. McCook, Major John P. Hatch, Captain D. W. Porter, and Mason (Haley 1952:123–124). He
Figure 19. Plan of 41CM95.
returned to San Antonio where he served at Fort
Sam Houston as Acting Assistant Inspector
General of the Department of Texas from No-


vember 6, 1875, to January 31, 1881. He then
was appointed deputy governor of the Soldiers’
Home in Washington, D.C., where he served
until 1882. In May, he was assigned to command
the recruiting depot at Columbus Barracks,
Ohio (Mason 1880, 1881, 1882).

Tax records indicate that Mason was assessed
for cattle and several hundred goats on his prop-
erty in Comal County between 1880 and 1884,
even though he was absent from Texas after May
1881. In addition, the valuation of the property
increased from $1,600 to $3,000 between 1883 and
1884, a strong indication of the construction of
major improvements on the land. The improve-
ments could have been made in preparation for
the move of General Mason’s daughter, Kate, and
son-in-law, John Wesley Eckles, to the ranch. The
reference to livestock during the 1880–1884 pe-


riod suggests that Eckles or some other agent
could have been using the property while Mason
was absent from the state. The Eckleses are
known to have been in residence by July 1885,
when Eckles wrote from the Oakland Park Ranch
in Comal County (location of 41CM95) that he
occupied a residence on Survey No. 172 and con-
sidered himself to be a resident of Comal County
(Eckles 1885).

Documents in the service record of John
Wesley Eckles indicate that the 1880s were tur-
bulent years for this former officer, who had
served in the Civil War with the 1st Delaware
Volunteers at Antietam, Fredericksburg,
Chancellorsville, Gettysburg, and Falling Wa-
ters. He obtained a second lieutenant’s commis-
sion in 1866 and was brevetted captain and then
major in San Antonio in 1868. In 1870, he was
appointed regimental quartermaster of the 15th
Infantry and posted to Fort Selden, New Mexico,
where he was accused of fraud and courtmartialed,
but found not guilty, in 1871.

He was courtmartialed again in 1873 for strik-
ing his superior officer and accepting a chal-
lenge to fight a duel. Eckles managed to retain
his office and was promoted to the rank of cap-
tain in 1875. However, he was courtmartialed
yet a third time in 1877, when he again was
accused of fraud. This time, he lost his commis-
sion. He spent the next 14 years trying to be
reinstated, lobbying Congress and the President
through his father-in-law and other influential
friends and politicians (Eckles various dates).

During the 1880s, Kate and John Wesley
Eckles lived on the ranch in the house at
41CM95 with their eight children—Mason,
Charles, John Wesley, Bessie, Nina, Kate,
Cornelia, and May. They raised goats they had
purchased from William D. Parrish at 41BX432
until about 1884 (Anonymous 1975; Barnett
1983:139; Texas. State Comptroller 1884), af-


ther which they kept an average of 5 horses and
mules and 70 cattle between 1886 and 1889
(Texas. State Comptroller 1884–1889).

Early in 1891, Eckles was notified that the
Committee on Military Affairs of the United
States Senate had reported adversely on a bill
for his relief and reappointment to the army, and
that the members had recommended the bill be
postponed indefinitely (Eckles various dates).

About the same time, fence cutters hit the ranch.
Eckles’s suspicions centered on a former employee
named J. Skaggs, and in September 1891, the two
men had a violent argument when they encoun-
tered one another between the ranch headquar-
ters and Boerne. Skaggs shot Eckles four times
and then surrendered himself to the authorities
in Boerne. Eckles was left alone until travelers
found him and took him back to his house where
he died (The San Antonio Daily Express, Septem
ber 29, 1891).

Although her husband was dead and her
father was living in Washington, D.C., Kate
Eckles apparently decided to remain on the
ranch with her children. Her sons Mason and
Charlie helped out by working for the Toeppe-
weins, planting corn, and hauling wood to
soldiers stationed at Leon Springs, but life
on the ranch could not have been easy for the
family. In her diary entries for 1892, May Eckles
described Mason’s return from the Toeppeweins
with a soup bone so that the family could have
soup the following day. During cold and rainy
weather, the children sometimes stayed “in the
kitchen all day hugging the fire.” Frost killed
all the peaches in March 1892, so there was no
hope for a crop that year. And above all, they
missed Eckles. On March 25, 1892, his daugh-
ter wrote, “It is six months since Papa died, and
it seems like a very short time because we miss
dear Papa so much.” On the other hand, pleas-
ant trips were made to see friends in Leon
Springs and at other ranches such as Schasse’s
where they had trouble because “they can’t talk
English and we can’t talk German.” A good meal
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was enjoyed nonetheless (Eckles 1892–1896:n.p.).

In April 1892, Kate Eckles rented a house in San Antonio and packed the contents of the house at 41CM95 in preparation for a move. The family lived in town for the most part after 1892, although the boys enjoyed frequent trips out to the ranch. Then, on June 1, 1895, May heard for the first time that her grandfather had sold the ranch—"we were very sorry to part with our old home" (Eckles 1892–1896:n.p.). The sale actually occurred 4 days later when General Mason of Washington, D.C., conveyed 1,880 acres "formerly occupied by J. W. Eckles" to Joseph Simon and Peter Doepenschmidt of Comal County. The land included 191 acres in the Socorro Farming Co. Survey (No. 1020) that had been patented to General Mason in 1879 and 1,644 acres out of the east half of Survey No. 172 (Bexar County, Deed Record 138:774–775). The sale included land on which 41CM95 and 41CM242 were located.

In 1900, Joseph Simon quitclaimed 895 acres in Survey No. 172 to Peter Doepenschmidt (Bexar County, Deed Record 187:5–7). Eleven years later, Doepenschmidt of Bexar County sold 1,195 acres in Survey No. 172, including 41CM95, to Carl August Grosser of Comal County (Bexar County, Deed Record 356:327–329). Grosser was a native of Schleisen, Germany, who immigrated to Texas in 1883 and settled in the Bergham area where he farmed cotton. In 1910, he moved to Van Raub (The Boerne Star, February 17, 1949).

The property that C. A. Grosser acquired from Peter Doepenschmidt on August 1, 1911, included the locations of 41CM95 and 41BX394. But it is not clear from historical documents if either of the two sites was occupied by Grosser after that date. C. A. Grosser is known to have made his permanent residence in the late 1930s at a site west of Camp Bullis. As a result, it appears likely that 41CM95 was occupied by nonfamily members, perhaps tenants or renters.

On November 30, 1914, Grosser sold 200 acres on the south side of the Cibolo to his son, Alwin Grosser (Bexar County, Deed Record 447:512), and this became the location of Alwin’s home (41BX394), which he occupied until 1941. In 1935, C. A. and Charlotte Grosser sold Alwin 601.82 acres north of the 200-acre tract, land that included the location of 41CM95 (Bexar County, Deed Record 1511:78–79). The Grossers owned the two tracts until August 15, 1941, when the property was condemned by the United States government to provide for the expansion of Camp Bullis (Bexar County, Deed Record 1847:351–355). An inventory of improvements on Alwin Grosser’s landmentions only the farmstead at 41BX394, suggesting that the Mason–Eckles house at 41CM95 had disappeared by that date.

Cultural Materials Observed and Collected: Two historic artifacts were collected from the surface at 41CM95—a ceramic sherd and a nail. A graduated screw top bottle was found southwest of the pens but not collected. Also collected were two Late Archaic projectile points (Marshall and Darl), a Guadalupe biface, and a triangular biface. Other prehistoric artifacts observed in the southern section of the site were 2 cores, 5 primary flakes, 10 secondary flakes, and 17 tertiary flakes. No prehistoric cultural features were noted.

Assessment: Site 41CM95 may have been associated with Lieutenant Thornton Augustin and Olive Ann (Jones) Washington (1860–1867) and Major John S. Mason (1867–1895). However, Washington was stationed in San Antonio only briefly before serving in the Confederacy, and for fewer than 2 years after the Civil War. As a result, he does not appear to have had strong associations with the Guerra Survey. Mason, though a resident of San Antonio after 1867 and an important figure at Fort Sam Houston, was often absent on military duty; and after 1881, he did not reside in Texas. The John Wesley Eckles family is known to have occupied 41CM95 from ca. 1883 to 1895. However, Eckles, though notorious, was not a significant figure in local military or ranching history. Nor does the site appear to have features that are representative of ranching in the Eastern Edwards Plateau region. The shovel tests suggest that it is unlikely that the historic nineteenth century components can be isolated through further excavation. Hence, they appear to lack the capacity to yield important archeological information, and 41CM95 is considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP. This contrasts with the recommendation offered by Gerstle et al. (1978) when the site was first recorded. The prehistoric component also is recommended as being ineligible for National Register listing based on the lack of subsurface deposits in which components could be isolated.
**41CM99**

**Description:** Site 41CM99 is located along the north edge of Cibolo Creek in Training Area 2A (Gerstle et al. 1978:167). The site originally was a 50x35-m lithic scatter ca. 180 m north of the creek. Upon the survey’s revisit during this survey, the site was extended to incorporate an area totaling 430x200 m that abuts the creek edge, as indicated by observed lithics on the surface.

Junipers and oaks dominate the larger flora along the creek edge, while patches of native grasses exist in small silty clearings upon the terrace, which sits at 1,220 ft asml. Soils are reddish brown silty clay, characterized as Comfort soils by Batte (1984:83). No shovel tests were dug due to extensive bedrock. Ground visibility was 50 percent.

**Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:** Transects across the site resulted in the enumeration of 256 lithic artifacts. Other than 3 collected projectile points, the scatter contains 20 primary, 74 secondary, 78 tertiary, and 16 biface-thinning flakes; 16 unifacial tools; 14 bifacial tools; 28 chunks; and 7 cores. The points consist of a late Prehistoric Perdiz arrow point and two untypeable Archaic dart points. The original 41CM99 appears to be associated with the northern half of the site as currently defined and reflects late reduction of chert and some tool use. The southern half consists mostly of bifacial and unifacial tools with a balance of early- and late-stage reduction debitage. No cultural features were observed.

**Assessment:** Gerstle et al. (1978:347) originally recommended that 41CM99 be considered eligible for the National Register. During the reassessment, the site dimensions were greatly increased and three projectile points were collected, but no cultural features were encountered. Shovel testing was not conducted due to a lack of accumulated sediments. This confirms that no intact deposits are present. Because components cannot be isolated, the site lacks the capacity to yield important archeological data. It is recommended that 41CM99 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

**41CM100**

**Description:** Site 41CM100 originally was recorded by Gerstle et al. (1978:170) as a 65x20-m Middle Archaic flake scatter located less than 100 m north of Cibolo Creek in Training Area 2A. This greatly extended the site to the north and east to an area of 215 m east-west by 275 m north-south, as indicated by observed lithic materials on the surface.

Juniper and oak trees dominate the larger flora along the creek edge while patches of native grasses exist in small silty clearings upon the terrace, which sits at 1,200 ft asml. Soils are reddish brown silty clay, which are characterized as Comfort soils by Batte (1984:83). No shovel tests were dug due to extensive exposed bedrock. Ground visibility was 40 percent. A bulldozed path that bisects the site was created many years ago to retrieve supply-laden parachutes dropped here by accident. No shovel tests were dug due to extensive bedrock exposures.

**Cultural Materials Observed:** Approximately 148 lithic artifacts were observed. The southeast quadrant of the site contained 75 flakes, followed by the northwest (n = 38), northeast (n = 21), and southwest quadrants (n = 14). In total, there were 11 primary, 36 secondary, 56 tertiary, and 14 biface-thinning flakes; 7 bifacial tools; 3 bifaces; 17 chunks; and 1 core. Tool use appears to have been restricted to the southern half of the site, with 9 of 10 bifacial and unifacial tools in this area. No cultural features were observed.

**Assessment:** Gerstle et al. (1978:349) originally recommended no further work for 41CM100. During the reassessment, the site dimensions were greatly increased, but no cultural features or temporal indicators were encountered. Shovel testing was not conducted due to a lack of accumulated sediments. This confirms that no intact deposits are present. Because components cannot be isolated, the site lacks the capacity to yield important archeological data. It is recommended that 41CM100 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

**41CM101**

**Description:** This 30x15-m site originally was located 300 m north of Cibolo Creek and 100 m west of the firebreak road in Training Area 2A (Gerstle et al. 1978:170). The site now extends to the road and continues 150 m south toward the creek. The new dimensions are 175 m north-south by 150 m east-west.
Junipers and oaks dominate the larger flora along the creek edge, while patches of native grasses exist in small silty clearings upon the flat terrace at 1,190 ft asml. Soils are reddish brown silty clay, which are characterized as Comfort soils by Batte (1984:83). No shovel tests were dug due to extensive exposed bedrock. Ground visibility was 50 percent. Flood debris was observed, especially near the creek.

*Cultural Materials Observed and Collected:* The artifacts at 41CM101 were encountered along three transects across the site. A total of 111 artifacts were encountered. The north transect (the original 41CM101 defined by Gerstle et al.) contained 17 flakes and 1 scraper. The central transect contained 27 flakes. The south transect contained 67 flakes and 1 scraper. The flakes are comprised of 5 primary, 28 secondary, 38 tertiary, and 12 biface-thinning flakes; 6 unifacial tools; 7 bifacial tools; 9 chunks; and 6 cores. A single untypeable Late Prehistoric arrow point made from a light tan chert was found in the southern section. No cultural features were observed.

*Assessment:* Gerstle et al. (1978:348) were not able to assess 41CM101 due to flooding. During the reappraisal, the site dimensions were greatly increased and one projectile point was collected, but no cultural features were encountered. Shovel testing was not conducted due to a lack of accumulated sediments. Since components cannot be isolated, the site lacks the capacity to yield important archeological data. Therefore, it is recommended that 41CM101 be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

---

41CM217

*Description:* Site 41CM217 originally was recorded as a 30x20-m lithic procurement site surrounding a karst feature in Training Area 1A (Veni et al. 1998a:20). This revisit extended the procurement area to 150 m north-south by 80 m east-west. At 1,200 ft asml, dense junipers and oaks surround the site, while a small east-west two-track road bisects it. Small patches of native grasses exist throughout the area. Ground surface visibility was good at 70 percent.

Soils are thin reddish brown silty clay loam with areas of exposed bedrock. According to Batte (1984:77), these are Rumple-Comfort soils. No shovel tests were dug due to extensive exposed bedrock.

*Cultural Materials Observed:* No diagnostics or cultural features were found, however, numerous tested lag gravels were noted throughout. The site area is typified by many primary and secondary flakes.

*Assessment:* Site 41CM217 originally was recorded in 1996 (Veni et al. 1998a:20) and recommended as ineligible for listing in the NRHP. During the revisit, the site dimensions were greatly increased, however, no cultural features or temporal diagnostics were encountered. Shovel testing was not conducted due to a lack of accumulated sediments. Since components cannot be identified or isolated, the site lacks the capacity to yield important archeological data. Therefore, it is recommended that 41CM217 still be considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP.
DESCRIPTION OF ARTIFACTS

PREHISTORIC ARTIFACTS

Dart Points

Bulverde

Two Bulverde points were found on the surface at 41CM242 and 41BX379 (see Table 1 for metric data for these and the other dart points). The large, broken point from 41CM242 is made of dull gray brown chert (Figure 20a). The triangular blade is biconvex in cross section. The contracting, wedged-shaped stem has slight fluting on both faces. Shoulders are abrupt. A twisting fracture is located on the very tip. Some damage occurs on one basal edge. The heavily reworked point from 41BX379 has a biconvex triangular blade and a parallel-sided stem with a slightly concave base. In cross section the stem is wedge shaped and has a small flute on one side. Barbs are abrupt; one appears to have been removed as a burin. The remaining tip is heavily reduced bifacially; small flake scars appear across the entire edge.

Castroville

Two Castroville points were found at 41CM234 and 41BX377. The base from 41CM234 is made of tannish gray chert with splotchy cream-colored patina (Figure 20b). The tip and part of the midsection are missing as a result of a transverse snap fracture. Likewise, one barb is missing. What remains is a well-thinned ovate form with a gently convex basal edge with two 12.7-mm-long basal notches that produce a slightly expanding stem and long rectangular barbs. The stem edges may be smoothed. The stem is wedge shaped in cross section. The blade retains much of its sharpness, but some stacking of material is evident along the edges from a series of step-terminated flake failures.

The base fragment from 41BX377 is made of tannish gray chert with splotchy cream-colored patina. The tip and part of the midsection are missing as a result of a transverse snap fracture. What remains is a well-thinned stem with a gently convex basal edge with two 8-mm-long corner notches that produce a slightly expanding stem and robust rectangular barbs. The stem has a wedge-shaped cross section.

Darl

The first Darl is a slightly damaged point from 41CM95 and has a slightly biconvex triangular blade and a damaged expanding bifurcated stem (Figure 20c). Damage includes a crushed tip and a snapped off basal ear. The point is made from tan to brown fine-grained chert with cortex on one side. The blade has beveled edges. The second damaged Darl point is from 41BX1391 and has a reworked parallel-sided blade and a rectangular bifurcated stem. It is made of brown chert with spotty white patination. The damaged distal end has been reworked, and a burin flake resulted in removal of one basal ear.

Ensor

Nine Ensor points were found at eight sites. The first is from 41BX1346 and is made of gray glassy chert with white cortex on both sides. It is complete except for the very tip. This point has a prominent rounded side notch on one edge and a diminutive side notch on the other. The
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Table 1. Metric data for dart points (in mm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Blade Length</th>
<th>Blade Width</th>
<th>Thickness</th>
<th>Neck Width</th>
<th>Base Width</th>
<th>Haft Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulverde</td>
<td>41BX379</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulverde</td>
<td>41CM242</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castroville</td>
<td>41BX377</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castroville</td>
<td>41CM234</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darl</td>
<td>41BX1391</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darl</td>
<td>41CM95</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enson</td>
<td>41BX1346</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enson</td>
<td>41BX1368</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enson</td>
<td>41BX1391</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enson</td>
<td>41BX373</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enson</td>
<td>41BX373</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enson</td>
<td>41BX379</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enson</td>
<td>41BX382</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enson</td>
<td>41BX383</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enson</td>
<td>41CM235</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frio</td>
<td>41BX1350</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frio</td>
<td>41BX380</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frio</td>
<td>41CM237</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gower</td>
<td>41BX1348</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gower</td>
<td>41BX1349</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gower</td>
<td>41BX371</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gower</td>
<td>41BX382</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lange</td>
<td>41BX379</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>41CM102</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>41CM95</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martindale</td>
<td>41BX1349</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montell</td>
<td>41BX1044</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedernales</td>
<td>41BX1044</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedernales</td>
<td>41BX379</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedernales</td>
<td>41BX385</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedernales</td>
<td>41CM237</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortugas</td>
<td>41CM242</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41BX1351</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>41BX379</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped corner notched</td>
<td>41BX1351</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped corner notched</td>
<td>41BX1353</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped expanding stem</td>
<td>41BX1045</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped expanding stem</td>
<td>41BX1348</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped expanding stem</td>
<td>41BX1351</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Blade Length</th>
<th>Blade Width</th>
<th>Thickness</th>
<th>Neck Width</th>
<th>Base Width</th>
<th>Haft Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untyped expanding stem</td>
<td>41BX1363</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped expanding stem</td>
<td>41BX1364</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped expanding stem</td>
<td>41BX1368</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped expanding stem</td>
<td>41BX371</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped expanding stem</td>
<td>41BX371</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped expanding stem</td>
<td>41BX371</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped expanding stem</td>
<td>41BX371</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped expanding stem</td>
<td>41BX371</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped expanding stem</td>
<td>41BX376</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped expanding stem</td>
<td>41BX382</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped expanding stem</td>
<td>41BX382</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped expanding stem</td>
<td>41BX383</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped expanding stem</td>
<td>41CM233</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped expanding stem</td>
<td>41CM99</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped expanding stem</td>
<td>41CM99</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped slightly expanding stem</td>
<td>41BX1348</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped slightly expanding stem</td>
<td>41BX1368</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped slightly expanding stem</td>
<td>41CM239</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped slightly expanding stem</td>
<td>41CM242</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped contracting stem</td>
<td>41BX1354</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped contracting stem</td>
<td>41CM235</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped parallel stem</td>
<td>41BX1362</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped parallel stem</td>
<td>41BX1368</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped parallel stem</td>
<td>41CM236</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped parallel stem,</td>
<td>41CM242</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straight base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped parallel stem,</td>
<td>41CM242</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straight base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped triangular</td>
<td>41BX1349</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next Enser is a damaged point from 41BX1391 and has a heavily reworked, biconvex, triangular blade and a short expanding stem. Two burin scars are on one blade edge and one basal ear. The remaining basal ear is robust and downward pointing. Broad corner notches contribute to the stem shape and abrupt barbs. Reworking is indicated by fresh flake scars on the slightly patinated surface.

The seventh Enser is a broken point from 41BX373. It has a slightly beveled, biconvex, triangular blade and a strongly expanding stem (Figure 20e). Corner notching and a deep basal concavity contribute to downward-pointing ears and abrupt barbs. Damage includes a bending snap fracture at the tip and removal of all or part of both barbs and one basal ear. The point is made of brownish chert.

The eighth Enser is from 41BX373. It is relatively complete and is made of grayish brown chert (Figure 20f). It has a planoconvex triangular blade and a slightly expanding stem with a concave base. Corner notching creates weak shoulders. The tip has been dulled by flaking. The final specimen is a base fragment from 41BX379. It has a concave base and side notches that create squared pointed ears and abrupt barbs. Damage includes a bending snap fracture that removed much of the blade. The point is made of grayish white fine-grained chert.

### Frio

Three Frio points were collected. This first is from 41BX1350 and is made of slightly

---

**Table 1, continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Blade Length</th>
<th>Blade Width</th>
<th>Thickness</th>
<th>Neck Width</th>
<th>Base Width</th>
<th>Haft Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untyped bifurcated stem</td>
<td>41CM235</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped fragment</td>
<td>41BX1354</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped fragment</td>
<td>41BX1361</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped fragment</td>
<td>41BX1368</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped fragment</td>
<td>41BX1368</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped fragment</td>
<td>41BX1390</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped fragment</td>
<td>41BX371</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped fragment</td>
<td>41BX379</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped fragment</td>
<td>41CM242</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 20. Typed dart points. (a) Bulverde; (b) Castroville; (c) Darl; (d–f) Ensor; (g) Frio; (h–i) Gower; (j) Lange; (k) Marshall; (l) Martindale; (m) Montell; (n–p) Pedernales; (q) Tortugas; (r) Travis.
patinated, light brown glassy chert (Figure 20g). It is nearly complete, missing only the tip of one basal ear. The small triangular blade is thin and well sharpened. The expanding stem is the result of corner notching and a strongly concave base, which form downward-pointing, recurved ears. Corner notching contributes to short pointed barbs.

The second Friio is a damaged point from 41CM237 and is made of grayish brown glassy chert. It has a well-thinned, biconvex, triangular blade and an expanding bifurcated base highlighted by small corner notches and a deep basal concavity that produce downward-pointing ears. One ear has been damaged, as evidenced by a bending snap fracture with minor flaking located proximally. The tip has the remnants of a bending-type fracture that has been reworked toward one edge.

The third Friio is a heavily damaged point with a planoconvex cross section, a downward-pointing basal ear, and an abrupt shoulder created by a side notch. It is from 41BX380. The other ear is missing and the other shoulder is not evident. The tip also is missing. This point is made of glassy brown chert.

**Gower**

Four sites yielded four Gower points. The point from 41BX1348 is heavily damaged, with a transverse snap fracture, burin scars on the tip, and a missing basal ear. Based on the patination patterns, the tip damage may be more recent than the ear damage. The point has broad side notching that produces round but strong shoulders, while the deep basal concavity contributes to the robust, downward-pointing, rounded ears. Along one blade edge, thin parallel flaking is evidence for a well-sharpened point.

The second Gower is from 41BX1349 and is a heavily reworked, triangular-bladed, rectangular-stemmed specimen. The blade has been resharpened and reworked to a small nub. Impact damage has removed a small flake from part of the tip. Damage and reworking have greatly reduced material in the area of the barbs. It is obvious that a basal notch forming two downward-pointing ears existed. However, one ear may have been removed by impact, as evidenced by burin scars on the lateral edge of the stem.

The third Gower is from 41BX371 and is a slightly damaged point featuring a biconvex triangular blade with a bifurcated parallel-sided stem with a deep basal concavity forming two downward-pointing ears (Figure 20h). Short damaged barbs also are present, with one having a burin scar. Other damage includes bending snap fractures at the tip and on one basal ear. A heavy white patina covers the entire point, including the damage scars.

The last Gower is a slightly damaged and heavily reworked point from 41BX382 that has a biconvex triangular blade and a straight bifurcated stem (Figure 20i). Corner removal and a concave base contribute to downward-pointing ears, one of which has been removed with a snap fracture. Shoulders appear abrupt. This point is made of light brown chert covered in a white patina.

**Lange**

A single Lange point was found at 41BX379. This damaged point has a reworked, biconvex, triangular blade and a squared base which is straight to slightly convex (Figure 20j). Barbs are weak to abrupt. Damage includes an impact fracture at the tip. The point is made of light brown chert with a slight gray patina.

**Marshall**

Two Marshall points were found. The first is a relatively complete point from 41CM95 that has a biconvex triangular blade and a slightly expanding stem created by corner notches (Figure 20k). Barbs are long, but one is damaged and appears stubby. The basal edge of the stem is straight. A distal head-on view reveals well-made straight blade edges.

The second Marshall is a heavily damaged proximal stem fragment from 41CM102. It has a slightly expanding to straight stem with a slightly concave base and basal notches, which contribute to the creation of downward-pointing barbs. Damage includes a transverse and bending snap fracture distally that removed the point tip and one blade edge. The point was made of brown semiglassy chert now dulled by a slight patina.

**Martindale**

The single point from 41BX1349 is a
relatively complete, triangular-bladed, expanding-stem Martindale (Figure 20l). It is missing the very tip and parts of the barbs. The basal area is intact and has two downward-pointing ears and a deep V-shaped basal concavity. The barbs appear to have been snapped off. The blade is well thinned and sharpened with some evidence for edge damage and subsequent repair.

Montell

This proximal end fragment from 41BX1044 has the distinctive bifurcated base and squared-off basal ears of a Montell point (Figure 20m). Shoulders appear abrupt. Damage includes a transverse snap fracture across the midsection. A small burin scar is on the interior edge of one basal ear. This point is of brown fine-grained chert.

Pedernales

Four Pedernales points were found at four sites. The first is a damaged point from 41CM237 and is made of dark brown semiglasy chert dulled with a slight patina (Figure 20n). It lacks the very tip, which has been snapped off with the flake scar being reworked. The point has a thick triangular blade with a weak shoulder on one edge and a strong shoulder on the other. The stem is straight sided and bifurcated, with a central basal notch that produces two downward-pointing ears.

The second Pedernales is a heavily damaged point from 41BX1044 and shows evidence of a biconvex triangular blade and a straight bifurcated stem. Damage includes a heavily scarred tip area, one fractured barb, and removal of material from the basal ears. The point is made of brown semiglasy chert with slight grayish patination.

The third Pedernales is a relatively complete point from 41BX379 and has a biconvex triangular blade and a slightly contracting bifurcated stem (Figure 20o). Barbs are weak to abrupt. Basal ears are robust and downward pointing, although one is partly missing. Other damage includes a rounded impact feature. The point is made of gray fine-grained chert.

The last specimen is a relatively complete point from 41BX385 that has a biconvex triangular blade and a parallel-sided bifurcated stem with straight downward-pointing ears (Figure 20p). Corner removals produce abrupt barbs. Damage includes wear at the tip and fire damage distally. The point is made of lightly patinated dark brown glassy chert.

Tortugas

A single Tortugas point was found in association with the burned rock midden at 41CM242. This triangular point is complete, except for a large hinged flake scar. It is made of brown glassy chert with slight white patination (Figure 20q).

Travis

Two Travis points were found. One is a complete point from 41BX1351 and has a thick, biconvex, ovate blade and a slightly expanding straight-based stem (Figure 20r). Problematic stacking of material on one side of the blade contributes to the overall thickness of the point. The base is wedge shaped in cross section. This point is made of tan chert with whitish patination.

The second specimen is a robust, relatively complete point from 41BX379. It has a thick, beveled, triangular blade and a slightly expanding, beveled, straight stem. Corner removal contributes to abrupt barbs. Damage includes an impact fracture at the very tip, edge damage on one lateral edge, and a small potlid scar on the base.

Untyped Corner Notched

Two corner-notched points that are untypeable but that appear to be of Late Archaic age were collected. The first is a damaged point from 41BX1353 and is made of dark brown glassy chert. It has a well-thinned, slightly beveled, biconvex, triangular blade and an expanding bifurcated base. Damage includes a broken tip highlighted by a bending snap fracture and a missing basal ear. The downward-pointing rounded ears are created by a concave base and broad corner notching.

The second is from 41BX1351 and is made of heavily patinated chert. It has a complete, though heavily reworked, biconvex triangular blade with a slightly expanding base. The damaged base is slightly concave and has broad
side notching which produces weak basal ears. Shoulders also appear weak.

**Untyped Expanding Stem**

Eighteen untypeable dart points with strongly or moderately expanding stems were collected. The first point is a broken specimen from 41BX1348 (Figure 21a). The tip is missing, probably due to impact and fracture along a fault in the material. It is a thick point apparently with stacking of chert material caused by many large and small hinge and step terminations on both faces. It has two downward-pointing ears created by a prominent basal concavity and corner removals. One ear appears slightly damaged. The corner removal of material also produces weak shoulders. The most distinguishing feature is beveling of the blade.

The second point comes from 41CM233 and is a relatively complete and well-made specimen with a thick triangular blade (Figure 21b). The thick blade is the result of soft-hammer flaking failures ending in the stacking of material with small step terminations along the blade edge. Broad side notching near the proximal end produces strong shoulders and prominent scars on the stem. No grinding is evident. One medium-sized squared ear appears complete, while the other is slightly damaged. The basal edge is straight and beveled in cross section. The very tip is missing, possibly the result of recent damage. The entire point surface is dulled with a slight patina, while the underlying material is shiny brown.

The third point, from 41BX1351, is made of dark grayish brown chert and has a complete, though heavily reworked, biconvex triangular blade. The base is slightly concave and has broad side notching, which produces small downward-pointing basal ears. Shoulders are weak.

The fourth specimen is a large but heavily damaged point fragment from 41BX1363 that is made of tan glassy chert. It has a well-thinned, biconvex, triangular blade and a short stem with a small basal concavity. Corner notching is evident as are abrupt shoulders. Damage appears as two bending snap fractures, one that removed the tip and one along one edge of the blade. The fifth specimen is from 41BX1364 and is a well-thinned, biconvex, heat-damaged medial fragment made of brown glassy chert.

The sixth point, from 41BX1368, is heavily damaged and made of lightly patinated glassy brown chert (Figure 21c). It consists of a blade edge, broken barb, long corner notch, pointed basal ear, and evidence of a shallow basal concavity. The missing half has a burinlike flake scar. The entire tip is missing as a result of a bending snap fracture.

The next five points in this category were recovered from 41BX371. One is a heavily damaged, patinated specimen with a biconvex triangular blade and a bifurcated stem. Short rounded ears are evident and were created by corner notching and a slightly concave base. Damage includes a small bending snap fracture at the tip, a bending snap fracture on one barb, and damaged basal ears. Also from 41BX371 is a slightly damaged point featuring a biconvex triangular blade and a small slightly bifurcated stem with small downward-pointing ears produced by corner notching and a slightly concave base (Figure 21d). Damage includes the removal of one barb. The third specimen from 41BX371 is a heavily reworked and damaged point with a biconvex triangular blade and a bifurcated stem. It is made of fine-grained glassy gray chert. One blade edge was removed as a burin, while the downward-pointing basal ears were removed by snap fractures. Broad corner removals produce abrupt shoulders. The fourth specimen from 41BX371 is a relatively complete point featuring a biconvex triangular blade and a short stem (Figure 21e). Broad corner notching contributes to the stem shape and the short pointed shoulders. A slight white patina covers the light grayish brown chert. The tip has been removed, as is evident from the reworked distal snap fracture. Finally, also from 41BX371 is a damaged point that has a biconvex triangular blade with a small bifurcated stem. The stem has small ears created by corner removals and the slightly concave base. Shoulders are abrupt. The tip exhibits a bending snap fracture.

The twelfth point is a highly fragmented base and blade edge from 41BX383 that is made from a grainy orange-tan chert. This once-large point has a strongly convex base and a small corner notch. This corner notching contributes to the robust and rounded barb. Otherwise, very little remains, due to a bending snap fracture at the tip and a transverse snap fracture that removed one lateral edge.

The thirteenth specimen is a heavily damaged point from 41BX382. It has a biconvex
Figure 21. Untyped dart points. (a–g) Expanding stem; (h–i) slightly expanding stem; (j) contracting stem; (k) parallel stem; (l) parallel stem, straight base; (m) bifurcated base.
triangular blade and a bifurcated stem. Deep corner notches and the concave base produce robust downward-pointing ears. Evidence for barbs exists as scars along the lower blade edges. Other damage includes a missing basal ear and a rounded snap fracture at the tip. Modifications include a thin burin scar that extends from the missing lateral barb across the remaining blade to the edge of the missing tip. The point is made of fine-grained glassy brown chert with spotty white to tan patination.

The fourteenth specimen is a heavily damaged stem fragment from 41BX382. It has one basal ear and the surrounding material. This point is made of dark gray chert. The fifteenth specimen is a slightly damaged point from 41BX1045. It has a biconvex triangular blade with a stem damaged along one basal corner. Shoulders are short and are the product of corner removals. The point is made of light brown chert with a whitish gray patina.

The sixteenth specimen, from 41BX376, is the lateral half of a point (Figure 21f). It has a barb and a strongly flared basal ear created by a corner notch. The basal ear has been modified into a scraper as indicated by fine flaking along the rounded steep working edge. The distal tip of the point appears crushed. The point is made of pinkish chert with white banding.

This seventeenth specimen has a well-made, biconvex, triangular blade and a long stem with a slightly concave base (Figure 21g). It is from 41CM99. Broad corner notching or corner removals created both the stem and the abrupt barbs. In cross section, the blades edges are straight and the stem twists slightly. The tip has been removed, as indicated by a recent flake scar.

The final specimen in this group is from 41CM99 and is a well-thinned and sharpened biconvex triangular blade and a stem highlighted by small downward-pointing basal ears. The barbs, created by corner notching, have been removed by bending snap fractures. Likewise, the tip has a bending snap fracture. The stem is wedge shaped in cross section and has a V-shaped basal concavity.

**Untyped Slightly Expanding Stem**

Four untyped points have slightly expanding stems. The first is from 41BX1348 and is a triangular-bladed point that lacks the tip and parts of the basal ears. It has strong shoulders created by broad corner notching. Evidence of a concave base and the corner notching hint at downward-pointing ears. The blade appears well thinned. The second specimen is a proximal stem fragment from 41CM239. It is a heavily pot-lidded base with a single downward-pointing basal ear. This base fragment is made of glassy brown chert.

The third point is complete and well worked. From 41CM242, it is made of heavily patinated tannish gray chert (Figure 21h). It has a reduced, biconvex, triangular blade and a long wedge-shaped stem. Long barbs have been broken off and reworked into abrupt shoulders. The fourth specimen, from 41BX1368, is a heavily damaged medial fragment and stem made of moderately patinated glassy brown chert (Figure 21i). It has a thin, biconvex, triangular, serrated blade and a stem with a slightly concave base and a burin scar on one ear and side.

**Untyped Contracting Stem**

Two untyped points have contracting stems. The first is from 41CM235. It is a heat-damaged fragment represented by the lower medial half and basal section of a point made of glassy brown chert. It has a well-thinned triangular blade and a heavily reduced stem formed by corner removals. Damage includes a snap fracture with lipping along a fault in the material at the distal end and pot-lidding on both faces. Evidence for barbs exists on the blade/stem juncture. The second specimen, from 41BX1354, is a relatively complete point made of heavily patinated chert (Figure 21j). It has a heavily reduced, thick, biconvex, triangular blade with edge damage and a thick stem.

**Untyped Parallel Stem**

Five untyped points have parallel-sided stems. One is from 41CM236 and is a damaged fragment represented by the lower medial half and basal section of a point made of semiglassy light brown chert. It has a moderately well-thinned triangular blade and a stem formed by corner removals. Some stacking of material is present on one side. Damage includes a heavily modified and reworked snap fracture at the distal end. Evidence for small weak barbs exists where the blade meets the stem. The stem has
dulled lateral edges and damage on both lower corners. There is slight evidence for fluting on both faces of the stem.

The second specimen is a broken point from 41BX1362. It is a biconvex fragment with a parallel-sided blade. It is made of a heavily patinated, fine-grained brown chert resharpened in antiquity. It has bending fractures across the blade and stem. Corner removals produce weak shoulders. The third specimen is from 41BX1368 and is a heavily damaged proximal stem fragment (Figure 21k). Evidence of slight shoulders is present. Evidence for downward-pointing ears exists as a scar along the basal edge.

The last two specimens in this category are distinguished by their straight bases. One, from 41CM242, is made of a dull tan chert with light inclusions (Figure 21l). It has a well-thinned triangular blade. The long stem is created by broad corner removals, which also produce abrupt shoulders. Damage includes a transverse bending snap fracture with some lipping diagonally across the blade. The second specimen is a heavily damaged point from 41CM242 and is made of dull brown chert. It has a biconvex triangular blade and a wedge-shaped base with slight basal fluting. Corner removals produce abrupt shoulders. One shoulder is slightly damaged.

Untyped Triangular

One untyped triangular point was collected from 41BX1349. It is made of heat-treated chert and is heavily damaged. It is missing one basal corner. The damage to this area appears to have been a single event, as evidenced by the transverse snap fracture interrupted by a fault in the material. It is impossible to determine when this damage occurred, but the recovery of the point near a recently bulldozed road may hint at recent breakage. A second area of possible damage mimics a side notch.

Untyped Bifurcated Stem

A single untyped point with a bifurcated stem was found at 41CM235. It is a heavily damaged basal section made of a tan chert with small orange speckles (Figure 21m). Much of the medial half and the tip were removed by a snap fracture. One blade edge is missing, while the other appears intact although dulled. One of the two strong downward-pointing basal ears has been snapped off.

Untyped Fragments

Five medial sections were collected. One is from 41BX1354 and is made of light brown chert with cortex in some places. It is a well-thinned biconvex blade with evidence of beveling. The point has bending snap and two transverse snap fractures. The second medial section is from 41BX1361. It is made of patinated brown chert with fresh flaking on both faces of the biconvex blade. A pointed barb is on one edge. The third specimen is from 41BX1368 and is a blade remnant of patinated fine-grained brown chert. The fourth specimen, also from 41BX1368, is a biconvex blade made of heat-treated gray chert. Both proximal and distal ends have bending snap fracture scars. The final specimen is from 41CM242. It is highly fragmented and made of gray chert.

Three triangular blade fragments were collected. One, from 41BX371, is made of light gray chert with whitish patination. It has a well-thinned biconvex blade snapped off proximally with a bending-type fracture. The second specimen is from 41BX1390 and has a thick biconvex blade and a broken stem snapped off at the neck. A single abrupt barb exists on one edge. The point is made of light brown chert with a white patina. The last point is from 41BX379 and has a thick biconvex blade and broken stem. Other damage includes an impact fracture at the tip. The point is made of a gray patinated chert.

Arrow Points

Edwards

Five Edwards arrow points were recovered from five sites (see Table 2 for metric data for these and the other arrow points). The first, from 41CM239, is well thinned with a biconvex triangular blade; it is made from tan chert (Figure 22a). It has a damaged expanding stem with evidence for corner/side notching that creates short barbs. Other damage includes a snap fracture at the tip. The second is a well-thinned, planoconvex, triangular-bladed specimen from 41BX1352; it is made from a slightly patinated tan chert (Figure 22b). It has a damaged expanding
Table 2. Metric data for arrow points (in mm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Blade Length</th>
<th>Blade Width</th>
<th>Thickness</th>
<th>Neck Width</th>
<th>Base Width</th>
<th>Haft Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>41BX1352</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>41BX1354</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>41BX1362</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>41BX1364</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>41CM239</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granbury</td>
<td>41BX1044</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granbury</td>
<td>41CM102</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granbury</td>
<td>41CM102</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdiz</td>
<td>41BX1393</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdiz</td>
<td>41CM99</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scallorn</td>
<td>41BX1044</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scallorn</td>
<td>41BX1363</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped</td>
<td>41BX373</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped</td>
<td>41BX379</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped</td>
<td>41BX1348</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped</td>
<td>41BX1350</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped</td>
<td>41BX1362</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped</td>
<td>41CM101</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

stem and corner notching that creates short barbs and long basal ears. Damage includes a snap fracture at the tip and removal of one barb and basal ear.

The third point is a heavily damaged fragment from 41BX1354. It has a planoconvex triangular blade and an expanding stem. Damage includes a transverse bending snap fracture at the tip and damage to both basal ears. Both barbs are present and slightly flared. The point is made from light brown chert. The fourth point is well thinned with a biconvex triangular blade; it is from 41BX1362 and made of tan chert (Figure 22c). It has a damaged expanding stem and corner/side notching resulting in short barbs. Other damage includes a snap fracture at the tip. The last point is a heavily damaged fragment from 41BX1364. It has a planoconvex triangular blade and an expanding stem. Damage includes a transverse bending snap fracture at the tip and damage to both basal ears as evidenced by a transverse snap fracture across the stem. Both barbs are present and slightly flared. The point is made of light brown chert with white spotty inclusions.

Granbury

The first of three Granbury points recovered is from 41BX1044. It has a well-thinned, biconvex, triangular blade and a gently convex base (Figure 22d). Damage includes a snap fracture along the tip and a flake removed basally. A small protuberance is on one distal blade edge. The point is made of fine-grained tan chert. The second point is a damaged, but well-thinned specimen from 41CM102. It has a slightly twisting biconvex blade that continues proximally to a squared-off and tapered base (Figure 22e). Damage includes the removal of the tip with a bending-type snap fracture. The point was made from light brown fine-grained chert. The last Granbury, also from 41CM102, is more rounded basally and is missing the tip. It is made of brownish glassy chert.

Perdiz

Two Perdiz points were recovered. The first is a well-made but broken point from 41BX1393 that has a well-thinned, biconvex, parallel-sided
Chapter 5: Description of Artifacts

Figure 22. Arrow points. (a–c) Edwards; (d–e) Granbury; (f) Perdiz; (g–h) Scallorn; (i–j) untyped.

blade and a long, contracting, pointed stem (Figure 22f). The remaining small barb is flared. The tip is broken. This point is made from glassy light brown chert. The second Perdiz is from 41CM99. It is a basal fragment with a biconvex blade and a long, contracting, pointed stem as well as downward-pointing barbs created by corner notching. The tip has been removed by a bending snap fracture. The point is made of brown glassy chert.

Scallorn

Two Scallorn points were collected. The first is a damaged specimen from 41BX1363 that has a biconvex, slightly concave, triangular blade and a slightly expanding stem (Figure 22g). Corner notches produce short slightly flared barbs. A slightly concave base contributes to downward-pointing ears. Damage includes a bending snap fracture at the tip and a snap fracture on one basal ear and barb. The point is made of tan chert. The second Scallorn is from 41BX1044. It has a planoconvex triangular blade and an expanding stem (Figure 22h). Corner notches contribute to abrupt barbs and evidence for strong basal ears. Damage includes a fractured tip and a missing basal ear. It is made of glassy dark brown chert.

Untyped

Six untyped arrow points were collected from six sites. The first is from 41BX1348 and has a planoconvex, serrated, triangular blade and a broken, slightly contracting stem. Corner notching contributes to abrupt pointed barbs (Figure 22i). The base is snapped off just below the neck leaving a squared-off basal remnant. The second is from 41BX1350. It is made of homogenous, fine-grained tan chert and has a thin, biconvex, triangular blade. One edge has a small corner notch and a small abrupt barb, and the other has a large corner notch and a flared barb. The base appears straight.

A complete point from 41BX1362 has a planoconvex triangular blade and a slightly expanding stem with a concave base and small downward-pointing ears (Figure 22j). Corner notches contribute to the expanding stem shape and small abrupt barbs. Tannish cortex remains on one side of the point, which is made of dark gray glassy chert. This appears to be a primary flake expediently fashioned into a small arrow point.
The fourth specimen, a fragment from 41BX373, is made of tannish chert. It has a biconvex triangular blade and a missing, but probably expanding stem. It also has abrupt barbs and a bending snap fracture at the tip. The fifth specimen, from 41BX379, has a well-thinned, biconvex, triangular blade and a missing stem. Other damage includes a missing tip and two missing barbs. The point is made of brown glassy chert. The last specimen is a small point from 41CM101 that has a biconvex triangular blade and a damaged, expanding, wide stem. The blade has one concave edge and one convex edge. Corner notching produces short pointed barbs. The basal ears have been removed by damage to the base.

**Bifaces**

**Guadalupe**

Three Guadalupe bifaces were collected, two from 41BX1354 and one from 41CM95. Each has a large convex dorsal side, a flat ventral side, and a small distal bit. The biface from 41CM95 is fire damaged; it is made of brownish gray chert with a tan cortex. The smaller biface from 41BX1354 appears heavily damaged on the ventral side as indicated by two large, deep flake scars; it is made of tan chert. The larger biface from 41BX1354 is complete and made of gray chert. Metric data for these artifacts, and the other bifaces collected, are presented in Table 3.

**Hare**

This tool from 41BX1351 is the proximal portion of a planoconvex biface made from light brown glassy chert with a cream-colored patina. One side has stacking of material and a series of step terminations. Modifications along one lateral edge may indicate resharpening. This is seen in fresh flaking and
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removal of patinated material. The other lateral edge has a burin scar that extends 21 mm from the broken edge.

**Pipe Creek**

This artifact is from 41BX1350. It is made of fine-grained, semiglasy, light brown chert and is well thinned. This artifact has a triangular blade with the stem offset to one side. The opposite corner is a notch that creates an abrupt shoulder on the blade edge. It is along this edge that some use wear is evident.

**Triangular**

Six small, thin, triangular bifaces may be arrow point preforms. The first is from 41CM237. It is biconvex in cross section with a missing distal tip. Problematic stacking of material on one side may have contributed to tip removal. It is made of fine-grained tan chert. The second specimen is from 41CM239. It is well thinned with a biconvex cross section and a bending snap fracture at the distal end. It is made of tannish brown glassy chert. The third biface is from 41CM240. It also is well thinned and biconvex with a missing distal tip; it is made from tannish gray chert with a slight patina. The fourth biface, from 41BX1044, is biconvex with a rounded base. The tip has been removed by a bending snap fracture as well as a step termination. This biface is made of fine-grained tan chert. The fifth biface was found at 41BX1044. It is a triangular form with flared basal corners. It is a well-thinned biconvex specimen with a bending snap fracture at the tip. The base is wedge shaped in cross section. This specimen is made from tan chert. The last specimen comes from 41CM95. It has a long biconvex body and a rounded basal edge. One lateral edge is undulating, while the other has a deep notch medially. This biface is made of glassy tan chert.

**Other**

Two complete bifaces do not fit in any of the categories above. One, from 41BX1351, is a late-stage ovate biface with a thick biconvex cross section. Cortex and heavy patination are present on one side. A fresh flake scar on one edge reveals fine-grained tan chert in the interior. The other, 41BX1354, is a complete, medium-sized, late-stage biface made of light tannish gray chert. The lateral edges are sinuous and wavy. One face has cortex over 60 percent of the surface. It is biconvex in cross section.

**Fragments**

Eight biface fragments were collected. A finished biconvex fragment was found at 41CM236 and is made of glassy dark brown chert with speckled gray patina. It has a snap fracture that removed most of the distal end. The fragment is well-thinned and sharp on both the parallel blade edges and the gently convex basal edge.

Two fragments were found at 41BX1351. The first is a finished biface of grainy tannish orange chert. It is a gently convex proximal end with a transverse snap fracture on a well-thinned biconvex blade. The second, made from tannish gray chert, is a straight-based proximal end with a transverse snap fracture on a well-thinned biconvex blade.

One fragment was collected from 41BX1354. It is a thin biconvex fragment with a rounded base and a damaged distal end. Damage includes a transverse snap fracture distally, a missing lateral edge, and an overshot flake scar that dominates the medial half of the biface. This specimen is made from light brown chert with tan cortex.

Three fragments of finished bifaces were found in Cluster A at 41BX379. The first is long, well thinned, biconvex, and triangular. The distal tip has been removed by a bending-type snap fracture. The lateral edges are sharp. This biface is made of tannish gray chert and is probably a blank for a dart point. The second biface also is well thinned and triangular, with the distal tip missing. In cross section, it is planoconvex with sharp lateral edges. A flake ending in a step termination was removed from one basal corner. This biface is made of dark brown chert with tan cortex remaining on one basal corner. The final specimen is a fragment featuring a well-thinned biconvex body. The lateral edges remain sharp. One basal corner and the tip have bending-type fractures.

The last biface fragment comes from Level 1 of Shovel Test 2 at 41CM235. It appears to be a late-stage biface that is missing the distal tip. It is thick and biconvex in cross section with the lateral edges being wavy. The basal edge is
rounded. The remnants of a hinge termination are along one basal corner. This indicates that this biface was made from a large percussion flake. This biface was made of light brown chert with whitish patina.

Uniface

The proximal portion of a uniface was collected from Level 1 of Shovel Test 1 at 41CM235. It appears to be a modified tested lag gravel. Orange cortex dominates the rounded and thick dorsal side. The dorsal side also exhibits three flake scars, one of which is a hinge termination implying that the blank for the uniface was removed from a much larger cobble. The ventral side reveals at least nine flake scars, two of which end in step terminations. A corner appears worked and dulled. This tool measures 42 mm in length, 37 mm in width, and 14 mm in thickness.

Edge-modified Debitage

Two examples of edge-modifieddebitage were recovered from Level 1 in Shovel Tests 1 and 2 at 41CM235. One is a primary flake with a large bulb of percussion and cortex over 50 percent of the dorsal face. Three flakes have been removed from the dorsal side of one edge, producing a 22-mm-long edge that exhibits some microflaking, implying utilization. The distal end of the tool is missing. The second tool is a heavily damaged fragment made of dark brown glassy chert that is potthided. The remaining lateral edge, which is 16 mm long, exhibits use wear as indicated by microflaking.

Core

A single core was recovered in Level 1 of Shovel Test 2 at 41CM235. This small core of brown chert is a heavily flaked lag gravel. Very little cortex remains. Over 20 flake scars are present, most of which end in hinge or step terminations. The core is 42 mm long, 33 mm wide, and 22 mm thick.

Debitage

Fourteen flakes were collected from various shovel tests: 41BX382, Shovel Test 1, Level 1 (n = 1); 41BX383, Shovel Test 2, Level 1 (n = 3); 41BX1350, Shovel Test 2, Level 1 (n = 1); 41BX1350, Shovel Test 3, Level 1 (n = 1); 41CM235, Shovel Test 1, Level 1 (n = 1); 41CM235, Shovel Test 3, Level 1 (n = 2); 41CM242, Shovel Test 1, Level 1 (n = 5).

Ground Stones

Two ground stone artifacts were collected. The first is a large (70x61x61 mm) light brown sandstone mano fragment found at 41BX1044. It is well rounded in cross section and has an abraded area 45 mm in length. The second fragment is a small (48x48x25 mm) piece of reddish orange sandstone showing evidence of grinding, found on the surface of 41BX1356. It is broken in three places and rounded along the remaining lateral edge. The sandstones from which these artifacts are made are found within the San Antonio area, north and south of Camp Bullis (Karl Kibler, personal communication 2000).

HISTORIC ARTIFACTS

Sixty-eight historic artifacts were collected from 10 sites. Provenience information for these artifacts is presented in Table 4. Descriptions of the historic artifacts by provenience and material type follow.

Ceramics

Of the five ceramic sherds from 41BX1024, two are ironstone, one is whiteware, and two are stoneware. One undecorated ironstone sherd has a black printed underglaze mark. Most of the motif is missing, but the fragmentary text reads “IRONSTONE...W. & E. CO...BURNSLEY...”. The company W. & E. Corn operated out of their Burslem factory in England from 1864 to 1891 (Wetherbee 1985:21). The second ironstone sherd is a rim from a large flatware serving vessel, possibly a platter. It has an unidentified molded shape that features slight scalloping. It also has a blue transfer-printed Willow pattern. Although the Willow pattern has been produced throughout most of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the ironstone ware type and shape are suggestive of production during the second half of the nineteenth century (Stoltzfus and Snyder 1997:11). A sherd of blue transfer-printed whiteware also
was recovered. It is a body sherd from an unknown hollowware, possibly a cup or mug. The pattern is not identifiable but features a small single flower and sprig motif. This style of transfer print featuring monochrome floral motifs over the entire vessel, sometimes referred to as “revival transfer print,” was most common in the late nineteenth century and was produced into the early twentieth century (Majewski and O’Brien 1987:145).

One stoneware sherd from 41BX1024 is a fragment of a jug neck and mouth. It bears the distinctive Leon slip glaze on both its interior and exterior. This type of glaze is derived from a clay dug in Bexar County by a family of German potters, which suggests the vessel was made locally (Greer 1981:194). The vessel most likely dates from the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The second stoneware sherd is a rim from a large mixing bowl. The paste is reddish orange. The exterior has a salt glaze, and the interior has a natural clay slip glaze. This glaze combination on Texas stonewares was most popular ca. 1850–1870 (Lebo 1987:140).

One of the two ceramic tableware sherds from 41BX1211 is a portion of a small bowl with a horizontal ribbed design and a bright cobalt blue engobe glaze. The other is a rim sherd from a flatware vessel. It has a slightly scalloped edge and a bright yellow engobe glaze. Specific pattern matches were not located for these specimens. However, the use of engobe glazes began in the late 1930s and was very popular into the 1940s and beyond (Cunningham 1982:313). A doll leg also was collected from 41BX1211. It is bisque white porcelain molded with a ribbed design to imitate a sock on the leg. A brown shoe is painted on the foot. Dolls made of cloth or kid bodies with porcelain head, arms, and legs sewn on, called china limb dolls, were common in the late nineteenth century. In 1893, such dolls could be ordered by catalogue in six different styles ranging in price from 30 cents to $4 per dozen (Stirn 1990:10).

Of the seven ceramic sherds from 41BX1365, three are bone china, three are semiporcelain, and one is whiteware. One of the bone china sherds is part of a base from a plate or saucer. It is undecorated with the exception of a gilded mark on its underside that reads “GERMANY.” Typically, country of origin was marked on wares beginning in 1891 to comply with the McKinley Tariff Act. However, wares marked “Germany” are known from as early as 1885 (Kovel and Kovel 1986:229). Neither of the other two bone china sherds is marked, but both are decorated. Both are rim sherds; one is from a cup and the other is from a 9-inch plate. Although the specific designs are different, both have polychrome floral decal decoration featuring roses, and both have a gilded band decoration around the rim. Decal decoration on porcelain was most popular between 1880 and

One of the semiporcelain sherds is from a hollowware base, possibly a bowl. It has a partial maker's mark stamped in green underglaze. There are two lines of text arcing over a crown. The text reads “ROYA... /... EMI-POR... .” Although the identification is tentative, the mark appears to be a “Royal Semi-Porcelain” mark associated with Johnson Brothers, Ltd., of England, and dated to ca. 1900 (Kovel and Kovel 1986:97). One other semiporcelain sherd also is undecorated and bears a maker's mark. The mark is green and stamped underglaze. It features an archery bow and an upward-pointing arrow, over which arches a single line of text that reads “SEMI PORCELAIN.” In the lower left-hand corner of the mark are the interlocking initials “H” and “P.” The remainder of the mark is missing. The Harker Pottery Company of East Liverpool, Ohio, used this mark from 1890 to 1930 (Gates and Ormerod 1982:83). The other marked semiporcelain sherd is decorated. It is a base sherd from a plate and has an elaborate polychrome decal decoration featuring a Chinese pheasant-type bird among large flowers. The mark is fragmentary and is stamped in green underglaze. It has a line of text that appears to be the bottoms of the letters “S” and “V,” under which is the word “CHINA” separated from the other text by a line. Underneath the text are the numbers “25 5 2.” This mark is probably a Knowles, Taylor & Knowles mark used on their line of semivitreous china between 1905 and 1926 (DeBolt 1994:74).

The final ceramic sherd recovered from 41BX1365 is white ware with both decoration and a mark. The decoration is a floral polychrome decal that has almost entirely worn off. The mark is stamped in green under the glaze. It has two lines of text that read “Ivory C... /...K.” This mark does not refer to a manufacturer, but instead refers to a specific line of wares (Ivory Color) manufactured by the Homer Laughlin China Company of East Liverpool, Ohio. This mark was used by the company in the 1930s (DeBolt 1994:81).

The ceramic sherds from 41BX1366 consist of a bone china sherd, a whiteware sherd, and a stoneware sherd. The bone china sherd is a large fragment (approximately one-quarter) of a cup plate. A fragmentary mark is present on the back. The mark is hand painted in an orangish brown color over the glaze and is somewhat worn. It is both illegible and unidentifiable. It is possible that the mark is Asian in origin or a decorator's mark. The sherd is undecorated, but portions not recovered could have had painted decoration, or possibly an overglaze decoration could have completely worn away. It is difficult to assign a precise date range to such an artifact, but generally this type of bone china would have been easily available from the last quarter of the nineteenth century through the first quarter of the twentieth century (Majewski and O'Brien 1987:128–129).

The whitenware sherd from 41BX1366 is an undecorated and marked base from a flatware vessel. The mark is stamped in green underglaze and has a single line of text that reads “W. C. 1. . .” This mark was used by the Wellsville China Company of Wellsville, Ohio, in the 1920s (DeBolt 1994:117). The final sherd from 41BX1366 is a neck and handle of a stoneware jug. It has a dark brown, natural clay slip glaze on both the interior and exterior. The form suggests that the fragment is from a cylindrical shouldered jug commonly used in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Greer 1981:76–77).

A single bone china sherd with rounded scalloped edges was collected from 41BX1404. According to Majewski and O'Brien (1987:155), this was an influence from the Art Nouveau movement that occurred between 1880 and 1905.

The single ceramic sherd from 41CM95 is a highly vitrified ironstone/hotel ware rim from an unidentified hollowware. It is decorated with a poor-quality brown transfer print. The decoration has a bamboo-style border and a sailing ship on the water. This appears to be the Bombay pattern made by Whittaker & Company of Hanley, England, which was registered in 1887 (Williams and Weber 1998:21).

**Glass**

One of the two glass sherds collected from 41BX1024 is container glass, and the other is lamp chimney glass. The container glass is a clear body sherd from a soda bottle. It has ribbed decoration and an embossed label inside a diamond. The partial label reads “... . . . . . ATD / . . . Y-20-1920 / . . . RANGE / . . . RUSH/BOTTLE/6 FL OZS.” The 1920 patent date is the most diagnostic attribute of this artifact. The lamp chimney
glass sherd has a machine-crimped finish and is solarized. These characteristics suggest manufacture between ca. 1875 and 1914 (Jones and Sullivan 1989:13; Woodhead et al. 1984:62).

Two sherds of container glass and one glass stopper were collected from 41BX1211. One sherd is solarized glass and appears to be a body sherd from a panel-style bottle. A fragmentary embossed label is present that reads "BO. / CO..." This label is too fragmentary to make an association with any particular product or manufacturer. The second sherd is a large fragment of a clear glass soda bottle. The body is molded with all-over stippling, a grasslike motif around the base, and chain designs above and below the label area. A blue and white applied color label (ACL) is on the front. It has a large letter "A" in the center around which "CIRCLE 'A' BRAND / BEVERAGES" is written. The use of ACL labels began commercially in 1934 (Jones and Sullivan 1989:16). A partial embossed label on the base reads "...AN ANTON...", which indicates that the bottle, and probably its contents as well, were local San Antonio products. The bottle stopper is solarized glass and measures 1.5 inches long. It is a disk stopper on which an embellished letter "L" is molded. The shank of the stopper has not been ground to ensure a tight fit. Instead, it might have fit loosely in its bottle or been fitted with a cork sheath to ensure a tighter fit. The tip of the shank is obscured by jagged glass where the glass was snapped loose from the mold (Jones and Sullivan 1989:151–152). From its fancy appearance and small size, this is probably a stopper for a perfume or other toiletry bottle. Perfume bottles with similar glass disk stopper closures were recovered from both Fort Union, New Mexico (1865–1890), and Fort Laramie, Wyoming (1870–1890) (Wilson 1981:71–72). The solarized glass suggests a date of ca. 1897–1914 (Jones and Sullivan 1989:13).

Two glass sherds were recovered from 41BX1365. One is a fragment of Depression glass tableware in the uranium green color, commonly called Vaseline glass (Pickvet 1995:475). It is a hollowware with a handle. The pressed decorative pattern with a floral border and linear semicircles is called Georgian and was made by the Federal Glass Company of Columbia, Ohio, from 1931 to 1936 (Florence 1996:98–99; Pickvet 1995:465). The second sherd is a patent finish and part of the shoulder of a panel bottle (Fike 1987:8). The characteristics of its mold marks indicate manufacture in a two-piece mold, with the finish formed with a finishing tool. The manufacturing techniques indicate a date ranging from the 1870s to the 1920s (Jones and Sullivan 1989:26–27, 42–43).

Two whole bottles were collected from 41BX1366. The first is solarized glass and is 5.63 inches tall. It is a panel-style bottle with chamfered corners and a screw-top finish. Three of the four paneled sides have embossing. The front face has an eagle with its wings spread holding a branch and encircled by a wreath with a ribbon at the bottom. Underneath this motif is the word "TRADEMARK." The two side panels read "GEBHARDT EAGLE // CHILI POWDER." The base has an embossed maker's mark. It is an open diamond with the numbers "695" inside, "DESIGN" arching over the top, and "PATENDED" running underneath. An exact match was not located for this mark. It is possible that the Diamond Glass Company of Royersford, Pennsylvania, manufactured the bottle. They used an open diamond mark beginning in 1924, but that is inconsistent with the solarized color of the glass, which was not produced commonly after World War I (Toulouse 1971:550–551; Jones and Sullivan 1989:13). The base also has an Owens suction scar, a manufacturing mark from a process introduced in 1904 (Jones and Sullivan 1989:39). Together, these features suggest an early-twentieth-century date for the bottle.

The second bottle from 41BX1366 is 7 inches tall and made of aqua glass. It has a slender cylindrical shape with a bulging heel, sloping shoulder, and long neck. The number "135" is embossed on the base, which probably represents a mold number or other manufacturing designation. The bottle was manufactured in a vented two-piece mold with a separate base part. Four small vent marks are evident on the shoulder. Vent marks are characteristic of manufacture from the last third of the nineteenth century until the 1920s (Jones and Sullivan 1989:47). The bottle has a flat or patent finish that was formed with a finishing tool (Fike 1987:8; Jones and Sullivan 1989:42). Typically, a bottle with this distinctive shape would have been used for olive oil (Wilson 1981:90). However, this bottle is much smaller than the average
olive oil bottle. Instead, this might have been a toiletry bottle.

A clear glass bottle finish also was recovered from 41BX1366. It has a prescription finish (Fike 1987:8) and was manufactured in either a semiautomatic or fully automatic machine as indicated by the multiple mold seams, especially on the finish itself. Commercial production of such narrow-mouth containers began in 1889, peaked by ca. 1917, and ended ca. 1926 (Jones and Sullivan 1989:39).

A clear glass shaker-top bottle from 41BX1404 has a screw top, decorative molding, and rounded triangular panel. This bottle has a "J" within a keystone maker’s mark. According to Toulouse (1971:271), the Knox Glass Bottle Co. of Mississippi used this mark from 1932 to 1953 or later. Also collected from 41BX1404 was a bottle base with a mark featuring a “B” in a circle. This maker’s mark is of an unknown date. A single sherd of window glass also was collected from 41BX1404.

Three crossmending sherds of aqua glass with embossed lettering from 41CM242 represent a canning jar. The embossed label has three lines of text, which are fragmentary. It reads “PATE.../NOV./185...” This label corresponds to “Mason's Patent Nov. 30th 1858.” Although Mason had a patent on his fruit jar design, once that patent expired, his name and label were pirated widely by other fruit jar manufacturers with only slight variations. The name Mason was so widely used on fruit jars that the terms became synonymous (Toulouse 1969:346, 391). Not enough of this jar survives to discern which manufacturer produced it. Mason jars were commonly made in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

A clear glass jar base from 41CM242 has a fragmentary embossed mark around its circumference that reads “F.../DISTRICT OF N...” No identification was located for this mark. However, the base also exhibits a valve mark, which indicates that it was manufactured in either a semiautomatic or fully automatic machine. The commercial production of wide-mouth containers began in 1893, peaked ca. 1917, and ended ca. 1926 (Jones and Sullivan 1989:39). A bottle base of solarized glass from 41CM242 bears a double-circle mark (one inside the other) on its base. It is possible that the Buckeye Glass Company of Martins Ferry, Ohio, manufactured this bottle. The company used the double-circle mark from 1880 until 1900 (Toulouse 1971:391), which is consistent in date with the solarized color of the glass. A single body sherd of clear container glass also was collected, but it offers no diagnostic information.

Four sherds of pink Depression glass were collected from 41CM242, and they represent two patterns. Three sherds crossmend into a portion of an oval vegetable bowl in the Mayfair pattern. Mayfair was an extremely popular floral pattern manufactured by the Hocking Glass Company of Lancaster, Ohio, from 1931 to 1937 (Florence 1996:126–130; Pickvet 1995:460). A single rim sherd from a bowl represents a different pattern. It has close vertical ribbing around the body, and the rim rolls over into a plain lip. A matching set of Depression glass nesting bowls was located in Florence (1996:201), but specific information was not given. It is possible that the pattern name is Golden Glow, and by association as Depression glass it should date to the 1930s–1950s.

Two large, thick, clear glass sherds were collected from 41CM242. They appear to represent ovenproof glass bakeware, probably a square or rectangular casserole dish. Heat-resistant glass kitchenware for baking and cooking was developed in the 1940s (Pickvet 1995:400). The last sherd collected from 41CM242 is clear glass with a slight hint of solarization. It is a fragment of a kerosene lamp font in the Sharon Panel pattern, which has a simple paneled design and a pronounced shoulder break. This pattern dates ca. 1900 (Thuro 1976:265).

Metal

A metal item from 41BX1044 has an art deco-style floral motif with a large iris-type flower on the end. The surface is rusted, but a mark can be observed on the back of the handle that reads “MADURA METAL.” No identification or other information was located for this mark. Based on the decoration style, the handle might date to the 1920s.

Two coins were collected from 41BX1346. The older of the two is an Indian head or buffalo-type nickel with a date of 1928, and the second is a George Washington quarter with a date of 1942.

Fourteen metal items were collected from 41BX1355. Seven are tin can fragments, includ-
ing an intact top from a key-opened can. It is 3 inches in diameter and has a small rectangular piece of metal on its top where a can key was once attached. The can would have had a scored strip around the upper circumference of the body that would be removed with the key, thus opening the can. A top could then be used to reseal the can. Smaller capacity key-opening cans commonly were used for dried milk ca. 1910 (Rock 1984:105, 1987:70). One large whole, but crushed and rusted, tin can was recovered. It is a hole-in-cap can on which the solder filling the vent hole is still visible. Due to the amount of rust, it is unclear if the side seam is hand or machine soldered. Hole-in-cap cans were common until the 1880s (Rock 1984:103–104). Subsequent to opening, the can was reutilized for an unknown purpose. A loop made of twisted wire has been inserted through the top of the can, possibly for suspension. Also present are the fragmentary remains of a tobacco tin. It is a vertical pocket-type tin, designed to fit into a man’s shirt pocket. A very faint remnant of a red lithographed label with illegible black and white lettering is present at the top portion of the tin. Its overall height would have been approximately 4 inches, with a 0.88-inch thickness. It exhibits a section of ribbing on its end designed to offer a place to light matches. The American Tobacco Company manufactured a vertical pocket tin of the same size with a striker plate for its Tuxedo Tobacco brand by the late 1910s (Rock 1987:62).

Four items from 41BX1355 are external friction slip lids. They are all oval and of the same size. The more-intact examples exhibit small notches in the edges of the lid lips on either end, presumably to aid in removal of the lid from its can. Slip lids were used on containers that held stable goods intended to be used over a period of time. This allowed the container to be opened and reclosed multiple times. These can types were common in the 1880s (Rock 1987:10). Other metal closures consist of two crown cap closures and associated fragments. One still has its plastic liner in place. Crown caps have become the standard closure for soda, beer, and other carbonated beverage bottles. Although the crown finish and cap were patented in 1892, the use of plastic for liners is modern (Jones and Sullivan 1989:163). The final metal artifact is a fencing staple, which became common with the widespread use of barbed wire for fencing in the latter part of the nineteenth century.

A single cuprous metal button was recovered from 41BX1365. The front has an embossed American eagle, suggesting this is a military-issue button. It has a shank attachment on the back and the maker’s mark “HORSTMANN / PHILADELPHIA” around the circumference of the back. The button still has a fastening pin of a kind typically used to affix buttons to cardstock paper prior to sewing the button onto a garment. This suggests that the button was an extra or spare, lost before it was actually in use.

A white metal lid with a 2.13-inch-diameter screw-top closure, and embossed label was collected from 41BX1366. The center has intertwined initials “JRW,” and “WATKINS / FRAGRANT POMADE” runs around the circumference. The J. R. Watkins Medicine Company was established in Plainview, Minnesota, in 1868 and moved to Winona, Minnesota, in 1885 (Fike 1987:82). The company manufactured a variety of health and beauty products, including pomade, a fragrant hair dressing.

A small cut nail was collected from 41CM95. Cut nails were used for a variety of fastening tasks throughout the second half of the nineteenth century. Typically, they had been replaced by wire nails with the onset of the twentieth century (Noël Hume 1968:253).

**Other**

The single bone artifact is from 41BX1365. It is a plate for a utensil handle. It has two drilled holes through which metal pins would have affixed it to a metal tang, most likely for an eating utensil. The handle is otherwise undecorated. Utensils with bone handles such as this one were common throughout the second half of the nineteenth century (Noël Hume 1968:182).

A single two-hole sew-through shell button was collected from 41BX1404. Shell buttons were used commonly on underclothes and shirt fronts in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Pool 1987:283).
ASSESSMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This survey examined Training Areas 1A, 2A, 2C, 2D, and parts of 5B and 3C at Camp Bullis. In total, 3,255 acres of land were covered entirely by pedestrian survey. Sixty-five sites were encountered and are assessed here (excludes 11 previously recorded sites for which no new information was documented). These consist of 39 new sites and 26 previously recorded sites. They are assessed in terms of eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places based on the criteria established by the U.S. Department of the Interior, and using the contexts developed by Hines (1993) and Freeman (1994a, 1994c) for Camp Bullis and the general vicinity. If a site is significant in American history, architecture, engineering, or culture, it is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP and worthy of protection, avoidance, or mitigation through data recovery. Significant properties are those that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

B. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

C. That 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. That have yielded or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history [National Park Service 1997:2].

One new prehistoric site (the burned rock midden at 41CM242) and three new historic sites (41BX1355, 41BX1359, and 41BX1394) are considered eligible for National Register listing (Table 5). In addition, two previously recorded prehistoric sites (41BX425 [Gerstle et al. 1987:156–158] and the burned rock midden at 41BX1044 [Kibler and Gardner 1997:36]) and two previously recorded historic sites (41BX397 [Gerstle et al. 1978:263] and 41BX1211 [Veni et al. 1998a:79]) are reassessed as eligible for listing in the NRHP (Table 6). The remaining 28 new prehistoric sites, 2 new multicomponent sites, and 5 new historic sites lack the potential to contribute significant data and, therefore, are considered ineligible. Additionally, 16 previously recorded prehistoric sites, 3 previously recorded multicomponent sites, and 3 previously recorded historic sites are reassessed as ineligible for NRHP listing.

Most of the ineligible prehistoric sites are located on ancient eroded landscapes where sediments that could contain buried cultural resources are thin or missing. Moreover, many lack diagnostic artifacts that would allow them to be assessed chronologically. For those sites with chronological indicators, there is no means
Table 5. National Register eligibility recommendations for newly recorded sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41BX1346</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter/historic rock feature and scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1347</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1348</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1349</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1350</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1351</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter/burned rock midden</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1352</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter/historic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1353</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1354</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1355</td>
<td>Historic shooting range</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1356</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1357</td>
<td>World War II-era camp</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1358</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1359</td>
<td>Historic military bunker</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1360</td>
<td>Historic military gun emplacements</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1361</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1362</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1363</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1364</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1365</td>
<td>Historic refuse area</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1366</td>
<td>Historic refuse area</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1367</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1368</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1390</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1391</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1392</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1393</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic resource area</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1394</td>
<td>Historic modification of natural spring</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1404</td>
<td>Historic habitation</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CM233</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CM234</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CM235</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CM236</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CM237</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CM238</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CM239</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CM240</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CM241</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CM242</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter/burned rock midden/historic headstone, structure, and artifact scatter</td>
<td>Eligible*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only the burned rock midden is recommended for eligibility as an interim measure pending testing.
Table 6. National Register eligibility recommendations for previously recorded sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Previous Recommendation</th>
<th>Current Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41BX371</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX373</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX376</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX378</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX379</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX380</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter/open camp</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX382</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX383</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter/historic artifact scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX385</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX388</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX394</td>
<td>Historic farmstead</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX397</td>
<td>Historic farmstead</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX425</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX426</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX434</td>
<td>Historic farmstead/World War II-era camp</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1024</td>
<td>Historic farmstead</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1044</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter/burned rock midden/</td>
<td>Potentially eligible</td>
<td>Eligible*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1048</td>
<td>historic farmstead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41BX1211</td>
<td>Historic farmstead/prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Potentially eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CM70</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CM94</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CM95</td>
<td>Historic farmstead/prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CM99</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CM100</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CM101</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Unknown eligibility</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CM217</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only the burned rock midden is recommended for eligibility as an interim measure pending testing.

by which to test how accurately the diagnostics represent the ages of the sites. Thus, these prehistoric sites fail to meet the basic criteria identified by Hines (1993:38 for National Register-eligible prehistoric sites at Camp Bullis):

Certain general criteria may be used to identify sites with the potential to contribute significant data. . . . Such sites must possess sufficient integrity to allow the vertical and/or horizontal isolation and absolute or relative dating of components, and they must yield samples of cultural materials (e.g., artifacts, features, faunal remains, and macrobotanical remains) of sufficient size to enable meaningful analyses.

The prehistoric component at 41CM242 includes one burned rock midden recommended as eligible for NRHP listing. Cultural deposits within the midden appear to be intact and are 38 cm thick. According to Hines (1993:40), midden sites at Camp Bullis may be eligible for the NRHP if they:
can be shown to represent a limited span of time (i.e., a single component or period of use) or to contain multiple but isolable components and can be related to the surrounding cultural deposits. The first criterion can be met best at sites with suites of consistent radiocarbon or other absolute assays and sizable samples of temporally sensitive artifacts, especially in depositional settings such as moderately thick or thick alluvial terraces and colluvium at the base of slopes. Middens in such depositional settings can also satisfy the second criterion, since stratigraphy and/or cultural stratification are needed to relate these kinds of features to their associated cultural remains with confidence.

The deposits at 41CM242 may be thick enough in the immediate area of the midden to isolate components. Evidence suggests that the site contains both Middle and Late Archaic components. The site may be able to contribute important information on topics such as settlement patterns (i.e., group and camp size, duration of occupation, and range of activities), chronology, technology, and material culture (i.e., tool manufacturing technology, subsistence technology, and personal and ritual technology), and intraregional and extraregional interaction. Additionally, if botanical and faunal remains are preserved, the site could yield valuable data on paleoenvironments, subsistence strategies, and season of occupation. It is recommended that the prehistoric component at 41CM242 be considered eligible for listing in the National Register on an interim basis pending testing to acquire sufficient data to determine whether components can be isolated, to investigate its internal structure and assess its stratigraphic integrity, and to determine whether botanical and/or faunal remains are preserved. It is for these same reasons that the burned rock midden at previously recorded site 41BX1044 is still recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP (Kibler and Gardner 1997:36).

Site 41BX425 is considered eligible for NRHP listing, in concurrence with Gerstle et al. (1978), because subsurface investigations yielded cultural materials to a depth of 90 cm below the surface, with cutbanks suggesting that the alluvial deposits could be as much as 4 m thick. As has been demonstrated at 41BX377 not far away (Kibler and Scott 2000), thick Holocene terrace deposits such as these can contain discrete and deeply buried archeological components that can yield high-resolution data sets relevant to a variety of important research topics.

Of the remaining 12 nonmilitary historic components recorded and revisited during the current survey, only 4 (41BX1355, 41BX1394, 41BX397, and 41BX1211) are recommended as eligible for NRHP listing. The remaining ineligible sites consist of both newly recorded (41BX1365, 41BX1366, and 41BX1404 and the historic component at 41CM242) and previously recorded sites (41BX394, 41BX1024, 41BX1048, and 41CM95).

During the 1920s and 1930s, the Schuetzenverein at 41BX1355 fulfilled an important function within the German community located in the northern area of Camp Bullis. Men regularly came to practice shooting, and families gathered for Freischütz, when they also ate, drank, and danced. As the location of a once-common, but increasingly rare expression of ethnic German activity, the Schuetzenverein at 41BX1355 is considered eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A and as a traditional cultural property.

Site 41BX1394 (Dripping Springs) is a natural seep spring where a 2-m-long basin was cut into limestone bedrock just beneath where the water seeps out from the rock face. The springs and trough have been a source of water during all but the most severe droughts. According to Schaefer (2000:1), members of his family used the road in about 1870, and Dripping Springs was a water stop on the route. Site 41BX1394 is one of several locally significant landmarks in northern Bexar County and southern Comal County, others being Mustang Hill and Green Camp Waterhole to the west and Catalie Prairie to the southeast. The springs and associated hand-made trough are mentioned as landmarks in accounts of early Hill Country life (see Hunter 1998; Schaefer [1995]). In addition, an early wagon road from the Cibolo community in northwest Bexar County to Boerne and beyond.
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passed by the waterhole, which provided a source of water to travelers and their horses. Because they are landmarks important in the local history, the springs and trough that comprise 41BX1394 are considered eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A.

Previously recorded historic site 41BX397 is the ranch and farmstead occupied first by George and Christoph Pfeuffer and then by Henry Schmidt. Two structures (the garage and milk house); two walls, including the 1870s artesian well; and the dipping vat remain on the site. Numerous other domestic and agricultural features are represented by foundation remnants and debris. Site 41BX397 represents an early improvement in northern Bexar County that has strong associations with community leaders in New Braunfels and along Cibolo Creek. George and Christoph Pfeuffer, who owned the property on which 41BX397 is located from 1873 to 1906, were German entrepreneurs who are documented in numerous historical texts and were instrumental in encouraging German immigration to western Comal County and northern Bexar County. They were among the first entrepreneurs to develop the area's underground water resources, and one of their artesian wells was located at 41BX397, which also was the location of a frame house they occupied.

Henry Schmidt, who occupied and developed 41BX397 between 1906 and 1941, was a highly successful stock farmer; his farmstead still includes most of the elements of a prototypical turn-of-the-century German stock farm including a smokehouse, milk house, wells, watering tanks, and dipping vat. In addition, Schmidt and his family were community leaders. He sponsored the West End Shooting Club or Schuetzenverein (41BX1355), which was located on his property for approximately 30 years. Site 41BX397 is considered eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A for its associations with German Hill Country agriculture. Moreover, the site could be considered eligible under Criterion D, if the late-nineteenth-century component, the Pfeuffer residence, could be isolated.

Previously recorded historic site 41BX1211 is the Fritz Scheel Ranch and farmstead, occupied by the Scheel family after 1905 until the 1930s. It contains the remains of structures representing the house, barns, wash house and cellar, cisterns, and a variety of outbuildings and pens, retaining good representative information on the layout of a German Hill Country stock farm. Like 41BX397, it is considered eligible for NRHP listing under Criterion A for its associations with German Hill Country agriculture. Unlike 41BX397, its twentieth-century age indicates that it has little capacity to contribute important archaeological information, and thus it is not eligible under Criterion D.

Newly recorded historic sites 41BX1365, 41BX1366, and 41BX1404 represent limited evidence for historic ranching and stock farming in the area and are considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP. Sites 41BX1365 and 41BX1366 are small refuse areas with unclear associations and an inability to yield important archaeological information. Site 41BX1404 is associated with the Schmidt family and represents Mexican workers' housing. The site lacks integrity and is not considered significant in the local history. The historic component at newly recorded site 41CM242 features a small circular stone structure, a broken headstone, and some scattered domestic debris. The historic component lacks the capacity to yield information on intra-graphic structure or ranch layout and is ineligible for listing in the NRHP. However, it is recommended that the area around the headstone be avoided.

Four previously recorded historic sites are assessed as ineligible for listing in the NRHP: 41BX394, 41BX1024, 41BX1048, and 41CM95. None is considered significant in local history, is associated with persons significant to the past, retains structural integrity, or is able to yield important archaeological information. Specifically, 41BX1048, a location where a portion of the film The Rough Riders was filmed is not considered eligible due in part to the lack of positive response to the movie and the fact that San Antonio failed to develop into a prominent film-making center.

Four historic military sites were recorded during the current survey: 41BX1357, 41BX1359, 41BX1360, and 41BX434. The new historic military component added to 41BX434 is part of the World War II-era encampment documented at adjacent site 41BX1345 (Cestaro et al. 2000:41). This camp, along with another World War II-era encampment at newly recorded site 41BX1357, lacks the capacity to yield important information. Neither site retains
structural integrity, and they are not considered significant in the military history of Camp Bullis or the nation. Site 41BX1360, containing historic military gun emplacements, fits into the Training Device property type as defined by Freeman (1994c:105–107) in the Camp Bullis historic context, but it cannot be assigned a specific age and is not significant in the military history of Camp Bullis.

Site 41BX1359 is a historic military bunker situated at the top of Mehl Hill in Training Area 3C. It has a plaque that is inscribed “ERECTED BY SECOND FIELD ARTILLERY BRIGADE NOVEMBER 1938.” The structure is similar to those at 41BX824 (on Neutze Hill), 41BX1028 (on Sykes Hill), 41BX1036 (on Buck Hill), 41BX1276 (west of Lewis Creek), and 41BX1277 (on Herr Hill). The date of construction suggests that the bunker was used by the 2d Division during field exercises, and it may have been associated with development and testing of the army's Triangular Division. Site 41BX1359 has little archeological potential (Criterion D), but it is considered eligible for listing in the NRHP based on its age, structural integrity, and possible association with the development of the U.S. Army’s Triangular Division (Criterion A).

The final recommendation offered here relates not to known sites but to sites that may remain undiscovered. As has been demonstrated at 41BX377 and as appears likely at 41BX425 nearby, there are discontinuous areas along Cibolo Creek where thick Holocene alluvium containing deeply buried prehistoric sites are present. Such sites, which have the capacity to contain discrete components that can yield important information, often cannot be found or effectively evaluated during surface survey and shovel testing. Instead, trenching is needed. Hence, it is recommended that Camp Bullis develop a program involving systematic trenching of Holocene landforms along Cibolo Creek to identify buried sites prior to deep ground-disturbing activities. While small pockets of Holocene deposits probably occur throughout the valley, large expanses of potential Holocene terrace deposits where most of the trenching needs to be done appear to be more-restricted in extent. For example, within the survey areas reported here, the largest areas needing trenching are as follows: ca. 60 acres on the north side of Cibolo Creek in Training Area 1A; ca. 3 acres in the northeast corner of Training Area 2A; ca. 17 acres in the northeast corner of Training Area 2C; ca. 70 acres on both sides of Cibolo Creek in the northwestern part of Training Area 2D; and ca. 60 acres on the south side of Cibolo Creek along the eastern side of Training Area 2D.
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APPENDIX A: Historic Properties Associated with the
Henry M. Smith Family

Martha Doty Freeman
Henry M. Smith, father of Clinton Lafayette and Jefferson Davis Smith, was born on May 26, 1812, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (Lich 1972). In March 1836, he enlisted at Louisville, Kentucky, in Captain Wiggington's company and Colonel Ward's regiment, Green's Brigade. He became orderly sergeant and landed in Galveston, Texas, in May 1836. He served in the company until November 1836, when he was discharged at Camp Johnson on the Lavaca River (Republic of Texas Claims Files, Reel 239:8). He later served in Captain Bird's company, participating in skirmishes with Indians, including one known as Bird's Creek Indian Fight near present-day Temple, which occurred on May 26, 1839. He also served as a private in the Austin County Volunteers, Nathan Brookshire captain commanding, from June 18, to July 24, 1839 (Republic of Texas Claims Files, Reel 186:403-404, 409; San Antonio Daily Express, June 12, 1855:3; Schaefer 1995:n.p.; Tyler 1996:550).

On September 15, 1839, Smith married Frances Short, who was born in Alabama on December 8, 1824. They married in Washington County, and 2 years later had their first child, Mary Jane. Two more children followed in 1843 (Martha Ann Elizabeth) and 1845 (Caroline Manley). By 1847, when William H. Smith was born, the family was living in Bexar County, where Alphonso was born in 1849 (Lich 1972).

According to Hunter (1998:11), Henry Smith established a blacksmith and gun shop with San Antonio resident Jacob Linn. He also served as the city marshall. The relationship between Linn and Smith appears to have been a close one: the Smiths' seventh child was named Jacob Linn Smith (Lich 1972), and Linn was responsible for Smith's early acquisition of land in Comal County. In 1851, Linn was serving as administrator of the estate of Frank G. Holmes. Part of the Holmes Estate was a grant of 320 acres. When Linn failed to pay a total of $1.36 taxes due on the property, the Bexar County tax assessor collector sold the Holmes Survey No. 226 (Bexar County, Deed Record K-1:403). Smith family tradition relates that Henry M. Smith, as the successful bidder, traded a rifle for the property (Hunter 1998:11). Deed records indicate that he paid the amount due in back taxes on December 20, 1851 (Bexar County, Deed Record K-1:403). The same day, he purchased the Jonathan Rhea Survey 225 located immediately to the east of the Holmes Survey (Bexar County, Deed Record K-1:403) (Figure 23).

The Smith family, which grew with the births of Amanda Matilda (October 23, 1852), Jacob Linn (March 1, 1855), Polly (September 26, 1857), Clinton Lafayette (August 3, 1860), and twins Jefferson Davis and Nancy Lea (August 31, 1862) (Lich 1972) appears to have lived in San Antonio during the 1850s. During the same decade, there are indications of an early involvement with livestock, as well as continuing cordial relations with Jacob Linn. In 1855, Linn transferred 15 head of stock cattle and their increase to Smith in consideration of $1 and the affection Linn had for the Smith family. Smith was directed to hold the cattle in trust for his wife and children (Bexar County, Deed Record N-1:544).

According to Clinton L. Smith (Hunter 1998:11), the family lived in San Antonio during the Civil War, when Henry M. Smith served with the Texas Rangers. He and his son William worked as freighters between San Antonio and Indianola after the war. At an unspecified date, but by at least 1867, they moved to the Holmes Survey on the Cibolo, settling on the north side of the creek in Comal County. During that year, Comal County tax rolls indicate that Smith was paying taxes on 320 acres (the Holmes Survey) worth $360, 22 horses worth $340, 129 cattle worth $415, and 200 sheep worth $208. The homeplace was called Dripping Springs after the springs located a short distance south of the Smith house. According to Schaefer (1996:n.p.), seep springs in the area were active only "during periods of abundant rainfall." But the waterhole nearby was the location of two springs that dried up only "during extended periods of drought." Early users of the water chiseled a trough in the bedrock of Cibolo Creek to capture the spring water. The family appears to have occupied a double-pen log building that may have been on the Holmes Survey when they moved there (Figure 24).

On May 22, 1869, Frances Short Smith died. Three weeks later, on June 14, Henry Smith

---

1 The Smith family bible is the source of the 1812 date of birth. The 1870 and 1880 censuses, as well as Smith's obituary, suggest that he was born in 1814 or 1815.
married Mrs. Harriet E. Savery Nicholson (Lich 1972). Nicholson, herself a widow and mother of three children, was living in San Antonio in 1860, when she ran a boarding house and had a personal estate of $2,500 (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1860). Harriet was the daughter of Asahel Savery (also spelled Savary and Savory), a native of Massachusetts and veteran of the War of 1812 who immigrated to Texas in 1831, participated in the Siege of Bexar and at San Jacinto as assistant quartermaster, and lived in Quintana in 1836. He moved to Austin by January 1840, and served under General Edward Burleson during the campaign up the Colorado River in fall 1842 against the Indians. He participated in the Mexican War, and was described as one of Texas’s “bravest and best soldiers.” By the mid-1850s, he was living in Port Lavaca, Calhoun County, but he had joined his daughter in San Antonio by 1860 (Republic of Texas Claims Files. Reel 92:135; 184:102, 109, 112, 119, 284; San Antonio Daily Express, June 13, 1882:4). Given their similar backgrounds on the Texas frontier and in ranging companies, it is possible that Savery and his future son-in-law were acquainted with each other well before 1869.

By 1870, the Smith family consisted of Henry M. and Harriet; two of Harriet’s children, Jack (14 years old) and Mary (12 years old); and three of Henry and Frances’s children, Clinton (9 years old) and twins Nancy Lea and Jeff (7 years old). It was the next year that the event occurred for which the Smith family is best remembered. On Sunday, February 26, 1871, at 9 A.M. (Lich 1972), Clinton and Jeff were captured by 12 Apache Indians accompanied by 2 Mexicans while the boys were herding sheep (U.S. 43rd Congress, 1st Session 1874:26). According to Schaefer, whose father later owned the Smith Dripping Springs property, and who remembers a visit Jeff made to the Schaefer Ranch in 1932 or 1933, Jeff and his brother were taken close to the Cibolo on the south side of the creek, east-northeast of the Smith home (Schaefer [1995]: n.p.). A deposition given by Clinton Smith in 1873 related that he was sold to a Comanche chief named Mah-way near the Brazos River. Jeff was not purchased at the Comanche Camp and was taken, instead, to Mexico by the Apaches.

Efforts by Henry Smith and a Ranger company from Camp Verde headed by Captain John W. Sansom to find and retake the two boys were unsuccessful. Clint lived with the Comanches for approximately 2 years until he was traded for an Indian Squaw at Fort Sill, Indian Territory. Jeff was purchased from the Lipan Apaches.
Figure 24. Photographs of the Smith Log House. (a) The remaining pen of the original double-pen house; (b) interior view.
through the efforts of William Schuchardt, United States commercial agent at Piedras Negras. The two boys were returned to the ranch house at Dripping Springs in the spring of 1873 (U.S. 43d Congress, 1st Session 1874:27). About that time, the Smith family moved out of the double-pen log house and into a one-and-a-half-story frame house (Figure 25) immediately north of the log structure (Schaefcr [1995]:n.p.). In addition, the family land holdings had increased significantly: in 1874 Henry Smith had purchased the Antonio Rubio 160-acre Survey No. 237; and in 1875, he had bought the 160-acre Friedrich Veges Survey 494 and the 218-acre T. G. McGee Survey 431, Section 3, all located northeast of the ranch headquarters on the Cibolo (Comal County, Deed Record Q:213).

Six years after Clint and Jeff returned, Henry Smith bought the western 600 acres of the 1,280-acre D. W. Babcock Survey for $600 from Sanders F. McAllister of Hays County on June 2, 1879; no improvements were mentioned in the deed (Comal County, Deed Record O:471–472). On October 2, 1882, he bought the eastern 680 acres of the Babcock Survey for $1,600 from David Chenault of Castalian Springs, Sumner County, Tennessee (Comal County, Deed Record R:51–52). The property was located west of the Dripping Springs Ranch on Cibolo Creek (see Figure 20), and ad valorem tax records suggest that the western 600 acres were unimproved through 1882–1883, when they were valued at 50 cents per acre. It may be that the Smiths improved the Babcock Survey shortly after Henry Smith sold the Holmes Survey (No. 226) to his son-in-law Ben Cravey, on May 29, 1883 (Comal County, Deed Record R:84–85).²

Henry and Harriet Smith lived briefly on the Babcock Survey until June 8, 1885, when Henry died (Lich 1972). During the August 1885 term of the Comal County Probate Court, Harriet was named administratrix of the estate (Comal County, Probate Minutes H:77–78). Three appraisers were appointed, one of whom, John Wesley Eckles, operated the Oakland Park Ranch located west and southwest of the Babcock Survey. According to the appraisers, Smith left an estate that consisted of 12 bucks; 45 head of cattle; 1,060 sheep; 3 horses; 1 farm wagon and 1 spring wagon; 1 small lot of oats, corn, and rye; 1,280 acres of land with improvements consisting of an eight-room rock dwelling (Figure 26), a two-room frame tenant house, and a sheep shed; and the north half of Lot 22 in Boerne with improvements consisting of a large rock building (Comal County, Probate Minutes H:84–85).

On September 30, 1885, Harriet leased 1,080 acres of the Babcock Survey to a Smith son-in-law, Ben Cravey, for 1 year. She retained 200 acres surrounding the improvements with the intention of using them as her homestead (Comal County, Probate Minutes H:111) (Figure 27). During its February term, the probate court determined that the property in Boerne and a two-thirds undivided interest in the eastern 680 acres of the Babcock Survey were Henry M. Smith's separate property. The remaining 600 acres in the western part of the Babcock Survey and the improvements there, an undivided one-third interest in the eastern 680 acres, and personal property listed in the inventory were the community property of Smith and his widow, Harriet (Comal County, Probate Minutes H:122). As a result, the 200-acre homestead tract was surveyed and set apart to Harriet in April 1886 (Comal County, Probate Minutes H:134–135).

Unfortunately, all parties concerned agreed that there was no way to equitably divide the 1,280-acre Babcock Survey without the 200-acre homestead tract, and at the August 1886 term of the court, Harriet waived her rights to the 200 acres. She and Cravey then asked the court to order the sale of the property (Comal County, Probate Minutes H:165–167, 235, 301–302). Subsequently, the Babcock Survey and lot and building in Boerne were sold at auction to Cravey on October 4, 1887 (Comal County, Probate Minutes H:235–236, 319–320).³

Cravey owned the Babcock Survey for 2 months and then sold it to Sylvester Simon (Comal County, Deed Record T:378–379). On November 26, 1890, Sylvester Simon sold the

² Harriet Smith's father, Asaeh Savery, was living in the Smith home at the time of his death on June 4, 1882 (San Antonio Daily Express, June 13, 1882:4). Two weeks later, Smith sold his land in the Veges, Rubio, and McGee Surveys to Ben Cravey for $1,200 (Comal County, Deed Record Q:213).

³ Harriet E. Savery Nicholson Smith was living in Victoria as late as 1901 (Republic of Texas Claims Files. Reel 238:721).
survey to Joseph Simon for $4,000 (Comal County, Deed Record U:470–471), and Joseph made his home in the rock house (Comal County, Deed Record 45:316–317) until December 1921. At that point, Joseph Simon and Harry P. Simon of Comal County and Emma Rust and her husband, Bruno F., and Clara Anna Schwarz and her husband, Robert, of Kendall County deeded land belonging to the family to Bruno and Hedwig Anna Klar. The property conveyed included 120 acres in the Babcock Survey on which the rock house formerly occupied by the Smiths and Joseph Simon was located (Comal County, Deed Record 45:318–320). Today, the property is owned by a descendant of Joseph Simon.

Deed, tax, and probate records make it clear that the Henry M. Smith family occupied the Holmes Survey (No. 226) during the mid-1860s and the time Clint and Jeff Smith were captured from and subsequently returned to the Dripping Springs Ranch. Henry Smith and his second wife, Harriet Savery Nicholson, moved to the western half of the Babcock Survey some time after 1879, and they occupied a two-story rock house there until Henry’s death in 1885. Probate records do not indicate where Henry M. Smith was buried, but 41CM242, the supposed location of his grave, is on property he never owned in the Maria de la Luz Guerra Survey ca. 0.7 miles from his home. A tenuous association between Smith and the Guerra Survey existed in the person of John Wesley Eckles, who lived on the survey and served as one of three appraisers for the Smith Estate in 1885. However, no evidence has been found that the association of the two men was sufficiently strong to explain the interment of Smith at 41CM242.
Figure 26. Photographs of the third Smith residence.
Figure 27. Plat of the Harriet E. Savery Nicholson Smith homestead tract on the Babcock Survey (reproduced from Comal County Probate Minutes H:135).
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APPENDIX B: *The Rough Riders* and *Wings*: Movie Production at Camp Stanley and Camp Bullis

Martha Doty Freeman
The film industry began in Texas in 1894 and in San Antonio approximately 15 years later, when the city became a center for motion picture filming and distributing companies. Favorable weather, varied geography, and colorful history made San Antonio particularly attractive, as did the city's military bases, which provided opportunities for filming increasingly popular war-time extravaganzas.

Between 1911 and the 1930s, numerous "home-grown" companies began in San Antonio, and other film companies visited, using locales such as the missions and Fort Sam Houston. Earliest motion picture producers included Gaston Melies, whose Star Film Company was headquartered in south San Antonio and made The Immortal Alamo. By ca. 1912, the Satex Film Company produced some of the earliest popular films about flight at Fort Sam Houston. The 1910s were further filled with the activities of Vitagraph, the Shamrock Photoplay Corporation, Sunset Pictures Corporation, Jester Comedy Company, Vitaphone Company, and San Antonio Pictures Corporation. West Coast-based companies, such as that of Samuel Goldwyn, made Heart of the Sunset in 1918, and 5 years later, the Fox Film Company made The Warrens of Virginia (Express-News, December 21, 1980:1-M; July 7, 1996:6G; Middleton 1980; Schmidt n.d.).

The 1920s and 1930s saw a plethora of films that reflected the public's persistent appetite for historical military epics and growing fascination with military flight and the Air Corps. In 1925, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer shot scenes for The Big Parade at Kelly Field and Fort Sam Houston, and a year later, Paramount directors Victor Fleming and William Wellman used military personnel and installations to film The Rough Riders and Wings. The trend continued in the 1930s with production of West Point of the Air and The Fall of the Alamo (Express-News, October 24, 1982:1-M; Moffatt 1993:38–39).

The Rough Riders and Wings were two of the largest film productions made in San Antonio in the 1920s, and the preparation that went into their making illustrated a relatively new commitment to authenticity of detail. Months before the arrival in San Antonio of the Famous Players-Lasky Company (the company that provided the director and stars for both movies), a representative came to the city to collect pictures of the Rough Riders, San Antonio scenes during the late 1890s, and the International Fair Grounds where the troops had trained in 1898 (San Antonio Express, June 4, 1926:21). In addition, representatives of the company contacted several San Antonians who had helped organize the Rough Riders, and their help in making the picture was solicited (San Antonio Express, August 3, 1926:2). During late July and early August, the company committed to rebuilding the fair grounds, and soon carpenters were at work on what was called a "set" but was, in fact, a full-scale replication of the International Fair Building (San Antonio Express, July 30, 1926:6; The San Antonio Light, August 15, 1926). About the same time, more than 200 laborers worked at Camp Stanley to "dress up" war terrain...to represent the Mont Sec sector of the battle of St. Mihiel" as a location for the filming of Wings (San Antonio Express, August 7, 1926:4).

Victor Fleming, director of The Rough Riders, also scouted out nearby locales that would be appropriate for specific scenes in that film. According to W. D. Smithers, who was hired as a guide and photographer, he took Fleming to numerous locations and made still photographs of the fair grounds, a railroad depot, the Old Market and Hay Plaza, Fort Sam Houston, streets with adobe houses, and hills near Leon Springs (Cook 1975:36). Lasky then began to arrange for the arrival of U.S. military troops who would appear in The Rough Riders. It was rumored in San Antonio that more than 1,000 cavalry from Fort Clark and Camp Marfa would be used in the film (San Antonio Express, August 1, 1926:15), and by the middle of August, approximately 500 members of the Fifth Cavalry began a march from Fort Clark while another 500 members of the First Cavalry Brigade prepared to move by train from Camp Marfa to San Antonio (San Antonio Express, August 10, 1926:5).

Use of military forces in the filming of two of Hollywood's largest films provoked a torrent of protest from members of the Western Players' Protective Association, who petitioned the War Department to stop the practice. The association charged that previous use of fighting

---

4 Interest in the preparatory activities probably was heightened by reports that the 1927 encampment of the Spanish-American War veterans would be held in San Antonio (San Antonio Express, July 8, 1926:8).
troops in movie epics such as *Ben Hur* had thrown hundreds of actors out of work. The War Department ruled against the use of the troops as a result of the protests, except in "films of historical or educational value and when their use [did] not deprive others of employment" (*San Antonio Express*, August 16, 1926:2). But production of the two Paramount films and use of the regular army troops continued nonetheless. By August 17, more than 1,000 men of the First and Fifth Cavalry Regiments had arrived at San Antonio, and they went into camp near the International Fair Grounds site (*San Antonio Express*, August 18, 1926:9).

Arrival of the troops was followed immediately by the arrival of directors, actors, and extras who would be working on *The Rough Riders* and *Wings*. The air of excitement in San Antonio became palpable as the newspaper pointed out that the two movies were the Famous Players-Lasky Corporation’s biggest pictures of 1926. "The fact that their major sequences are to be made here virtually makes San Antonio the Western headquarters of Paramount for the months of August, September and October..." (*San Antonio Express*, August 18, 1926:9). Between August 19 and September 6, the stars of both movies arrived, and the city celebrated with parties, receptions, and daily coverage of all aspects of the film productions in the newspaper. Indeed, by early September, the *Express* announced that San Antonio now was "one of the leading centers of film interest in the United States" (*San Antonio Express*, September 6, 1926:10).

Preparation for filming was accompanied by renewed attention to detail that had been highlighted 2 months earlier. Costuming was deemed to be authentic, and director Victor Fleming "compared notes for details in military equipment for the Rough Riders with Lewis Maverick," who had been a member of the organization (*San Antonio Express*, August 21, 1926:5). Other former Rough Riders were consulted, as well, including Dr. A. A. Luther, Colonel M. L. Crimmins, F. W. Walf [sic], William M. Chester, and John L. Dewees of San Antonio; David Calrow of Boerne; David L. Hughes of Los Angeles; and J. H. Tate (also spelled Tait) of Chandler, Arizona (*San Antonio Express*, August 22, 1926; August 27, 1926:22). Reference was made to a collection of photographs that was owned by Mrs. Henry Drought and depicted the fair grounds. These were enlarged, "and the details of the construction shown were faithfully reproduced" (*San Antonio Express*, August 22, 1926:15). The newspaper also mentioned the research carried out by Paramount’s own "extensive research department." The end result was reproductions andcostuming so authentic that it won the approbation of Hermann Hagedorn, Roosevelt’s biographer and author of *The Rough Riders* story (*San Antonio Express*, August 22, 1926:15).

Between September 6 and 16, local papers focused on the production of *Wings* as the cast arrived, filming began at the Fort Sam Houston Quadrangle, and more military personnel arrived, including a battery of anti-aircraft guns from Fort Barrancas, Florida; Air Service photographers; and flyers, planes, and airships from Selfridge Field, Michigan, Scott Field, Illinois, and Galveston, Texas (*San Antonio Express*, September 3, 1926:11; September 6, 1926:10; September 8, 1926:3; September 11, 1926:22; September 12, 1926:14; September 16, 1926:7). In the meantime, Fleming finished filming at the fair grounds, and on September 15, actors and extras assembled at the old San Antonio Aransas Pass Railroad Station at South Alamo and South Flores Streets. As cameras ran, the "Rough Riders" entrained for their camp in Tampa, Florida. They were watched by hundreds of spectators (*San Antonio Express*, September 16, 1926:9).

With completion of most of the San Antonio scenes, Famous-Players-Lasky began preparations for filming at Camp Stanley in earnest. Workers associated with the *Wings* production dug trench systems, created shell holes with explosives, and built a mock French village as well as "luxurious dugouts" for "German officers" (*San Antonio Express*, September 19, 1926:7). At the same time, a short distance away,5

---

5 An article published in the *San Antonio Express* on September 19, 1926, indicated that *Wings* would be filmed at Camp Stanley and *The Rough Riders* at Camp Bullis. However, after September 21, the paper reported that both films would use the Camp Stanley facilities (*San Antonio Express*, September 22, 1926:6; September 26, 1926; October 1, 1926:7; October 7, 1926:7; October 13, 1926:11). One reference (*San Antonio Express*, September 30, 1926:8) indicated that battle rehearsals occurred at Camp Bullis.
preparations were made for the Battle of San Juan Hill, and during the next 2 weeks, the Hill Country landscape slowly was transformed into a tropical setting as carloads of palms and other typical Cuban trees were transplanted (San Antonio Express, October 3, 1926:7).

On September 30, the San Antonio Light announced that actors were running through preliminaries for the San Juan battle scene, and that "Roosevelt" soon would be leading a charge through Daiquiri Pass. According to the Express, some filming began on September 30, and the historic charge up the hill was scheduled for October 1 (San Antonio Express, October 1, 1926:22). However, final filming of Roosevelt’s charge up Kettle and San Juan Hills was delayed until October 8–13. At that point, members of the First and Fifth Cavalry Regiments, movie stars, and hundreds of extras climbed steep inclines in the face of heavy fire from the "Spaniards" entrenched at the top. A balloon under the direction of local expert B. H. Fournier reconnoitered the enemy’s position. Nearly 2,000 soldiers participated in the action, which featured Frank Hopper as Roosevelt, Colonel Fred Lindsay as Colonel Leonard Wood, and other stars such as Charles Emmett Mack, Noah Beery, George Bancroft, and Fred Kohler. "Shrapnel broke overhead, thousands of rounds of rifle bullets were discharged, and thunderous blasts from concealed batteries added to the din" (San Antonio Express, October 7, 1926:7; October 9, 1926:4).

With completion of filming at Camp Stanley, the production company moved back to San Antonio, planning to film the Battle of Bloody Bend at the San Antonio River near the State Hospital (San Antonio Express, October 12, 1926:11). However, rainy weather interrupted the work, and after several days, Famous Players-Lasky Corporation made plans to leave San Antonio. Victor Fleming, Noah Beery, George Bancroft, Mary Astor, Charles Farrell, and a host of other actors boarded a special train to Los Angeles at 8:00 P.M. on October 19. They left behind them a San Antonio that had participated briefly in the reenactment of two important historical events. They also left a city that was convinced its glorious three months as "the capital of filmdom" (San Antonio Express, September 21, 1926:8) were just the beginning of a long partnership with Hollywood.

6Simultaneously, the 2d Division went "over the top," fighting the Battle of St. Mihiel (San Antonio Express, October 2, 1926:6).
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