

# **ADVANCED RAPID TRANSIT**

## **North/South Corridor Project**

### **Non-Archeological Historic Resources Survey Report**

April 2023

This report is currently being reviewed by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) as part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and related legislation, review process to determine potential impacts of the proposed project. This report and other technical studies will not be considered final until FTA completes its environmental review process and provides a categorical exclusion determination.



**DRAFT**

**(Information is under FTA review and is subject to change.)**

# **VIA Advanced Rapid Transit North/South Corridor Project**

## **Non-Archeological Historic Resources Survey Report**

Prepared for:



Prepared by:



**(Information is under FTA review and is subject to change.)**



**Re:** Project Review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and/or the Antiquities Code of Texas

**THC Tracking #202304540**

**Date:** 02/22/2023

VIA Advanced Rapid Transit North/South Corridor Project  
Roosevelt Avenue at Steves Avenue

**Description:** HRSR revised to address THC and CoSA OHP comments. Please see link in email for access to all files.

Dear Emily Reed:

Thank you for your submittal regarding the above-referenced project. This response represents the comments of the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Executive Director of the Texas Historical Commission (THC), pursuant to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the Antiquities Code of Texas.

The review staff, led by Justin Kockritz, Alex Toprac and Sheena Cox, has completed its review and has made the following determinations based on the information submitted for review:

**Above-Ground Resources**

- THC/SHPO concurs with information provided.
- Property/properties are eligible for listing or already listed in the National Register of Historic Places.
- No adverse effects on historic properties.
- THC/SHPO concurs with information provided.

We have the following comments: The THC History Programs Division staff, led by Justin Kockritz, has completed its review of the revised Non-Archeological Historic Resources Survey Report and concurs with all of the updated findings of National Register eligibility. The Texas Historical Commission's Division of Architecture staff, led by Sheena Cox, concurs with the determination that the undertaking will have no adverse effect on the identified NRHP-listed or eligible historic properties within the project APE.

We look forward to further consultation with your office and hope to maintain a partnership that will foster effective historic preservation. Thank you for your cooperation in this review process, and for your efforts to preserve the irreplaceable heritage of Texas. If the project changes, or if new historic properties are found, please contact the review staff. If you have any questions concerning our review or if we can be of further assistance, please email the following reviewers: [justin.kockritz@thc.texas.gov](mailto:justin.kockritz@thc.texas.gov), [alex.toprac@thc.texas.gov](mailto:alex.toprac@thc.texas.gov), [sheena.cox@thc.texas.gov](mailto:sheena.cox@thc.texas.gov).

This response has been sent through the electronic THC review and compliance system (eTRAC). Submitting your project via eTRAC eliminates mailing delays and allows you to check the status of the review, receive an electronic response, and generate reports on your submissions. For more information, visit <http://thc.texas.gov/etrac-system>.

Sincerely,

for Mark Wolfe, State Historic Preservation Officer  
Executive Director, Texas Historical Commission

**Please do not respond to this email.**

**DRAFT**  
**(Information is under FTA review and is subject to change.)**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>CHAPTER 1.</b>	<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Project Details .....	3
<b>CHAPTER 2.</b>	<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>CHAPTER 3.</b>	<b>SECTION 106 CONSULTING PARTIES .....</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	Public Involvement Outreach Efforts .....	4
3.2	Consulting Parties .....	5
<b>CHAPTER 4.</b>	<b>AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>CHAPTER 5.</b>	<b>EXISTING CONDITIONS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
5.1	Current Land Use .....	6
5.2	Previously Evaluated Historic Properties .....	7
5.3	Previous Relevant Historic Resources Study .....	9
<b>CHAPTER 6.</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>10</b>
6.1	Research Sources .....	10
<b>CHAPTER 7.</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>10</b>
7.1	Preparation for Field Investigations .....	12
7.2	Documentations Standards .....	12
7.2.1	Photography .....	12
7.2.2	Numbering .....	12
7.2.3	Inventory Forms .....	12
7.2.4	Maps .....	13
<b>CHAPTER 8.</b>	<b>RESULTS .....</b>	<b>13</b>
8.1	Property Types .....	13
8.2	Resources Recommended Individually Eligible for the NRHP .....	14
8.3	Resources Potentially Individually Eligible for the NRHP .....	20
8.3.1	405 West Gramercy Place & 701 South St. Mary's Street .....	20
8.4	Historic District NRHP Eligibility Recommendations .....	20
8.4.1	NRHP-Listed Historic Districts .....	20
8.4.2	Districts Potentially Eligible for the NRHP .....	24
8.5	Effects .....	27
8.5.1	Direct Effects .....	27
8.5.2	Indirect, Cumulative or Reasonably Foreseeable Effects .....	29
<b>CHAPTER 9.</b>	<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>30</b>

## List of Tables

Table 1	Potential Consulting Party Responses.....	5
Table 2	NRHP and NRHP-Eligible Properties in APE.....	7
Table 3	OHP Landmarks and Districts in the APE*.....	8
Table 4	Surveyed Historic-Age Property Types.....	13
Table 5	Impact Summary for Alta Vista.....	28

## List of Figures

Figure 1	ART North/South (N/S) Corridor Study area .....	2
----------	---	---

## APPENDICES

---

APPENDIX A	CONSULTING PARTIES AND RESPONSES
APPENDIX B	MAPS
APPENDIX C	SURVEY FORMS
APPENDIX D	RESOURCES RECOMMENDED NOT ELIGIBLE FOR THE NRHP
APPENDIX E	PROJECT AREA PHOTOGRAPHS

## ACRONYMS

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
Aggregator	Historic Resources Aggregator
APE	Area of Potential Effect
ART	Advanced Rapid Transit
Atlas	Texas Historical Sites Atlas
BPR	Bureau of Public Roads
CAD	Bexar County Appraisal District
I&GN	International & Great Northern Railroad
MKT	Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NPS	National Park Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
OHP	City of San Antonio Office of Historic Preservation
OTHM	Official Texas Historical Marker
ROW	Right-of-Way
RTHL	Recorded Texas Historical Marker
SAISD	San Antonio Independent School District
SAL	State Antiquities Landmark
SAT	San Antonio International Airport
SOI	Secretary of the Interior
TDAT	Tribal Directory Assessment Tool
THC	Texas Historical Commission
TxDOT	Texas Department of Transportation
UP	Union Pacific
VIA	VIA Metropolitan Transit

## Chapter 1. ABSTRACT

---

VIA Metropolitan Transit (VIA) proposes to construct an approximately 12-mile-long bus advanced rapid transit (ART) line from the San Antonio International Airport (SAT) on the north, through downtown San Antonio, to Steves Avenue on the south (see **Figure 1**).

Cox|McLain Environmental Consulting, Inc., now Stantec (Stantec), architectural historians conducted a reconnaissance survey of the area of potential effects (APE), and documented all resources constructed in 1980 or earlier, 45 years before the proposed construction-letting date of 2025.

In all, 423 historic-age resources were documented. Three extraordinary non-historic-age resources were evaluated for significance achieved within the past 50 years. The 245 non-historic-age resources on parcels with one or more historic-age resources were photographed and included on an inventory form with an associated historic-age resource but are not described in this report. Due to the evolving nature of the design, some properties that are documented in this report are no longer within the APE; they are retained here as they were already evaluated. Also, additional properties were added to the APE later, resulting in non-geographically sequential numbering.

As a result of the survey, the following recommendations are made:

- Thirteen (13) properties are recommended individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP),
- Five(5) resources are recommended contributing to existing NRHP historic districts,
- Two (2) potential historic districts recommended to the NRHP, and
- Thirty-five (35) resources are recommended contributing to a potential historic district.

A determination of no adverse direct or indirect effects under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) is recommended for all NRHP-eligible resources in the APE. The remaining surveyed resources are each recommended not eligible for the NRHP.



Figure 1 ART North/South (N/S) Corridor Study area

**DRAFT**  
(Information is under FTA review and is subject to change.)



## 1.1 Project Details

County:	Bexar	
City:	San Antonio	
Limits:	San Antonio International Airport to Roosevelt Avenue at Steves Avenue	
Project Type:	Bus Rapid Transit	
Proposed Construction Date:	2025	
Section 106 Applicability (Federal Funding and Permitting):		
	Funding by Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	
Antiquities Code of Texas Applicability:		
	X	Project owned by a political subdivision of the State of Texas (VIA)
	X	On public land
	X	May affect archeological sites
	X	Will involve 5 or more acres of ground disturbance
	X	Will involve 5,000 or more cubic yards of earth moving
	X	Will occur inside a recorded archeological site or designated historic district
Principal Investigator:	Emily Reed, Cox McLain Environmental Consulting, Inc., now Stantec (Stantec)	

## Chapter 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

The proposed undertaking, an approximately 12-mile-long bus ART line, extends from the SAT on the north, through downtown San Antonio, to Steves Avenue on the south (**Appendix B, Figure 1**). The project would generally operate along Airport Boulevard, East Ramsey Road, Isom Road, San Pedro Avenue, Navarro Street, Saint (St.) Mary's Street, and Roosevelt Avenue. The project would operate in 75 percent dedicated transit lanes and 25 percent mixed traffic and would include 26 branded stations with off-board fare collection, next bus messaging, public announcement systems, bicycle parking, and safety features like security cameras and lighting. FTA has determined that this project constitutes an undertaking subject to Section 106 of the NHPA and is the type of activity that has the potential to cause effects to historic properties.

The alignment's three segments are described and depicted in **Appendix B, Figure 2**.

### North, SAT to Interstate (I) 35

The alignment commences at the ground level passenger arrival area of the SAT airport and proceeds west to Airport Boulevard/Dee Howard Way, north along the North United States Highway (US) 281 frontage road, west along East Ramsey Road, southwest to Isom Road, and south along San Pedro Avenue to Interstate (I) 35.

### Downtown, I-35 to East Cesar Chavez Boulevard

From I-35, the alignment follows San Pedro Avenue to Navarro Street. At the North Saint Mary's Street intersection, the alignment splits, continuing southbound on Navarro Street, through downtown San Antonio to East Nueva Street. Between East Nueva Street and the North Saint Mary's/Navarro Streets intersection, the northbound alignment follows Saint Mary's Street through downtown San Antonio. Southbound from East Nueva Street, the combined alignment follows South Saint Mary's Street to East Cesar Chavez Boulevard.

### South, East Cesar Chavez Boulevard to Steves Avenue

From East Cesar Chavez Boulevard, the alignment follows South Saint Mary's Street south to Roosevelt Avenue. The alignment then follows Roosevelt Avenue south to Steves Avenue.

## Chapter 3. SECTION 106 CONSULTING PARTIES

---

### 3.1 Public Involvement Outreach Efforts

Section 106 regulations state that certain entities have by-right consulting privileges and are entitled to participate as consulting parties during Section 106 review. These parties include the State Historic Preservation Officer (whose duties the Texas Historical Commission [THC] conduct in Texas); Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations; representatives of local governments; and applicants for federal assistance, permits, licenses, and other approvals. During this project, consulting parties may be engaged in its planning and development with public meetings and informal electronic mail correspondence and telephone contact. Public involvement should incorporate the opportunity for consulting parties to provide comments about the project in accordance with Section 106.

On June 21, 2022, VIA contacted 24 potential consulting parties with an invitation to become a project consulting party. To date, VIA has received seven responses as indicated in **Table 1**. The responses are included in **Appendix A**.

On November 16, 2022, VIA hosted a virtual meeting with consulting parties who had demonstrated interest in the project. The meeting presentation included a project overview, an overview of Section 106, and a summary of the properties recommended eligible for the NRHP. On November 22, 2022 the parties were given a copy of this survey report for review. The Lavaca Neighborhood Association expressed support for the findings on December 16, 2022. The City of San Antonio Office of Historic Preservation provided comments on December 16, 2022; their comments have been addressed in the present draft. **Table 1** outlines potential consulting party responses.

**Table 1 Potential Consulting Party Responses**

Potential Consulting Party	Response
Alta Vista	None
Bexar County Heritage & Parks	None
Bexar County Historical Commission	None
City of San Antonio Office of Historic Preservation	Yes; confirmed wish to become consulting party
Conservation Society of San Antonio	Yes; confirmed wish to become consulting party
Crownhill Park	None
Downtown Residents	Yes; confirmed wish to become consulting party
Five Points	None
Greater Harmony Hills	None
King William	Yes; confirmed wish to become consulting party
La Villita Historic District	None
Lavaca	Yes; confirmed wish to become consulting party
Mid Tex Mod	None
Monte Vista Historical Association	None
Monte Vista Terrace	None
North Shearer Hills	None
Northmoor	Yes; confirmed wish to become consulting party
Olmos Park Terrace	None
OST 100 San Antonio	None
Roosevelt Park	Yes; confirmed wish to become consulting party
San Antonio Living History Association	None
Shearer Hills/Ridgeview	Yes; confirmed wish to become consulting party
Tobin Hill	None
Ursuline Historic District/Southwest School of Art	None

### 3.2 Consulting Parties

To develop a list of potential Section 106 consulting parties (**Appendix A**), Stantec architectural historians reviewed the:

- THC Atlas for NRHP historic districts intersecting or adjacent to the proposed alignment (Texas Historical Commission 2022).
- City of San Antonio Office of Historic Preservation Explorer Geographic Information System (GIS) layer for historic districts intersecting or adjacent to the proposed alignment (City of San Antonio Office of Historic Preservation).
- City of San Antonio map of neighborhood associations intersecting or adjacent to the proposed alignment (City of San Antonio 2022).

Stantec architectural historians used Google Maps and previous experience with San Antonio–area projects to identify local organizations with potential interest as a consulting party. Identification focused on organized groups with memberships and distribution networks and groups with a connection to the city’s historical and cultural development, a general interest in the built/historic environment, and community groups with possible connections to long-time residents who might have knowledge about specific resources.

For identification of potential interested tribes, a search of the Tribal Directory Assessment Tool (TDAT) v2.0 was conducted to determine if any tribes might attach significance to properties in Bexar County (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development 2022). FTA identified and contacted seven tribes. None responded with specific concerns regarding traditional cultural or ancestral properties, sacred sites, or properties of religious or cultural significance.

## Chapter 4. AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS

---

The APE for the proposed project is defined as “the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist. The area of potential effects is influenced by the scale and nature of an undertaking and may be different for different kinds of effects caused by the undertaking” (U.S. Congress 1966). These APEs were developed in consideration of the nature of the proposed undertaking, which has potential for both direct and indirect effects to historic properties.

In coordination with FTA and the SHPO, the APE for direct effects APE was established as the roadway right-of-way (ROW) within which the ART would operate. The indirect effects APE, for visual, auditory, and vibratory impacts, was established as a 150-foot buffer from areas of proposed property acquisition and station locations, and the roadway ROW elsewhere. Where property acquisition is proposed, the entirety of the impacted parcel was evaluated, even if only a portion of that parcel is in the APE. The APEs are depicted in Appendix B, Figure 2.

## Chapter 5. EXISTING CONDITIONS

---

### 5.1 Current Land Use

Land use in the project area is varied and includes commercial, domestic, educational, governmental, health care, industrial, recreational, religious, social, and transportation improvements. The north segment of the project includes SAT and some light industrial uses. Between SAT and I-35, the study area consists primarily of low-density commercial and domestic uses, with some educational, light industrial, recreational, and social facilities. The downtown segment has low- to high-density commercial, single- and multiple-family domestic, educational, governmental, health care, religious, and recreational uses. The

south segment has low-density commercial and domestic uses, with some educational, light industrial, and recreational facilities.

## 5.2 Previously Evaluated Historic Properties

Architectural historians from Stantec reviewed the THC's Texas Historic Sites Atlas (Atlas) for NRHP properties, Recorded Texas Historic Landmark (RTHL) designations, and Official Texas Historic Markers (OTHM) (Texas Historical Commission 2022). The Texas Department of Transportation's (TxDOT) Historic Resources of Texas Aggregator (Aggregator) dataset was reviewed (TxDOT 2022). The Atlas does not offer mapped locations of State Antiquities Landmarks (SALs), but the Aggregator does. Stantec architectural historians reviewed the THC map of properties previously determined eligible for the NRHP, recently conducted surveys in the project area, and the City of San Antonio Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) map of local historic landmarks and districts (Texas Historical Commission 2022; City of San Antonio Office of Historic Preservation).

**Table 2** enumerates properties listed in or previously determined eligible for the NRHP in the APE, **Table 3** lists OHP individual landmarks and local historic districts in the APE, and both data sets are depicted in **Appendix B, Figure 2**.

**Table 2 NRHP and NRHP-Eligible Properties in APE**

Property
Alamo National Bank
Alamo National Bank Building
Aztec Theater
Builders Exchange Building
David J. and May Bock Woodward House
Duplex at 1004 South Saint Mary's Street (Parcel 108832)
Gas Station (Parcel 108894)
House at 1010 South Saint Mary's Street (Parcel 108823)
Houston Street Bridge
James Butler Bonham Elementary School
King William Historic District
La Villita Historic District
Luby's Commercial Block
Mill Bridge
Mission Parkway District
Monte Vista Residential Historic District
Navarro Street Bridge
Pecan Street Bridge
Romana Street Bridge
Saint Mary's Bridge
San Antonio Downtown and River Walk Historic District
San Antonio Drug Company

Property
San Pedro Springs Park
South Alamo Street-South Saint Mary's Street Historic District
St. Mark's Episcopal Church
Staacke Brothers Building
Stevens Building
Travis Street Bridge
(Texas Historical Commission 2022; TxDOT 2022)

**Table 3** OHP Landmarks and Districts in the APE\*

Property
HS-0029
HS-0030
HS-0031
HS-0044
HS-0099
HS-0100
HS-0101
HS-0102
HS-0103
HS-0186
HS-0210
HS-0211
HS-0226
HS-0292
HS-0293
HS-0451
HS-0552
HS-0583
HS-0602
HS-0774
HS-0775
HS-0776
HS-0777
HS-0778
HS-0923
HS-0944

Property
HS-0955
HS-0996
HS-1047
HS-1053
HS-1062
HS-1065
HS-1078
HS-1081
HS-1082
HS-1083
HS-1166
HS-1199
HS-1245
602 West French Place, Altamira-Carrizo*
602 West French Place, City of San Antonio*
701-703 South Presa Street
Auditorium Circle Historic District
King William Historic District
La Villita Historic District
Lavaca Historic District
Mission Historic District
Monte Vista Historic District
Olmos Park Terrace Historic District
Ursuline Historic District

(City of San Antonio Office of Historic Preservation)

*\*Individual OHP landmarks are identified with a case number. OHP does not provide specific information regarding property name, historic significance, and resource type. Those with an asterisk do not have an assigned case number.*

*Note: In San Antonio, all properties within a local historic district are deemed contributing according to zoning regulations.*

### 5.3 Previous Relevant Historic Resources Study

An intensive-level historic resources survey of the NRHP-listed San Pedro Springs Park Historic District for the City of San Antonio was conducted in 2014 (Reed, Finney, and Rush 2014). The original nomination did not identify contributing and noncontributing status in the district, but the survey resulted in a detailed inventory that defined a classification for each resource. The 2014 survey recorded 34 historic-age resources (28 contributing resources, 11 of which were also considered individually eligible, and 6 noncontributing resources) (Reed, Finney, and Rush 2014). In addition, many properties in the blocks surrounding the park were documented at the reconnaissance level and evaluated in the same survey, which received concurrence from the THC. In accordance with the approved Research Design for the VIA N/S project, surveyed resources determined eligible in the 2014 San Pedro Springs Park Survey were field

verified for integrity and considered for effects. No such eligible resources were identified in the APE. Resources determined not eligible for the NRHP in the San Pedro Springs Park Survey (including the surrounding blocks) were not revisited/redocumented for the present survey.

## Chapter 6. LITERATURE REVIEW

---

### 6.1 Research Sources

Stantec architectural historians conducted research about the study area using the following sources:

- Atlas, THC
- Aggregator, TxDOT
- Preservation Explorer, OHP
- Bexar Appraisal District (CAD) property data, website
- Series of aerial images from the U.S. Geological Survey and Nationwide Environmental Title Research
- Series of topographic maps from the U.S. Geological Survey
- Series of county highway maps from the Texas State Highway Department, now TxDOT
- The Texas Freedom Colonies Project Atlas, website
- The Texas Almanac, website
- Handbook of Texas Online articles, including entries for San Antonio, Bexar County, and San Pedro Springs Park, Texas State Historical Association website
- City and/or county histories, newspapers, and vertical files or archival collections that may be at local libraries
- Bexar County Spanish Archives
- NRHP nominations and multiple-property listings
- Sanborn Map Company fire insurance maps
- Historic-period county or city online maps from Bexar County, Texas General Land Office, Library of Congress, university libraries, and similar websites
- The Portal to Texas History, University of North Texas Libraries website
- Subscription services with archival resources
- Virginia Savage McAlester, *A Field Guide to American Houses: The Definitive Guide to Identifying and Understanding America's Domestic Architecture*, 2015
- Previously prepared cultural resource management studies

## Chapter 7. METHODOLOGY

---

Stantec architectural historians meeting the Secretary of the Interior's (SOI) professional qualifications standards conducted a survey to identify historic-age resources in the APE, evaluate them for NRHP eligibility, and assess effects of the proposed undertaking on any historic properties. The architectural historians documented all resources within the APE that would be 45 years or older (built in or before 1980) at the time of proposed project construction in 2025. Non-historic-age resources on a parcel with one or more historic-age resources were photographed and included on an inventory form for a resource associated with the parcel. Historic-age railroad-related resources were documented, but railroad tracks



were not. Certain extraordinary non-historic-age resources were evaluated for significance achieved within the past 50 years.

The NRHP is a federal list of historic resources deemed worthy of preservation for their historic significance. The list is administered by the National Park Service (NPS), and inclusion in the list is an honorary and administrative designation bestowed upon properties that meet registration criteria. In general, for a property to be deemed eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, it must be at least 50 years old and must possess historic significance and integrity. Both individual properties and districts can be listed in the NRHP. Further, cemeteries, birthplaces or graves of historical figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, properties primarily commemorative in nature, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years are not ordinarily considered eligible for the NRHP. However, properties of these types will qualify for the NRHP if they fall within one of seven Criteria Considerations, or are an integral part of a historic district (Andrus 1995).

The NPS has established four criteria under which a property may be historically significant, and a resource must possess significance under at least one criterion to be eligible for listing in the NRHP. The four criteria are listed below.

- Criterion A. Properties associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- Criterion B. Properties associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- Criterion C. Properties 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.
- Criterion D. Properties that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (Andrus 1995).

The seven NPS Criteria Considerations addressing extraordinary properties are listed below.

- Criteria Consideration A: A religious property deriving primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance.
- Criteria Consideration B: A building or structure removed from its original location but which is significant primarily for architectural value, or which is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic person or event.
- Criteria Consideration C: A birthplace or grave of a historical figure of outstanding importance if there is no appropriate site or building directly associated with his or her productive life.
- Criteria Consideration D: A cemetery which derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events.
- Criteria Consideration E: A reconstructed building when accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan, and when no other building or structure with the same association has survived.

Criteria Consideration F: A property primarily commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own exceptional significance.

Criteria Consideration G: A property achieving significance within the past 50 years if it is of exceptional importance (Andrus 1995).

To assess visual effects, detailed maps and photographs illustrating where new construction would occur are included. These views show: the resource from the nearby proposed new construction; the opposing view, from the new construction to the resource; and the resource and area of new construction together.

## **7.1 Preparation for Field Investigations**

Before field investigations began, the architectural historians reviewed parcels in and intersecting the APE to preliminarily identify the likely locations of historic-age resources based on Bexar AD data and aerial imagery. They confirmed the likely construction dates of all resources in the APE during field investigations. Properties in the APE previously listed in or determined eligible for the NRHP were noted in a GIS layer.

## **7.2 Documentations Standards**

### **7.2.1 Photography**

During field investigations, the architectural historians documented each historic-age resource in the APE from public ROW with ground-level digital photographs. The photographs were sufficient in number and perspective to capture character-defining features, except when vegetation, automobiles, fences, or other objects obscured views. In such cases, limitations were noted on survey forms.

### **7.2.2 Numbering**

Grouped by parcel, each resource on the same parcel shares a unique identification number. Situations where associated resources are on overlapping parcels are noted. For parcels with multiple resources, alphabetical characters are also assigned (e.g., 1A, 1B, etc.). Resource numbers are assigned generally proceeding north to south and west to east. However, resource numbering continued as the project design progressed and additional properties were added to the APE.

### **7.2.3 Inventory Forms**

Inventory forms for each historic-age resource recount:

- Architectural style and/or form
- Architectural details, including exterior materials
- Comments section including historical background, description of nonhistoric resources on the parcel, historic property designations, and any investigations limitations encountered
- Construction date
- Latitude and longitude
- Photographs showing integrity issues and/or aerial images
- Physical address, when known
- Project name
- Survey resource identification number
- NRHP eligibility recommendations for Criteria A–D (Yes or No), Criterion Considerations A–G, as appropriate, and NRHP Historic District contributing resource recommendations (Recommended)

- NRHP Historic District contributing status (Yes or No) and/or NRHP individual properties (Listed)<sup>1</sup>
- Direct and indirect effects recommendation for eligible properties

## 7.2.4 Maps

Maps show:

- Project location and components on current aerial images
- APE and ROW boundaries
- Major street names and directional markers
- Locations of each documented historic-age resource
- Previously identified NRHP and OHP properties, SALs, and RTHLs in the APE
- Proposed boundaries for NRHP-eligible resources and potential historic districts

## Chapter 8. RESULTS

The survey documented historic-age resources at 304 locations—292 on land parcels and 12 on roadways—in the APE. In all, 423 historic-age resources built in or before 1980 were documented. Three extraordinary non-historic-age resources were evaluated for significance achieved within the past 50 years. The remaining 260 non-historic-age resources, on parcels with one or more historic-age resources, are included on the inventory form for a historic-age resource associated with the parcel but are not described in this report.

As a result of the survey, 13 properties are recommended individually eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. Five properties have already been determined eligible for the NRHP as the result of other surveys, totaling 18 resources recommended or already determined eligible for the NRHP within the survey area. Five resources were recommended contributing to existing NRHP historic districts and 35 resources were recommended contributing to two potential historic districts in Alta Vista and Olmos Park Terrace. In Monte Vista Historic District, two previously contributing resources were recommended as non-contributing based on deteriorative states, and one resource was recommended as a contributing resource. The remaining 409 historic-age resources are recommended not eligible for the NRHP. The resources recommended not eligible for the NRHP are summarized in Appendix D. Due to the evolving nature of the design, some properties that are documented in this report are no longer within the APE; they are retained here as they were already evaluated.

### 8.1 Property Types

Surveyed historic-age resources represent 24 property types in the survey APE. **Table 4** outlines the property types.

**Table 4** Surveyed Historic-Age Property Types

Function	Quantity
Agricultural/Outbuilding	1
Commerce/Business	95

<sup>1</sup> NRHP eligibility fields on inventory forms reflect NRHP Properties and Historic Districts only. For instance, a property may be contributing to an NRHP historic district (Yes) and be also individually listed on the NRHP. Listed status does not reflect local landmarks or districts; that information is discussed in the comments section of the form.

Function	Quantity
Commerce/Financial institution	2
Commerce/Professional	4
Commerce/Restaurant	16
Commerce/Specialty store	11
Commerce/Warehouse	10
Domestic/Single dwelling	131
Domestic/Multiple dwelling	25
Domestic/Secondary structure	49
Education/Library	4
Education/School	2
Healthcare/Hospital	1
Industry/Communications facility	1
Industry/Manufacturing	2
Landscape/Park	5
Landscape/Street furniture or object	39
Recreation and Culture/Outdoor recreation	2
Recreation and Culture/Theater	2
Religion/Church school	1
Religion/Religious facility	4
Social/Meeting hall	2
Transportation/Road-related	13
Unknown	1

## 8.2 Resources Recommended Individually Eligible for the NRHP

**Resource 58**, the Asbury United Methodist Church, was completed in 1958 and designed by architect Hugh D. Ledford and his associate Richard C. Slavin (*San Antonio Express* 1956, 12A). The congregation, founded in 1948, had several buildings constructed, including the 1953 original sanctuary (Resource 58C) on the parcel's southwest corner and the 1958 sanctuary complex (Resource 58A) (*San Antonio Light* 1953, 12; *San Antonio Express and News* 1958, 6B). The school building (Resource 58B) at the property's northwest corner was completed in 1962 (*San Antonio Express and News* 1962b). The parcel includes a historic-age spire (Resource 58D) on the south side, a historic-age sign (Resource 58E), and two historic-age roof awnings (Resources 58F and 58G) (**Appendix B, Figure 4**).

The Asbury United Methodist Church (Resource 58A) is recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of Architecture as an excellent local example of a Mid-Century Modern religious design. Constructed simultaneously with the church, the spire (Resource 58D), sign (Resource 58E), and folded plate roof awnings (Resources 58F and 58G) all contribute to the property's significance. The school building (Resource 58B), the 1953 original sanctuary (Resource 58C), and the two nonhistoric signs

(Resources 58H and 58I) are recommended noncontributing. With a steeply pitched roof forming a triangular or A-frame shape, buff-colored roman brick, concrete screens, and folded plate roof entrance awning, it embodies the distinctive characteristics of the style (Horak et al. 2021). The resource meets Criterion Consideration A as a religious property that derives its primary significance from its architectural importance. The parcel polygon is the recommended NRHP boundary.

**Resource 71** is the former 1962 Trim & Swim Health Spa (Resource 71A), constructed by Davis and Chandler Construction (*San Antonio Express* 1962, 1). The facility was the first of several San Antonio Trim & Swim Health Spa locations affiliated with Prestige Clubs around the world. Trim & Swim Health Spa, which operated from the building from 1962 until at least 1977, was advertised as the "world's most modern health studio" with more than 100 machines and apparatuses for exercise, a hot mineral swirl pool, a swimming pool surrounded by Grecian statues, sauna baths made of rocks imported from Finland, a desert dry heat room, a medicated inhalation room, an ultraviolet sun ray room, and a private outside sun deck. The facility had dressing rooms, a massage studio, and a doctor's office (*San Antonio Express and News* 1962a, 27; *San Antonio Express* 1977, 11D). Women were the company's targeted customers, but the spa welcomed men. The building is now a health center with an emphasis on physical therapy. The building is relatively unaltered and the swimming pool and sun deck are extant. The property has a historic-age commercial sign (Resource 71B) at the southwest corner of the parcel and a non-historic-age metal perimeter fence (Resource 71C) that encircles the parking lot. Resources 71B and 71 C are noncontributing (**Appendix B, Figure 5**).

The Trim & Swim Spa is recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A in the area of Health/Medicine as an excellent local example of the health and exercise movement of the 1960s. Its period of significance is from 1962 to 1977. This was one of the first luxury spa and health centers of its kind in San Antonio. Its success led to more locations on the north side. The building retains a high degree of physical integrity; the addition of fabric awnings is the only exterior modification. Its function remains true to the historic period since a wellness business occupies the space. The parcel polygon is the recommended NRHP boundary.

**Resource 78** is the 1937 International and Great Northern (I&GN) Railroad underpass built in 1937 by the Texas Highway Department as a grade-separated crossing between San Pedro Avenue and the I&GN Railroad. The underpass includes a pair of sidewalks, Art Deco style balustrade, and some decorative elements along the embankment. This resource is recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A for Transportation as an early instance of grade separation infrastructure constructed by the State of Texas. By 1937, planners and engineers began encouraging greater use of grade separation and bypass methods for improving traffic flow in urban centers (Texas Historical Commission 2013, p. 173). Although not a bypass, this underpass facilitated traffic along San Pedro Avenue, which at the time was the original route for U.S. Route 281, a major north-south thoroughfare between San Antonio and points north. Railroad traffic along the I&GN Railroad was also improved through San Antonio with the construction of the overpass, which is still in use today by Union Pacific (UP). Although modified, the bridge retains integrity for its association with Transportation. A recommended period of significance is ca. 1937 and the structure facility carrying San Pedro Avenue from Westwood Avenue to Ridgewood Court is recommended as the NRHP property boundary.

**Resource 117** is the 1949 Elsmere Apartment complex. The property has a two-story multiple-family residence (Resource 117A at 403 West Elsmere Place), a single-story multiple-family residence (Resource

117B at 411 West Elsmere Place), a detached garage with residence (Resource 117C at 407 West Elsmere Place) accessed from San Pedro Avenue, a bronze statue of the *Feudal King Riding in Battle* with stone base (Resource 117D) in the southeast corner of the parcel, and a non-historic-age shed (Resource 117E) (**Appendix B, Figure 6**). Resource 117A's interiors feature white walls with arched openings, wooden beams with painted decoration, and stained-glass windows. Resource 117C's garage bays were enclosed before 2007. Resources A, B, and C are included as an individual City of San Antonio Historic Landmark.

The dwellings (Resources 117A and 117B) and the statue (Resource 117D) are recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of Architecture as an excellent local example of the Spanish Colonial Revival style. Its period of significance is its year of construction, 1929. The garage and shed (Resources 117C and 117E) are recommended noncontributing. The complex embodies the distinguishing characteristics of the Spanish Colonial Revival style. The buildings have asymmetrical horizontal massing, low-pitched clay-tile roof, paneled wood doors, and arched fenestration. The buildings are ornamented with exquisite Spanish Revival details like embellished door openings with low-relief sculptural ornament, stained-glass windows, and decorative tile and vents. Integrity of workmanship and materials have been diminished by the removal of some original window sashes; however, all other design features, materials, and traits of workmanship appear intact. The parcel polygon is the recommended NRHP boundary.

**Resource 137A** is the Gothic Revival style Mark Twain Junior High School built in 1923 as one of the eight original junior high schools in the San Antonio Independent School District (SAISD) (SAISD 2022). The resource is associated with the history of the SAISD, reflecting a period of rapid expansion during the 1920s. With its brick exterior, decorative parapet, and stylized door openings, the resource is an example of a Gothic Revival-style school building that embodies important trends in educational programmatic theory from the Progressive era. These trends included the incorporation of specialized classrooms and ancillary buildings into the building's original plan that reflect curricular goals, such as a vocational training building and recreational building. It is recommended eligible under Criteria A and C for its significant association with the educational history of San Antonio and for possessing the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. The school is also recommended as contributing to a potential Alta Vista Historic District.

**Resource 149A** is a Classical Revival dwelling constructed for B. L. and Blanche Ellen Naylor in about 1904. North Carolina-native B. L. Naylor (1854–1910) and Illinois native Blanche Ellen (1864–1938) married in 1882 and had one child, Brazillis (U.S. Department of Commerce and Labor 1913). In 1910, just a few years after the house was built, Naylor was a rancher and he served on the Lockwood National Bank Board of Directors in the late 1900s (*San Antonio Gazette* 1909; U.S. Department of Commerce and Labor 1913). The residence was converted to a coffee house in the 1960s and later a movie theater (*San Antonio Express* 1968, 9A). Today, it is used as commercial offices. A carriage house originally at the parcel's southwest corner was demolished. A contemporaneous retaining wall with balusters and a carriage block (Resource 149B) are extant and on the parcel's west side (**Appendix B, Figure 7**).

The Naylor House (Resource 149A) is recommended eligible for the NRHP at the local level under Criterion A in the area of Community Planning and Development for associations with local early residential development in the Monte Vista neighborhood. It is also recommended eligible under Criterion C in the area of Architecture as an excellent local example of Classical Revival design. For both criteria, the period of significance is the building's approximate construction date, 1904. The retaining wall and carriage block (Resource 149B) is considered contributing. Slightly north of downtown, Monte

Vista was initially developed around the turn of the twentieth century as an opulent suburb for prominent residents. Streetcar routes and automobile networks influenced this expansive suburban burst of domestic improvements. The Naylor dwelling embodies the distinctive characteristics of Classical Revival style, most notably a one-story entry porch that Doric columns support; the original porch roof balustrade has been removed. The resource's integrity of materials and workmanship have been diminished with the removal of the original doors and window sashes and some deterioration. Repurposing of nearby San Pedro Avenue dwellings for commercial uses alters the setting. Historic aerial images suggest the carriage house was removed during the historic period, with the concrete carriage block a vestige of its existence (Nationwide Environmental Title Research 1973, 1983). Nevertheless, the dwelling retains overall design and form, materials, and related workmanship. The parcel polygon is the recommended NRHP boundary.

**Resource 180A**, the San Antonio Central Library building, was designed by Mexican architect Ricardo Legorreta (1931–2011) and constructed in 1995. The building is a paragon of the architect's culturally inspired style characterized by bold use of color, stark geometric forms, and lattice-like wall perforations, to create a uniquely Mexican architecture. Legorreta studied architecture at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México and later under José Villagrán García, who was among the post-revolutionary generation of architects that catalyzed Mexico's Modernist movement. With his 1963 entry into private practice, Legorreta began responding to Mexican Modernism's overt nationalism championed by architects such as Villagrán, and later, Juan O'Gorman and Enrique del Moral, who viewed wall space as an expressive location to communicate Mexican culture (O'Rourke 2017). Legorreta, mindful of the preeminence of walls in Mexican culture, turned from expressionism towards abstraction and the use of walls to create remarkable interior-focused spaces (Noelle 2012; O'Rourke 2017). As a disciple of and collaborator with Luis Barragán, Legorreta's break with Mexican Modernism became complete and his characteristic Mexican-influenced design ethos fully emerged (Olsen 2022). His far-flung work has been built at Georgetown University in Qatar, Pavilion Hacienda Matao in Brazil, Bancomer Tower in Mexico City, Managua Metropolitan Cathedral, and Pershing Square in Los Angeles. These, but especially the San Antonio Central Library, typify his synthesis of Mexican-inspired vernacular design elements including nearly windowless wall volumes that prioritize interiority and privacy, bright pigments that evoke folk art, and large interior spaces inspired by pre-Columbian plazas (O'Rourke 2017). Legorreta received numerous eminent awards and was the first Latin American to accept the International Union of Architects Gold Medal in 1999, the American Institute of Architects Gold Medal in 2000, and the Japan Art Association Praemium Imperiale in 2011.

As an extravagant interpretation of Mexican architecture and the work of internationally renowned master architect Legorreta, the 1995 library is recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C, in the area of Architecture. It is eligible at the local level of significance. The building is likely eligible at the state level of significance, but the comparative analysis required for such a recommendation is beyond the scope of this reconnaissance-level project. The building exudes Legorreta's vibrant architectural ethos—a synthesis of space, mass, form, color, shadow, and light that created remarkable functional spaces. Since the building is less than 50 years old, it meets Criterion Consideration G. Legorreta's work has been analyzed in peer-reviewed articles since at least 1987, providing historical perspective. This is his only San Antonio work; his other Texas projects are limited to a Fort Worth museum, a Corpus Christi museum expansion, and in Dallas, the Latino Cultural Center and part of a shopping complex. His only other library project in the United States is in Chula Vista, California. These comparative buildings have similar significance and historical associations; however, as one of Legorreta's most exuberant designs,



the San Antonio Library is a dazzling portrayal of his work. The San Antonio building, with its brightly painted stucco and stone exterior, evokes the volcanic rock commonly used in Mexican construction more accurately than the Fort Worth Museum's brick cladding. Similarly, the library's interior motor court, an element the Fort Worth, Chula Vista, and Corpus Christi buildings lack, foreshadows the library's interior full-height atrium. Both spaces exemplify Legorreta's culturally inspired attention to interior spaces. The building is the most comprehensive of these comparable works and best communicates the architect's design ethos. Resource 180B, the library's parking deck, was constructed before the library and refashioned. It is recommended non-contributing (**Appendix B, Figure 8**). The parcel polygon is the recommended NRHP boundary.

## **Resource 215**

### Individual Eligibility

*Criterion C:* Resource 215, comprised of Resources 215A-F, is recommended individually eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C at the local level of significance in the area of architecture as the property is a good representative example of its type. Even though the former single dwellings are now used as a hotel, their function remains domestic. Resources 215A-D, four double gallery Colonial Revival houses with Queen Anne features retain their architectural integrity and each contribute to the property. Resources 215E, a non-historic age resource, and 215F, a small object, are non-contributing to the property.

*Criteria A, B and D:* No associations were identified linking the property to persons or events of historic importance. Because the buildings offer neither a local interpretation of a standard design nor an undocumented construction technique, they have limited potential to yield important information. As a result, the property recommended not eligible for individual listing in the NRHP under Criterion A, B, or D.

### Relationship to La Villita

The property is located within the La Villita historic district's NRHP boundary but is inconsistent with the vernacular building types described in the nomination. It is therefore recommended non-contributing to the La Villita historic district.

**Resource 218A**, the Oliver de Werthern House, is recommended individually eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C at the local level of significance in the area of architecture as a good representative example of its type. No associations were identified linking the property to persons or events of historic importance. Because the building offers neither a local interpretation of a standard design nor an undocumented construction technique, it has limited potential to yield important information. As a result, it is recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion A, B, or D. The property is a City of San Antonio individual historic landmark. The property is located within the La Villita historic district's NRHP boundary but is inconsistent with the vernacular building types described in the nomination. It is recommended non-contributing to the historic district.

**Resource 219A**, the Ernst Homestead, is recommended individually eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C at the local level of significance in the area of architecture as a good representative example of its type. No associations were identified linking the property to persons or events of historic importance. Because the building offers neither a local interpretation of a standard design nor an undocumented construction technique, it has limited potential to yield important information. As a



result, it is recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion A, B, or D. The property is a City of San Antonio individual historic landmark. The property is located within the La Villita historic district's NRHP boundary but is inconsistent with the vernacular building types described in the nomination. It is recommended non-contributing to the historic district.

**Resource 239B** is the Big Pig; a Programmatic/Mimetic commercial structure shaped like a pig. Built of concrete and steel, the 14-foot tall Big Pig was constructed by Mexican mason Anastacio Gaytan in 1935 for the Pig Stand Coffee Shop chain. The building, originally located at the chain's restaurant (Pig Stand #25) on Broadway at I-35, functioned as a car-hop shelter. Between 1989 and 1995, it was located at the Humbert O'Con Tavern near the intersection of Roosevelt Avenue and East White Avenue. It was moved to 1604 S. Presa Street in 1995 and subsequently moved to its current location in 1996, adjacent to the location of Pig Stand #24. The building has since been restored by local artist Carlos Cortes (King William Association 2022). It originally featured window openings at the southern ends of the east and west elevations that have since been infilled. Existing window sashes within the glass block surrounds were also replaced at an unknown date. The property also includes two other historic-age buildings located to the east of the resource.

The Big Pig is recommended individually eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C at the local level of significance in the area of architecture as an exceedingly rare example of programmatic architecture. Regarding Criterion Consideration B, which addresses moved properties, such properties can be historically significant if they still have an orientation, setting, and general environment that are comparable to those of the historic location and that are compatible with the property's significance (Andrus 1995). As the Big Pig is adjacent to the location of Pig Stand #24, it satisfies the Criterion Consideration. No associations were identified linking the property to persons or events of historic importance. Because the building offers neither a local interpretation of a standard design nor an undocumented construction technique, it has limited potential to yield important information. As a result, it is recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion A, B, or D.

**Resource 262** is the 1937 South Saint Mary's Street underpass the Central Bitulithic Company built under a Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad (MKT) Railroad bridge for the Texas State Highway Department. The four-lane underpass has flanking sidewalks with stylized concrete guardrails with decorative quatrefoil reliefs along the walls and a single concrete lamp post on the guardrail. The guardrail originally featured multiple lamp posts. The MKT rail bridges over the underpass are plate-girder bridges. The north overpass carries two railbeds and the smaller south overpass carries a single railbed. The south rail bridge has been out of service since 1995 when its track and corresponding railroad bridge over the San Antonio River was removed. The line was part of a wye to the east, dividing rails eastbound toward Houston and Austin.

The South Saint Mary's Street underpass is recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A in the area of Transportation at the local level of significance with a period of significance of 1937 to 1980. Although the underpass is in the NRHP-listed Mission Parkway Historic District, it was constructed after the district's period of significance ends in 1899, and it is not identified in the nomination (Clark et al. 1975). The Bureau of Public Roads (BPR) funded construction of this bridge. During the Great Depression, the BPR received enhanced funding under New Deal programs (Moore 2016). This underpass is similar to the 1937 Nogalitos Street underpass, which is not decorated with quatrefoil reliefs. It is notable for passing under the MKT Railroad before the line splits. As the only railroad bypass between the San Antonio River to the west and Hackberry Street to the east, this underpass fostered population growth on

the south side of the city (U.S. Geological Survey 1959). Although some lamp posts are missing and the guardrail has been partially damaged, the bridge remains otherwise unaltered and is still in use. Both overpass rail bridges remain, conserving the resource's setting. The property's footprint is the recommended NRHP boundary (**Appendix B, Figure 9**).

**Resource 264A**, the 1929 Roosevelt Park Public Library, was the first branch library in the San Antonio Public Library system. John M. Marriott was the architect and W. H. Wolter was the contractor. The building served as a library branch until its 1968 closure when it became offices for the Police and Fire Pension fund (SA2020 2018). The resource was converted to a commercial/retail function in 2014. The parcel also has a historic-age sign (Resource 264B) and a historic-age masonry wall (Resource 264C) (**Appendix B, Figure 10**).

The Roosevelt Park Public Library (Resource 264A) is recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A at the local level in the area of Community Planning and Development for its association with local public library development. Its period of significance is 1929 to 1968, during which the building was in use as a library. The sign (Resource 264B) and stone wall (Resource 264C) are not contemporary with Resource A and are recommended non-contributing. Branches provided library and community services to neighborhoods removed from the main library, usually positioned centrally in a downtown or a primary commercial area. As the first branch in the local system, the resource is closely associated with the extension of library and community services outside of downtown San Antonio. The parcel polygon is the recommended NRHP boundary.

## **8.3 Resources Potentially Individually Eligible for the NRHP**

### **8.3.1 405 West Gramercy Place & 701 South St. Mary's Street**

Upon consultation, THC indicated further evaluation would be necessary to determine the NRHP eligibility of these properties but agreed that no further evaluation is warranted at this time.

## **8.4 Historic District NRHP Eligibility Recommendations**

### **8.4.1 NRHP-Listed Historic Districts**

**King William Historic District** was listed in the NRHP in 1972 with Architecture as the area of significance and no criteria indicated at the time of its publication. The contributing status of the following surveyed resources in the NRHP-listed King William Historic District was affirmed:

- Resource 223A; an 1869-70 Italianate dwelling (Anton Wulff House)

**La Villita Historic District** was listed in the NRHP in 1972 with Architecture as the area of significance and no criteria indicated at the time of its publication. The nomination did not classify resources as contributing or noncontributing to a property. The nomination describes two vernacular building types that characterize the district: Mexican-influenced buildings of stucco-covered brick or caliche block, and German-influenced masonry buildings with modest architectural detail.

The contributing status of the following surveyed resources in the NRHP-listed La Villita Historic District was affirmed:

- Resource 217; an 1896 German-influenced vernacular dwelling (Walter C. Tynan House)
- Resource 220A; an 1868 German-influenced vernacular dwelling (William Richter House)

The status of these surveyed resources in the NRHP-listed La Villita Historic District was evaluated based on the district's defined vernacular characteristics. These resources are considered inconsistent with the ethnic-influenced vernacular building focus on which the NRHP listing is based. As a result, the following surveyed resources are recommended noncontributing to the historic district:

- Resource 214; ca. 1900 commercial building (Brown Legal Building)
- Resources 215A–C; 1903 Colonial Revival single-family dwellings
- Resource 215D; a 1903 Queen Anne single-family dwelling
- Resource 216; a 1930 apartment building of no apparent style
- Resource 218A; a 1910 Queen Anne single-family dwelling (Oliver de Werthern House)
- Resource 219A; a ca. 1890 Queen Anne single-family dwelling (Ernst Homestead)
- Resource 221; a ca. 1911 commercial building

The **Mission Parkway Historic District** was listed in the NRHP in 1975 with Archaeology (Prehistoric and Historic), Agriculture, Architecture, and Art as the areas of significance and no criteria indicated at the time of its publication. The contributing status of the following surveyed resources was affirmed:

- Resource 263; the 1912 Roosevelt Park (Training Area for Teddy Roosevelt's Rough Riders)

The **Monte Vista Residential Historic District** was listed in the NRHP in 1998 under Criterion A in the area of Community Planning and Development with a period of significance from 1882 to 1950. The status of the surveyed resources in the NRHP-listed district was re-evaluated based on the district's defined area of significance and registration requirements for contributing status. With the exception of one property (dwelling and ancillary building), the status of each surveyed resource previously considered noncontributing was affirmed. The contributing status of the following surveyed resources was affirmed:

- Resource 88; a 1928 Craftsman dwelling
- Resource 89A; a 1928 Craftsman dwelling
- Resource 89B; a 1928 garage
- Resource 90A; a 1929 Craftsman dwelling
- Resource 91A; a 1929 Craftsman dwelling
- Resource 91B; a ca. 1929 garage
- Resource 92A; a 1927 Tudor Revival dwelling
- Resource 92B; a 1927 garage
- Resource 93A; a 1928 Craftsman dwelling
- Resource 94A; a 1928 Craftsman dwelling
- Resource 94B; a 1927 garage
- Resource 107A; a 1927 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 107B; a ca. 1925 garage
- Resource 108A; a 1924 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling (Crenshaw House)
- Resource 108B; a ca. 1924 garage
- Resource 107B; a ca. 1924 garage
- Resource 111; a 1925 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling (Charles Bamberger House)

- Resource 118A; a ca. 1920 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 118B; a ca. 1920 Spanish Colonial Revival carriage house
- Resource 118C; a 1911 entry gate pylon
- Resource 119A; a ca. 1925 Craftsman dwelling
- Resource 119B; a ca. 1925 maid's quarters
- Resource 120A; a ca. 1935 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 120B; a ca. 1935 garage
- Resource 126A; a 1923 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 120B; a 1923 secondary domestic structure
- Resource 126C; a 1911 entry gate pylon
- Resource 127A; a 1928 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 131A; a 1921 Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 131B; a ca. 1921 secondary domestic structure
- Resource 132A; a 1929 Tudor Revival dwelling
- Resource 132B; a ca. 1929 garage
- Resource 136; a 1925 Craftsman dwelling
- Resource 140; a 1928 Streamline Moderne building
- Resource 147A; a 1904 Classical Revival dwelling
- Resource 147B; a 1911 secondary domestic structure
- Resource 150A; a 1922 Renaissance Revival building (Walker Apartments building)
- Resource 150B; a ca. 1922 garage and maid's quarters
- Resource 152; a 1930 commercial strip center of no style
- Resource 153A; a ca. 1906 Queen Anne dwelling
- Resource 153B; a ca. 1906 secondary domestic structure
- Resource 290A; a 1924 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 290B; a 1924 Spanish Colonial Revival secondary domestic structure

As a result of the survey, the following formerly contributing surveyed resources are recommended as noncontributing based on loss of physical integrity:

- Resource 141A; a 1909 Craftsman dwelling
- Resource 141B; a 1909 garage and maid's quarters

The following surveyed resource is in the Monte Vista Residential Historic District's boundary but was not yet 50 years old in 1998, when the property was listed. The property is now more 50 years old and is recommended contributing to the historic district:

- Resource 115; a 1950 Ranch style dwelling (Zeke La Hood House)

The **San Antonio Downtown and River Walk Historic District** was listed in the NRHP in 2016 with Architecture, Community Planning and Development, and Commerce as the areas of significance. The period of significance for the district is 1854-1970. The district encompasses the city's central business district, government center, theatre district, and River Walk complex. A variety of late 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century architectural styles are present, including Art Deco, Classical Revival, Corporate Modernism,

Beaux Arts Classicism, Late Gothic Revival, Mission/Spanish Colonial Revival, Moderne, New Formalism, and Italian Renaissance.

As a result of the survey, the contributing status of the following surveyed resources was affirmed:

- Resource 182; the 1915 North St. Mary's Street Bridge (between Navarro and Convent Streets)
- Resource 183; the 1921 Romana Street Bridge
- Resource 184; a 1929 Commercial style building (Southwestern Bell Building)
- Resources 185A-B; the ca. 1943 San Antonio Greyhound Bus Station and Baggage Claim
- Resource 186; a ca. 1935 Commercial style building (Texas Savings and Loan Association building)
- Resource 187; a 1959 Commercial style building (First Federal Savings building)
- Resource 188; an 1865 Gothic Revival church complex (St. Mark's Episcopal Church)
- Resource 189; the 1927 Pecan Street Bridge
- Resource 190; a 1925 Commercial style building (Builders Exchange Building)
- Resource 191; a 1927 Spanish Eclectic style building (Green Gate Club)
- Resource 192A; a 1924 Commercial style building (Travis Building)
- Resource 193; the 1925 Houston Street Bridge
- Resource 195; the 1925 St. Mary's Street Bridge (between Crockett and College Streets)
- Resource 196; the 1922 Navarro Street Bridge
- Resource 197; a 1938 Commercial style building (The Esquire building)
- Resource 198; a 1926 Commercial/Exotic Revival building (Aztec Theatre)
- Resource 199A; an 1894 Renaissance Revival style building (Staacke Bros. Building)
- Resource 199B; an 1891 Richardsonian Romanesque style building (Stevens Building)
- Resource 200; a 1929 Art Deco building (Alamo National Bank Building)
- Resources 201-202; a ca. 1920 Commercial style building (Flannery Building)
- Resource 203; an 1880 Commercial style building (Pancoast Building-Kampman House)
- Resource 204; a 1910 Commercial style building
- Resource 205; a 1902 Renaissance Revival building (Old Alamo National Bank Building)
- Resource 207; a ca. 1926 Commercial style building
- Resource 210; a 1919 Commercial style building (San Antonio Drug Company Building)
- Resource 211; the 1915 South St. Mary's Bridge (between Market and Villita Streets)
- Resource 212; the 1922 Mill Bridge
- Resource 213; a 1925 Art Deco building (Hermann Sons Grand Lodge)
- Resource 292A; a 1970 New Formalism building (Travis Park West building)
- Resources 293A-B; the 1870 Travis Park and World War I Memorial within the square
- Resource 294; the 1930-41 San Antonio River Walk and Flood Control System
- Resource 303; a 1927 Commercial/Spanish Baroque style building (Hendrick Building)

The **South Alamo Street-South Saint Mary's Street Historic District** was listed in the NRHP in 1984 with Architecture and Commerce as the areas of significance and no criteria indicated at the time of its publication. The nomination did not classify resources as contributing or noncontributing. The district reflects efforts of the city's earliest developers and demonstrate the transformation of vernacular forms, the appearance and variety of or popular architectural styles, and patterns of urban development.

As a result of the survey, the contributing status of the following surveyed resources was affirmed:

- Resources 226A-B; an 1889 school building and flagpole (Bonham Academy)
- Resource 232A; a 1900 Queen Anne dwelling (Richard Jochimsen House)
- Resource 232C; a 1925 dwelling of no specific style
- Resource 233, a ca. 1910 Queen Anne dwelling (Juan B. Carreon House)
- Resource 241A, a 1915 Eastlake/Stick dwelling (Jean Gray House)
- Resource 246; a 1910 Queen Anne dwelling (Anselma Padilla House)
- Resource 248A, an 1899–1949 Spanish Colonial Revival church and school (Westminster Presbyterian Church)
- Resources 249A-B, a 1920 Craftsman dwelling and detached garage (Isaias C. Juarez House)

The South Alamo Street-South Saint Mary’s Street Historic District boundary consists of the west block of South Alamo Street, the west block of South Saint Mary’s Street, Temple Street, and the San Antonio River. Temple Street was renamed Eagleland Drive at an unknown date. The district’s boundary justification mentions a hard edge of commercial development on South Saint Mary’s Street’s east side that eroded the residential cohesiveness with “modern” development. A number of extant domestic resources in the blocks encompassed by South Alamo, South Presa, West Carolina, and South Saint Mary’s Streets are consistent in character, style, age, form, scale, and materials with those of the historic district. The APEs do not include the entirety of this area, but as the result of appraising the vicinity and its resources, a boundary expansion is recommended for the NRHP listing that would include the following blocks with these contributing surveyed resources:

- Resource 251; a 1906 Folk Victorian single-family dwelling
- Resource 227; a 1914 Classical Revival single-family dwelling
- Resource 228; a ca. 1890 Italianate former single-family dwelling (A.L. Sartor House)
- Resource 229; a ca. 1912 Classical Revival multiple-family dwelling;  
TxDOT determined this building individually eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A (CSJ 0915-12-252) (TxDOT 2022)
- Resource 297A; a 1925 Craftsman bungalow

## **8.4.2 Districts Potentially Eligible for the NRHP**

### **8.4.2.1 Alta Vista**

**Alta Vista** is one of several north central neighborhoods developed as San Antonio expanded in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries (Alta Vista Neighborhood Association 2023). By 1890, San Antonio streetcar lines 1 and 19 boosted the appeal of Alta Vista as an early streetcar suburb, along with the popularity of San Pedro Springs Park to the south of the neighborhood (Texas Transportation Museum 2022). The neighborhood is generally bounded by Hildebrand Avenue to the north, San Pedro Avenue to the east, Myrtle and Hickman Streets to the south, and the UP (formerly I&GN Railroad) ROW to the west.

The district is not currently listed in the NRHP or as a local historic district. Because only a portion of the neighborhood is within the APE, a full evaluation of all properties was outside the scope of this project. It is likely that an eligible historic district is present within the boundaries of the neighborhood described above, with significance under Criterion A in the area of Community Planning and Development for its associations with early suburban development along San Antonio’s streetcar network. Various early twentieth century academic eclectic architectural styles are present within the neighborhood, providing the potential for eligibility under Criteria C for Architecture as well. A preliminary period of significance is

recommended as ca. 1890 to ca. 1955, which captures the primary period of development for both the residential properties and the commercial resources along the San Pedro corridor.

Surveyed resources recommended contributing to the potential historic district were constructed within the period of significance and are similar to other buildings in the district. Twenty-seven of the historic-age properties in the APE within the Alta Vista neighborhood are recommended as contributing to a potential district. The surveyed resources recommended contributing to the district are:

- Resource 101A; a ca. 1940 Craftsman bungalow
- Resource 102; a ca. 1950 Spanish Colonial Revival building (Crystal Pistol Tavern)
- Resource 103A; a 1926 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 104A; a 1926 Mission Revival apartment building (Tropicana Apartments)
- Resource 105A; a 1927 Tudor Revival dwelling
- Resource 109A; a ca. 1940 Spanish Colonial Revival apartment building
- Resource 110A; a 1950 Renaissance Revival apartment building
- Resource 114; a 1934 Mission Revival apartment building
- Resources 117A-B; a 1929 Spanish Colonial Revival apartment complex (Elsmere Apartments)
- Resource 117D; a ca. 1929 sculpture, *Feudal King Riding in Battle*
- Resources 122 A-B; a ca. 1925 Mission Revival dwelling and detached garage
- Resource 123; a 1915 Mission Revival dwelling
- Resource 124; a 1940 Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 128; a 1930 Spanish Colonial Revival apartment building
- Resources 129A-B; a 1929 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling and additional dwelling on the parcel of no particular style
- Resource 133A; a 1926 Romanesque Revival dwelling
- Resource 137A; a 1923 Gothic Revival school building (Mark Twain Junior High School)
- Resources 137B-C; a 1937 Rustic building and associated stone wall built by the Works Progress Administration (Twain Academy Recreation Building)
- Resource 145A; a ca. 1955 French Eclectic restaurant (Toddle House)
- Resource 149A-B; a ca. 1904 Neoclassical dwelling (The Naylor House) and associated landscape
- Resource 291A; a 1950 apartment building of no particular style
- Resource 302; a 1927 Colonial Revival dwelling

No further study of the district is recommended for this project, as the contributing resources within APE lack any potential for adverse effects.

#### **8.4.2.2 Olmos Park Terrace**

The OHP **Olmos Park Terrace** Historic District is an early twentieth century residential subdivision originally platted in 1931 by developer H.C. Thorman's Northside Improvement Company. Thorman's earliest work as a builder began in 1907. By 1922, Thorman had developed area neighborhoods including Olmos Park, Park Hill Estates, Country Club Place, and West Ashby Place in Tobin Hill. He built approximately 750 dwellings in San Antonio, averaging 20 to 40 houses per year.

The district is a local San Antonio Historic District and is conservatively recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A in the area of Community Planning and Development for its associations with local suburban development. Its period of significance is recommended as 1931 to 1945. H. C. Thorman



designed many of the district's Minimal Traditional and English Stone Cottage houses. Surveyed resources recommended contributing to the potential historic district were constructed within the period of significance and are similar to other buildings in the district. The surveyed resources recommended contributing to the district are:

- Resource 27, a 1939 Minimal Ranch dwelling
- Resource 28; a 1939 Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 29; a 1942 Minimal Traditional dwelling
- Resource 37; a 1939 English Stone Cottage dwelling
- Resource 289A; a 1942 Minimal Traditional dwelling
- Resource 301A; a 1938 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 301B; a ca. 1938 secondary domestic structure of no particular style

Because the local district extends well beyond the VIA APE, full evaluation of the district to make comprehensive NRHP contributing/noncontributing classifications and an NRHP boundary recommendation was outside the scope of this project. However, no further study of the district is recommended for this project, as the district resources within APE lack any potential for adverse effects.

#### **8.4.2.3 San Pedro Avenue Commercial Corridor**

The length of San Pedro Avenue between I-35 north to Loop I-410 was considered as a potential commercial historic district. This corridor was the principal north/south thoroughfare from downtown San Antonio to its northern suburbs until 1978 when construction of US 281 was complete. Surveyed commercial resources along the corridor can be generally grouped into four clusters, ranging from north to south:

- Loop I-410 to Basse Road: There are 19 commercial resources in this cluster, including 8 strip centers with at least 3 commercial spaces (Resources 4A, 5A, 6A, 7A, 13A, 14A, 17A, and 33) and 2 restaurants that have been modified from their original appearance (Resources 24A and 8A). One building was constructed in the 1950s, 8 in the 1960s, and 10 in the 1970s.
- Clower Street to Hildebrand Avenue: There are 17 buildings constructed between 1946 and 1980 in this cluster. Three of the buildings are former gasoline stations (Resources 53, 59, and 68), a former movie theater completely modified from its original use and appearance (Resource 72), and a single-family dwelling now in commercial use (Resource 55).
- Mulberry Avenue to Woodlawn Avenue: This cluster has two 1-part commercial blocks (Resources 140 and 152) and five other commercial buildings. Construction dates range from 1928 to 1966 with three built in the 1950s.
- I-35 to Myrtle Street: This group has a mix of 17 buildings with multiple commercial building forms (Resources 154, 158, 160, and 161). Construction dates range from 1911 to 1978, with most built between 1950 and 1969.

The commercial resources along San Pedro Avenue, whether considered as clusters or as a totality of commercial buildings along the entire corridor, are united neither historically nor aesthetically, by plan, or physical development. Building forms range from one-part commercial blocks to strip centers and include a number of resources that have been completely changed from their original use or appearance. In summary, these resources do not constitute a cohesive district or disparate districts.



## 8.5 Effects

### 8.5.1 Direct Effects

#### 8.5.1.1 NRHP Historic Resources

Direct effect impacts for eligible resources are summarized below. For NRHP-eligible or listed properties or historic districts where new ROW, new station locations, or construction activities are proposed, the project poses no adverse direct effects.

**Resource 118** is a ca. 1920 domestic complex constructed consisting of a dwelling, a carriage house, and an entry-gate pylon. Resources 118A and 118B are Spanish Colonial Revival domestic buildings that contribute to the NRHP-listed Monte Vista Residential Historic District; Resource 118C, a 1911 entry-gate pylon is also contributing. A taking of approximately 0.024 acres from the parcel is proposed. Although Resource 118C appears to be within the footprint of the proposed ROW (**Appendix D, photographs 10, 11 and 14**), VIA has indicated that the resource would not be disturbed. A determination of **no adverse direct effect** is recommended.

**Resource 137**, the 1923 Mark Twain Junior High School consists of the primary school building, a historic-age masonry wall, a nonhistoric sign, and a nonhistoric building. The primary school building is recommended NRHP-eligible and the secondary building contributing. A taking of approximately 0.007 acres is proposed from the parcel and a station would be located within the ROW adjacent to this parcel. The building is not within the footprint of the proposed ROW and is outside of proposed construction activities. A determination of **no adverse direct effect** is recommended.

**Resource 147**, a 1904 Neoclassical dwelling, is a contributing resource to the NRHP-listed Monte Vista Historic District. No taking would occur, but stations would be located within the ROW adjacent to the historic house. The building is not within the footprint of the proposed stations and is outside of proposed construction activities (**Appendix D, photographs 18-20**). A determination of **no adverse direct effect** is recommended.

**Resource 149**, The Naylor House, is a ca. 1904 Neoclassical dwelling recommended individually eligible for the NRHP and contributing to the recommended eligible Alta Vista Historic District. No ROW is proposed here, but a station would be located within the ROW adjacent to the historic house. The building and contributing carriage step are outside of proposed construction activities (**Appendix D, photographs 18-20**). A determination of **no adverse direct effect** is recommended.

**Resource 180**, the San Antonio Central Library, is recommended individually eligible for the NRHP. A taking of approximately 0.011 acres from the parcel is proposed. The building is not within the footprint of the proposed ROW and is outside of proposed construction activities. The ROW may impact a non-historic sidewalk, but this resource does not contribute to Resource 180 (**Appendix D, photographs 18-20**). A determination of **no adverse direct effect** is recommended.

**Resource 226**, the 1889 James Butler Bonham Elementary School, is listed in the NRHP. The school also contributes to the South Alamo Street-South Saint Mary's Street Historic District. Resources 226A and 226B are contributing and Resources C-E, all non-historic-age resources, are noncontributing. A taking of approximately 0.003 acres from the parcel is proposed. The building is not within the footprint of the proposed ROW and is outside of proposed construction activities. The ROW may impact a non-historic

sidewalk, but this resource does not contribute to Resource 226 (**Appendix D, photographs 18-20**). A determination of **no adverse direct effect** is recommended.

**Resource 251** is a 1906 Folk Victorian dwelling that is recommended contributing to a recommended expansion of the NRHP-listed South Alamo Street-South Saint Mary's Street Historic District. A taking of approximately 0.009 acres from the parcel is proposed. The building is not within the footprint of the proposed ROW and is outside of proposed construction activities. The ROW may impact a sidewalk along South Saint Mary's Street, but this resource does not contribute to Resource 251 (**Appendix D, photographs 24-26**). A determination of **no adverse direct effect** is recommended.

**Resource 263**, Roosevelt Park, is a contributing resource in the NRHP-listed Mission Parkway Historic District. A taking of approximately 0.039 acres from the parcel is proposed. No historic-age buildings, structures, or objects within the park are within the footprint of the proposed ROW and proposed construction activities (**Appendix D, photographs 27-29**). A determination of **no adverse direct effect** is recommended.

**Resource 264**, the former Roosevelt Public Library, includes Resource 264A, the library building; Resource 264B, a masonry sign; and Resource 264C, a stone wall. Resources 264B and 264C are considered non-contributing. A taking of approximately 0.010 acres from the parcel is proposed. The building is not within the footprint of the proposed ROW and is outside of proposed construction activities (**Appendix D, photographs 30-32**). A determination of **no adverse direct effect** is recommended.

#### 8.5.1.2 Potential NRHP Historic Resources

Direct effect impacts are summarized below for properties within the Olmos Park Terrace Local Historic District and Alta Vista neighborhood. **Table 5** outlines impacts along San Pedro Avenue in the Alta Vista neighborhood.

Although the Olmos Park Terrace local historic district is not definitively recommended eligible for the NRHP, for purposes of Section 106 compliance, effects are discussed here. **Resource 27**, a 1939 Minimal Ranch dwelling, would be contributing to a potential Olmos Park Terrace historic district. A taking of approximately 0.003 acres from the parcel is proposed. Because the building is not within the footprint of the proposed ROW (**Appendix D, photographs 1-3**) a determination of **no direct adverse effect** is recommended.

Like the Olmos Park Terrace local historic district, the Alta Vista neighborhood is conservatively recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and C. The proposed project would require small ROW acquisition along the edges of seven properties that would be contributing to a district. The acquisitions would not directly affect buildings or character-defining features of the district. A determination of **no adverse direct effect** for the contributing resources and the district as a whole is recommended.

**Table 55 Impact Summary for Alta Vista**

Contributing Resource	Acreage
Resource 110	0.001
Resource 114	0.0012

Contributing Resource	Acreage
Resource 117	0.011
Resource 123	0.011
Resource 137	0.004
Resource 145	0.003
Resource 149	0.002

### 8.5.2 Indirect, Cumulative or Reasonably Foreseeable Effects

Per 36 CFR Part 800, adverse effects can occur when there is a “change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance” or “introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features.” A determination of no adverse indirect effects is recommended. The undertaking would not cause any substantial visual, auditory, or vibratory changes to the setting or feeling of any of the NRHP-eligible properties. Although the proposed project would introduce new ART stations into the setting, the stations would remain along the roadway consistent with the placement of current VIA bus stations. New stations and bus traffic along the existing transportation corridor would not result in a substantive change in setting for the historic properties. As all properties are currently immediately adjacent to major thoroughfares, noise and vibration impacts should remain consistent with their present condition; future changes in these levels would not inhibit the properties from conveying their significance. No reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance, or be cumulative were identified in this effects assessment.

## Chapter 9. REFERENCES

---

- Alta Vista Neighborhood Association. 2023. "History." Alta Vista Neighborhood Association. <https://altavistana.org/about/history/>.
- Andrus, Patrick W. 1995. *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. Vol. 15 *National Register Bulletin*, edited by Rebecca H. Shrimpton, ed. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resources, National Register of Historic Places.
- City of San Antonio, Enterprise GIS. 2022. City of San Antonio Registered Neighborhood Associations.
- City of San Antonio Office of Historic Preservation. "Explorer." City of San Antonio, Office of Historic Preservation. Accessed 2022. <https://gis.sanantonio.gov/OHP/explorer/index.html>.
- Clark, John, Adan Benavides, Dan Scurlock, and Dana Isham. 1975. Mission Parkway Historic District, National Register of Historic Places Registration Form. Austin: Texas Historical Commission, State Archeologist's Office.
- Horak, Katie E., Andrew Goodrich, Alan Hess, Barbara Lamprecht, John English, Richard Starzack, and Mitzi Mogul. 2021. *L. A. Modernism, 1919–1980. SurveyLA: Los Angeles Historic Resources Survey, Citywide Historic Context Statement Series*. Los Angeles: City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, Office of Historic Resources.
- King William Association. 2022. "Big Pig." King William Association. <https://www.ourkwa.org/big-pig>.
- Moore, Larry. 2016. "International & Great Northern Railroad Underpass." The Living New Deal. The Living New Deal,. Last Modified June 14, 2016. <https://livingnewdeal.org/projects/international-great-northern-railroad-underpass-san-antonio-tx/>.
- Nationwide Environmental Title Research. 1973. Bexar County (Aerial Images). Historicaerials.com, subscription service.
- . 1983. Bexar County (aerial images). Historicaerials.com.
- Noelle, Louise. 2012. "Ricardo Legorreta, An Architect in Search of Modernity Within Tradition." *Docomomo Journal* 43: 90–91.
- O'Rourke, Kathryn E. 2017. *Modern Architecture in Mexico City: History Representation and the Shaping of a Capital*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Olsen, Patrice. 2022. "Ricardo Legorreta." 20th Century Architecture.
- Reed, Emily, Céline Finney, and Haley Rush. 2014. *Intensive-Level Historic Resources Survey of San Pedro Springs Park, San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas*. Austin: Cox McLain Environmental Consulting, Inc.
- SA2020. 2018. "Today's Roosevelt Library is a New Kind of Gathering Space." SA2020,. Last Modified 2018-05-09. <https://sa2020.org/stories/todays-roosevelt-library-is-a-new-kind-of-gathering-space>.
- San Antonio Express*. 1956. "Latest New Church." <https://newspaperarchive.com/san-antonio-express-dec-01-1956-p-12/>.
- <https://newspaperarchive.com/san-antonio-express-mar-09-1962-p-1/>.
- January 27, 1968, 1968, 9. <https://www.newspapers.com/image/legacy/82871703/?terms=>.
- . 1977. "Physical Fitness Instructors (Advertisement)." December 31, 1977, 1977, 37. <https://www.newspapers.com/image/legacy/62312541/?terms=>.
- San Antonio Express and News*. 1958. "Charter Members Due Anniversary Honors." <https://www.newspapers.com/image/legacy/29602721/?terms=>.
- <https://www.newspapers.com/image/legacy/29672121/?terms=>.
- October 13, 1962, 1962b, 29. <https://www.newspapers.com/image/legacy/29685145/?terms=>.
- San Antonio Gazette*. 1909. "The Lockwood National Bank (Announcement)." <https://www.newspapers.com/image/legacy/39226444/?terms=>.

**DRAFT**

**(Information is under FTA review and is subject to change.)**

- July 8, 1953, 1953, 12. <https://newspaperarchive.com/san-antonio-light-aug-07-1953-p-12/>.
- Texas Department of Transportation Environmental Affairs Division. 2022. "Historic Resources of Texas Aggregator." <https://txdot.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=e13ba0aa78bf4548a8e98758177a8dd5>.
- Texas Historical Commission. 2022. "Texas Historic Sites Atlas,." <https://atlas.thc.state.tx.us/>.
- Texas Transportation Museum. 2022. "History (Streetcars in San Antonio)." San Antonio Transportation History. Last Modified 2022. <https://txtransportationmuseum.org/history/>.
- U.S. Congress. 1966. Code of Federal Regulations, Title 36, Part 800. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Publishing Office.
- U.S. Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of the Census. 1913. *Volume I, Population, General Report and Analysis*. edited by Government Printing Office. Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2022. "Tribal Directory Assessment Tool,." <https://egis.hud.gov/TDAT/>.
- U.S. Geological Survey. 1959. San Antonio East, Quadrangle, Texas. In *7.5 Minute Series*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Geological Survey.