

## Appendix E: Historic District Photographs

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs

### NRHP-Listed Historic Districts

#### *Wilshire Historic District*



*Resource 165, Noncontributing: 4141 North I-35. View facing southwest.*



*Resource 166, Contributing: 4204 Bradwood Road. View facing west.*

Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 169, Contributing: 4200 Bradwood Road. View facing southwest.*



*Resource 170, Noncontributing: 4102 Bradwood Road. View facing northwest.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 175, Contributing: 4200 Bradwood Road. View facing south.*

### *Delwood Duplex Historic District*



*Resource 180A, Contributing: 1300 Kirkwood Road. View facing west.*

Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 181A, Contributing: 1301 Kirkwood Road. View facing west.*



*Resource 181B, Contributing: 1301 Kirkwood Road. View facing northeast.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs

### *Little Campus Historic District*



*Resource 320A, Contributing: 709 East MLK Jr. Boulevard. View facing north.*



*Resource 320B, Contributing: 1823 Red River Street. View facing northwest.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs

### *Swedish Hill Historic District*



*Resource 328, Contributing: 905 East 15<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing southeast.*



*Resource 329, Contributing: 907 East 15<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing southeast.*

Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 330, Contributing: 902 East 14<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing northwest.*



*Resource 334, Contributing: 910 East 14<sup>th</sup> Street. View Facing northwest.*



## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs

### *Sixth Street Historic District*



*Resource 378, Contributing: 706-708 East 6<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing east.*



*Resource 382, Contributing: 701 East 6<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing west.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 383, Contributing: 709 East 6<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing west.*



*Resource 385, Contributing: 713 East 6<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing southwest.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 386, Contributing: 719 East 6<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing southwest.*

### *Willow-Spence Streets Historic District*



*Resource 419, Noncontributing: 906 Willow Street. View facing northeast.*

Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 424, Contributing: 904 Willow Street. View facing northeast.*



*Resource 433, Contributing: 901 Spence Street. View facing southeast*

**Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs**



*Resource 437A, Contributing: 78 San Marcos Street. View facing southwest.*

**Rainey Street Historic District**



*Resource 427, Contributing: 85 Rainey Street. View facing southeast.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 428, Contributing: 83 Rainey Street. View facing southeast.*



*Resource 429, Contributing: 81 Rainey Street. View facing northeast.*

Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 430, Noncontributing: 79 Rainey Street. View facing southeast.*



*Resource 431A, Contributing: 77 Rainey Street. View facing southeast.*

**Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs**



*Resource 446, Noncontributing: 61 Rainey Street. View facing southeast.*

**Travis Heights-Fairview Park Historic District**



*Resource 467, Noncontributing: 1013 East Riverside Drive. View facing southwest.*



Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 469, Contributing: 1019 East Riverside Drive. View facing southwest.*



*Resource 470, Noncontributing: 1027 East Riverside Drive. View facing southwest.*

Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 471, Contributing: 1016 Hardwood Place. View facing northeast.*



*Resource 473, Contributing: 1022 Hardwood Place. View facing north.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs

### NRHP-Eligible Historic Districts

#### *Delwood I*



*Resource 146: 4404 Airport Boulevard. View facing southwest.*



*Resource 151: 1202 Crestwood Road. View facing northeast.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 154: 1302 Crestwood Road. View facing northeast.*



*Crestwood Avenue. Outside project APE. View facing southwest.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Crestwood Avenue. Outside project APE. View facing north.*



*Crestwood Avenue. Outside project APE. View facing northeast.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Crestwood Avenue. Outside project APE. View facing southeast.*

### *Delwood II*



*Resource 104: 4610 Elwood Road. View facing west.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 108: 4602 Elwood Road. View facing southwest.*



*Resource 116: 1103 Bentwood Road. View facing southwest.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 118: 4510 Elwood Road. View facing northwest.*



*1309 Norwood Road. Outside project APE. View facing southwest. Showing infill.*



## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Intersection of Parkwood and Fairwood Roads. Outside project APE. View facing northeast.*



*Intersection of Fairwood and Rowood Roads. Outside project APE. View facing northwest.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Bentwood Road. Outside project APE. View facing north.*



*Intersections of Norwood and Parkwood. Outside project APE. View facing southeast.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Norwood Street. Outside project APE. View facing north.*

### *Swedish Hill Historic District Extension*



*Resource 336, Contributing: Swede Hill Pocket Park. View facing southwest.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Intersection of East 14<sup>th</sup> and Navasota Streets. Outside project APE. View facing south.*



*Intersection of East 13<sup>th</sup> and Waller Streets. Outside project APE. View looking south.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Intersection of East 13<sup>th</sup> and Olander Streets. Outside project APE. View facing southeast.*



*Intersection of Navasota and East 14<sup>th</sup> Streets. Outside project APE. View looking west.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs

### *East 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Streets Historic District*



*Resource 402: 900 East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. View facing northeast.*



*Intersection of Brushy and East 3<sup>rd</sup> Streets. Resource 406 at right. Other buildings are located outside of project APE. View Facing southeast.*

Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 411: 903 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. View facing southwest.*



*Resource 413: 907 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. View facing southwest.*

Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 414A: 906 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. View facing northwest.*



*Intersection of Brushy and East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. Outside project APE. View facing northeast.*



## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Intersection of East 2<sup>nd</sup> and Waller Streets. Outside project APE. View facing northeast.*



*Intersection of East 2<sup>nd</sup> and Navasota Streets. Outside project APE. View facing northwest.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Intersection of East 2<sup>nd</sup> and Navasota Streets. Outside project APE. View facing northeast.*



*Intersection of East 2<sup>nd</sup> and Comal Streets. Outside project APE. View facing southwest.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Intersection of East 3<sup>rd</sup> and Navasota Streets. Outside project APE. View facing southwest.*



*Intersection of East 3<sup>rd</sup> and Waller Streets. Outside project APE. View facing southeast.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs

### *Willow-Spence Streets Historic District Extension*



*Resource 439A: 902 Taylor Street. View facing east.*



*Resource 440A: 904 Taylor Street. View facing northeast.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 441A: 908 Taylor Street. View facing northeast.*



*Resource 441B: 74 San Marcos Street. View facing northwest.*

Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 442: 907 Taylor Street. View facing southwest.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs

Previously Determined or Recommended Eligible Districts, No longer Eligible

*N.S. Rector Subdivision Historic District*



*Resource 322: 811 East 15<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing southeast.*



*Intersection of East 16<sup>th</sup> and Waller Streets. Resource 322. View facing southwest.*

Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 324: 903 E. 16<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing southeast.*



*Resource 325: 910 East 15<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing northeast.*



## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Intersection of 15<sup>th</sup> and Waller Streets. Outside project APE. View facing northwest.*



*Intersection of East 15<sup>th</sup> and Navasota Streets. Outside project APE. View facing west.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Intersection of East 14<sup>th</sup> and Navasota Streets. Outside project APE. View facing north.*



*East 15<sup>th</sup> Street. Outside project APE. View facing east.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs

### *Subdivision of Outlot 41 Historic District*



*Resource 337: 806 East 13<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing northeast.*



*Resource 339: Limerick-Frazier House. 13<sup>th</sup> and Olander Street facing southeast.*

Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 340: 809 East 13<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing southeast.*



*Resource 347: 900 East 12<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing northeast.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Infill at the corner of 14<sup>th</sup> and Olander Streets. View from Olander Street facing northwest.*



*Empty lot at 12<sup>th</sup> and Waller Streets. Outside project APE. View facing west.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs

### *Robertson Hill Historic District*



*Resource 360: 809 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street, and non-historic-age infill (left). View facing southeast.*



*Resource 366: 900 East 7<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing northeast.*

Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 367: 902 East 7<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing northeast.*



*Resource 368: 904 East 7<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing northeast.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs

### *East Sixth Street Historic District*



*Resource 379: 816 East 6<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing southeast.*



*Resource 380: 906 East 6<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing northeast.*



Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



Resource 381: 910 East 6<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing northwest.



Resource 390: 805 East 6<sup>th</sup> Street, and non-historic-age infill (left). View facing southeast.

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 391: 809 East 6<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing southwest.*

**Additional Areas Considered for Historic District Potential, Recommended Not Eligible**

### *Cherrywood Neighborhood*



*Resource 210: 3716 Robinson Avenue. View facing southwest.*

Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 260: 3402 Robinson Avenue. View facing northwest.*



*Resource 264: 3308 Robinson Avenue. View facing northwest.*

Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 269: 3302 Robinson Avenue. View facing northwest.*



*Hollywood Avenue (3300 block). Outside project APE. View facing northeast.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Hollywood Avenue (3500 block). Outside project APE. View facing northwest.*



*Werner Avenue (3400 block). Outside project APE. View facing southwest.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Dancy Street (3200 block). Outside project APE. View facing southwest.*



*Intersection of Dancy and 32<sup>nd</sup> Streets. Outside project APE. View facing northeast.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Intersection of Dancy and 30<sup>th</sup> Streets. Outside project APE. View facing southwest.*

### ***Hancock Area (Hill, NorthVale, Ridgetop, Ridgetop Annex, Mayfair Terrace, Country Club Terrace)***



*Resource 127: 1028 Ellingson Lane. View facing northeast.*

Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 130: 1030 East 44<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing northwest.*



*Resource 132: 1034 East 44<sup>th</sup> Street. View facing northeast.*



## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 160: 1035 East 43<sup>rd</sup> Street. View facing southwest.*



*Harmon Avenue (5400 block). Outside project APE. View facing southwest.*

Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*East 52<sup>nd</sup> Street. Outside project APE. View facing northwest.*



*Littlevine Primitive Baptist Church: East 52<sup>nd</sup> Street. Outside project APE. View facing west.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Intersection of East 53<sup>rd</sup> Street and Harmon Avenue. Outside project APE. View facing northwest.*



*Intersection of Bennet Avenue and East 50<sup>th</sup> Street. Outside project APE. View facing southwest.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Bennet Avenue (900 block). Outside project APE. View facing southwest.*



*East 47<sup>th</sup> Street (1000) block. Outside project APE. View facing northeast.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Ellingson Lane (1000 block). Outside project APE. View facing southeast.*



*East 44<sup>th</sup> Street (1000 block). Outside project APE. View facing northwest.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Intersection of 44<sup>th</sup> and Red River Streets. Outside project APE. View looking northeast.*

### ***Southeast Austin (South of East Riverside Drive and East of I-35)***



*Resource 482: 1100 Manlove Street. View facing northwest.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 483: 1101 Manlove Street. View facing northeast.*



*Resource 484: 1102 Manlove Street. View facing west.*

## Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 488: 1503 Lupine Street. View facing southwest.*



*Resource 490: 1304 Summit Street. View facing east.*



Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 493: 1406 Summit Street. View facing northwest.*



*Resource 507: 1605 Summit Street. View facing southwest.*

Appendix E: Historic District Evaluation Photographs



*Resource 512: 1804 Matagorda Street. View facing northwest.*

## Appendix F: Consulting Party Comments

## Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/ Section	New Page/ Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
1	Page 160/ National Register Eligibility	N/A	City of Austin - Historic Preservation Office	Additional Info: Resource 367: 902 East 7th Street (House):Pending relocation; goes to City Council summer 2022.	Thank you for this information. No modifications to the HRSR required.
2	Page 162/ National Register Eligibility	N/A	City of Austin - Historic Preservation Office	Additional Info: Resource 377: East 6th Street at Waller Creek (East 6th Street Bridge at Waller Creek)City landmark casefile may have information. Contact Amber Allen (amber.allen@austintexas.gov), referencing case number C14H-1988-0016, for details.	Thank you for this information. No modifications to the HRSR required.
3	Page 165/ National Register Eligibility	Page 171/National Register Eligibility	City of Austin - Historic Preservation Office	Additional Info: Resource 392: 501 North I-35 (Robinson Brothers Warehouse): This is a City of Austin landmark (C14H-2002-0002).	Thank you for this information. Noted the City of Austin Historic Landmark status in the evaluation for Resource 392.
4	Page 169/ National Register Eligibility	N/A	City of Austin - Historic Preservation Office	Additional Info: Additional Info: Resource 399A: 606 East 3rd Street (House) and Resource 399B: 608 East 3rd Street (House): There may be a relocation application filed for these resources in 2022. Contact Kimberly.Collins@austintexas.gov for more information.	Thank you for this information. No modifications to the HRSR required.
5	Page 216/ National Register Eligibility	Page 150/National Register Eligibility	City of Austin - Historic Preservation Office	Disagree: Resources 235A-B: 3509 North I-35 (Roberts House): Consider importance of vernacular architecture here--lack of ornamentation may resonate with the Roberts' decision to purchase at the start of the Great Depression; as such, it is a part of their story and should not be discounted for missing high-style details. Reconsider significance of family as representative of those impacted by Austin's long history of infrastructure-based displacement.	Thank you for this comment. M&H reevaluated Resources 235A-B in coordination with TxDOT and the THC considering the comments provided. The property's significance was reconsidered and a new evaluation recommending it eligible under Criterion A is provided in the HRSR. This change resulted in modifications to inventory forms, inventory table, maps, and the Section 106 effects section of the report.

# Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/ Section	New Page/ Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
6	Page 217/ National Register Eligibility	N/A	City of Austin - Historic Preservation Office	Potential disagreement - more information needed: Resources 245A-B: 3502 Robinson Avenue (House): Was additional research completed for Criterion A? Is it available?	This property was addressed individually in the HRSR because it appeared to have been mistakenly identified as eligible under Criterion C on the TxDOT Historic Resources Aggregator at the time of survey. It has since been removed from the TxDOT maps. Reconnaissance-level research and survey, along with public outreach, did not reveal indications of additional significance under Criteria A or B for this property. Furthermore, the proposed project is expected to have limited impacts on the resources. For these reasons, additional detailed, property-specific research for this property would be outside the scope of this project. No changes to the HRSR.

# Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/ Section	New Page/ Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
7	Page 219/ National Register Eligibility	Pages 235- 237/National Register Eligibility	City of Austin - Historic Preservation Office	Potential disagreement - more information needed: Integrity: Did any the other alterations mentioned take place during the historic period, other than the ones specifically listed as non-historic?	Alterations to the house are historic age but obscure the architectural character of the building. Images were added to illustrate the extent of these changes, and a note was added in the text to discuss when historic aerials show the front addition. The evaluation notes that it may have once been a good example of Colonial Revival architecture denoting potential significance under Criterion C. However, the period of significance under Criterion C for Architecture would be limited to its date of construction and its alterations beyond that date, which are not historically significant in their own right, constitute a loss of integrity. The property remains recommended not eligible for the NRHP due to lack of integrity.
8	Page 222/ National Register Eligibility	N/A	City of Austin - Historic Preservation Office	Potential disagreement - more information needed: Criteria Consideration G: Could intact large-scale Austin Brutalist architecture, or University of Texas Brutalism, count as a potential category? Reconsider, if so.	The Frank Erwin Center is significant under Criteria A and C but does not appear to meet the threshold of "exceptional importance" under Criteria Consideration G for non-historic age buildings. The Perry-Castaneda Library would arguably serve as a better example of Brutalist architecture at The University of Texas at Austin. The property remains recommended not eligible for the NRHP due to lack of significance. No changes to the HRSR.

# Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/ Section	New Page/ Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
9	Page 227/ National Register Eligibility	N/A	City of Austin - Historic Preservation Office	Potential disagreement - more information needed: Significance: Would like to see brief discussion on whether or not any significant Mexican American educators were found to be associated, and whether Cruz A. Lopez' significance as an architect and former student was considered. Lori Renteria with Tejano Trails may be a good resource.	Thank you for these suggestions. While it is possible that additional research focused on these educators and the architect may reveal new potential areas of significance, the building remains highly altered and unlikely to convey historical significance due to its lack of overall integrity. Furthermore, the proposed project is expected to have limited impacts on the property, which is located at the edge of the project APE. For these reasons, additional research would be outside the scope of this project and the property remains recommended not eligible for the NRHP due to lack of integrity.
10	Page 238/ National Register Eligibility	N/A	City of Austin - Historic Preservation Office	Potential disagreement - more information needed: Significance: This question is specific to this building, but it's also a general S106/4f process question that could apply to any ongoing rehabilitation project: Will impacts be reassessed if detailing is restored and re-assembled, potentially restoring integrity and Criterion C eligibility, during the I35 project duration? If so, how?	Under NEPA and NHPA Section 106 processes, assessment of impacts is based on current conditions. If conditions change during the course of project development, there may be opportunities for re-evaluation. A rehabilitated building would be treated as a post-review discovery per 36 CFR 800.13 and TxDOT's Programmatic Agreement with the Texas SHPO and ACHP, which states that TxDOT would seek to resume consultation regarding eligibility and project effects. Per FHWA Section 4(f) Policy Paper, Section 4(f) would not be considered under Section 4(f) if land from the property was purchased for transportation purposes prior to the designation or prior to a change in the property's determination of significance.

# Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/ Section	New Page/ Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
11	Pages 246-259/ National Register Eligibility	N/A	City of Austin - Historic Preservation Office	Concern/request for upcoming information: Single Dwelling Residential Resources and following sections: Were any of these individual resources noted in other surveys, as mentioned for some of the districts below?	The property type evaluations in these sections includes resources that were not identified during survey, reconnaissance level research, or public outreach as having potential for individual historical significance. Some of these resources may have been evaluated in previous surveys, but they were not recommended individually eligible for the NRHP.
12	Page 268	N/A	City of Austin - Historic Preservation Office	Additional Info: Resource 179: 4000 North I- 35 (Elgin Butler Brick Company Main Office): This resource is also eligible for City landmark status. Please let us know how to submit feedback for pending 4(f) assessment.	Thank you for this information and question. Section 106 consultation is the primary opportunity to comment on resource eligibility and effects. The project's adverse effect to the NRHP-eligible property makes the property subject to Section 4(f). The THC, as Texas SHPO, is considered the Official With Jurisdiction (OWJ) for the property under Section 4(f). TxDOT will provide the Section 4(f) evaluation to the THC (as Texas SHPO) for coordination and comment.
13	Page 270/ National Register Eligibility	N/A	City of Austin - Historic Preservation Office	Additional Info: Resource 295: 3009 North I- 35 (Haster House): Potentially eligible for City landmark status	Thank you for this information. No modifications to the HRSR required.



# Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/ Section	New Page/ Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
14	Page 311/Determination of Section 106 Effects	N/A	City of Austin - Historic Preservation Office	<p>Concern/request for upcoming information: Indirect, Cumulative or Reasonable Foreseeable Effects: Please share construction/vibration impact assessments with City of Austin HPO when available. Current City recommendations for assessment include: Explore economic impact of potential loss of historic fabric, legacy businesses, and district integrity by performing detailed analysis/projections for affected resources. Create historic context report re: historical displacement and barrier creation related to IH-35 through the twentieth century. Encourage reconnection-based, community-led mitigation with acknowledgement of I-35's context of past segregation, cultural erasure, and resident displacement/historic resource loss through urban renewal, industrial corridor creation, and highway construction practices before, during, and after the segregation era. Encourage creation of historic interpretive materials, placemaking efforts, etc. Mitigate further integrity loss of corridor-adjacent cultural and historic resources.</p>	<p>Thank you for providing this valuable feedback and suggestions. TxDOT will consider these ideas when developing a mitigation program for I-35 CapEx Central and future projects. TxDOT is inviting Section 106 consulting parties to a October 13, 2022 virtual meeting via Zoom. The meeting will focus on project effects to historic properties and mitigation ideas.</p>
15	Page 15/Project Setting/Study Area	Page 17/ Project Setting/Study Area	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	<p>Would be prudent to add a review of the Texas Freedom Colonies Atlas. <a href="https://www.thetexasfreedomcoloniesproject.com/atlas">https://www.thetexasfreedomcoloniesproject.com/atlas</a></p>	<p>Included review of the Texas Freedom Colonies Atlas Map.</p>

## Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

I-35 Capital Express Central  
Reconnaissance-level HRSR

Comment Number	Draft Page/Section	New Page/Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
16	Page 16; Table 1/Project Setting/Study Area	Pages 17-18; Table 1/Project Setting/Study Area	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Resource 321 A-C: Also a Historic Texas Cemetery and City of Austin - Historic Preservation Office Historic Landmark	Thank you for this information. Included these additional designations in Table 1 for Resources 321A-C.
17	Table 2/Project Setting/Study Area	Pages 19-20; Table 2/Project Setting/Study Area	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Hancock Recreation Center: Also contributes to the Hancock Golf Course NRHP.	Thank you for this information. Included these additional designations in Table 2 for the Hancock Recreation Center.
18	Table 2/Project Setting/Study Area	Pages 19-20; Table 2/Project Setting/Study Area	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	It looks like quite a few city landmarks are missing including Dickinson-Hannig House, multiple properties from Symphony Square.	City landmarks that are not also listed in the NRHP or as a RTHL were not included in the table. Added a note in the text to clarify.
19	Page 20/Project Setting/Study Area	Page 22/Project Setting/Study Area	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Last Paragraph: Other freedman's community in the study area that need to be included are Horst's Pasture, Gregorytown, Waller Creek, and Robertson Hill.	Added the other freedman's communities in the study area as indicated on the Texas Freedom Colonies Atlas.
20	Page 25/Project Setting/Study Area	Page 26/Project Setting/Study Area	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Last Paragraph: Tillotson College and Samuel Huston College should be named.	Include Tillotson College and Samuel Huston College as examples of educational land uses.

## Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/Section	New Page/Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
21	Page 35/Project Setting/Study Area	N/A	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Post War Development bullet: Urban renewal programs in Austin are big part of the story of the development in the 1960s and 70s.	Thank you for the comment. Agree that Urban Renewal programs were an important aspect of Austin's postwar development history. This topic is addressed in the general historic context and in the East Cesar Chavez Street HRSR Addendum historic context. The "Historic Periods and Property Types" section of the HRSR is intended to provide a very broad outline of historic time periods related to property types in the APE. Urban Renewal falls under the Postwar Development in Austin historic period and it would not be appropriate to list it separately.
22	Page 42/Survey Results/Literature Review	Page 42/Survey Results/Literature Review	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Last Paragraph Before bullets: CRM firms are referencing the Texas Freedom Colonies Atlas as a foundational document that informs reviews. Please use and reference this document for this review and in future reviews. Here is a link for how CRM firms can reference this document. See the Transportation Projects Guide <a href="https://www.thetexasfreedomcoloniesproject.com/resources">https://www.thetexasfreedomcoloniesproject.com/resources</a>	The Texas Freedom Colonies Project Atlas and several other online GIS sources, including Mapping the Gay Guides, and Navigating the Green Book, were examined and used in developing the historic context. These were added to the Literature Review.
23	Page 56/Historic Context	Page 56/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Growth and Development in the East Austin Outlots: Missing space between whole and came.	Thank you. Revised per comment.

# Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/Section	New Page/Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
24	Page 61/Historic Context	N/A	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Public School System: Need to clearly note this was for white children only.	This paragraph is quoted from the City of Austin's East Austin Historic Resources Survey (HHM 2016) and it appears to be accurate based on additional reconnaissance-level research. Please see the Austin History Center's "Public Schools Resource Guide" available online which indicates that Austin's public schools established during this period included facilities for African American as well as White children. No changes made to the HRSR.
25	Page 62/Historic Context	Pages 61-62/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	First Paragraph: Should mention creation of Gregory Town School, the Black high school (to be named L.C. Anderson), and The Texas Blind, Deaf and Orphan School for Colored Youth	Included additional information on these schools in the context.
26	Page 64/Historic Context	Page 64/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	First full paragraph; first sentence: I presume these were white children?	This paragraph is quoted from the Travis Heights- Fairview Park Historic District NRHP nomination and constitutes general contextual information regarding overall land development in South Austin. Inserted a revised sentence to further generalize and state the fact that the overall population had increased, resulting in the need for a new school in the Swisher Addition.
27	Page 64/Historic Context	Page 62/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	First full paragraph: There were enclaves of Black settlements south of the river as well, such as Brackenridge and community around Barton Springs Baptist Church.	Added new paragraph to address early Black settlements in South Austin.

## Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/Section	New Page/Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
28	Page 65/Historic Context	Page 65-66/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Third paragraph: Strictly for white people.	Added a sentence to highlight that Hyde Park and many subsequent suburban developments were racially restricted.
29	Page 67/Historic Context	Page 69/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	The Early Twentieth Century in the East Outlots: Missing commercial development for Black and Latino communities in East Austin.	Addressed early 20th century commercial properties in East Austin with a footnote. For additional detailed information, please see the East Cesar Chavez Street HRSR Addendum.
30	Page 68/Historic Context	N/A	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	First full paragraph: The streetcar system ran up against East Austin but did not go all the way into East Austin.	Thank you for this comment. Our sources indicate that the a streetcar line entered East Austin at 1st and 6th Streets. Please See Figure 19 (1925 map of Austin) showing the streetcar network. Newspaper research conducted for the East Cesar Chavez HRSR Addendum indicated that the East 1st Street line was built as early as 1897 and extended to its final length in 1902. No changes made to the HRSR.
31	Page 68/Historic Context	N/A	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Need to mention churches of East Austin--why they were there and why African Americans followed the churches.	Thank you for this comment. This topic is discussed briefly in the "Demographic Trends" section of the historic context. While historically African American churches are an important aspect of Austin's history, there are no anticipated impacts to this property type by the proposed project. Therefore, additional detailed research on this topic would be outside the scope of this historic resources survey. No changes made to the HRSR.

# Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/Section	New Page/Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
32	Page 68/Historic Context	Page 73/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Last paragraph: Fail to mention why East Austin was already the home to so many Black and Latino Austinites.	Additional factors are described in the East Cesar Chavez Street HRSR Addendum historic context. Added reference to the East Cesar Chavez Street HRSR addendum at the end of the section.
33	Page 70/Historic Context	Page 71/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Third paragraph: Oscar Hofheinz bungalows in East Austin and Clarksville. "Hofheinz homes"	Thank you for this information. Included additional text from the City of Austin's East Austin Historic Resources Survey (HHM 2016) to address Hofheinz homes.
34	Page 70/Historic Context	Pages 73 and 89/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Fourth paragraph: Mexicans settled in West Austin originally around Republic Square, which was then known as "Mexico" or "Mexico Square." When East Austin's Latino population began to grow, they moved Our Lady of Guadalupe Church and School to East Austin, but most Latinos were in West Austin in the beginning of the 20th century (escaping Mexican Revolution). See remark below where this would be an appropriate addition.	Thank you for this comment. The "Demographic Trends" section that follows this paragraph has a discussion of the shift of the Mexican American population from west to east. Our Lady of Guadalupe Church is also specifically addressed in the "Austin's Growing Mexican American Population Moves to East Austin" section later in the historic context. Added a footnote to explain Mexican American settlement around Republic Square, then known by many residents as "Mexico." Additional information on these topics is provided in the East Cesar Chavez HRSR Addendum.
35	Page 72/Historic Context	N/A	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	First Paragraph: Note that the land in East Austin was cheaper because it was more flood prone and less desirable to white people.	The existing paragraph describes the land as "less expensive and flood prone." No changes to the HRSR necessary.

## Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/Section	New Page/Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
36	Page 78/Historic Context	Page 79/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	First paragraph: and for all ethnicities as schools were segregated at this time.	This paragraph is quoted from the City of Austin's East Austin Historic Resources Survey (HHM 2016) and constitutes general contextual information regarding public works projects. Racial segregation of public facilities and schools is addressed elsewhere in the historic context. Inserted revised sentence into the quote to note that the new schools served multiple ethnicities.
37	Page 88/Historic Context	Page 89/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Austin's Growing Mexican American Population Moves to East Austin: Needs "Mexico" and "Mexican Square" (Republic Square) context added by that area was significant to the Mexican population in Austin	See response to previous comment regarding this area. Added reference to "Mexico" in footnote.
38	Page 90/Historic Context	Pages 91-92/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Third paragraph: Missing major build out of Zilker Park by WPA, CCC, and NYA.	Added discussion of Zilker Park and New Deal programs to the paragraph and included a reference to additional detailed information on this topic provided in the Town Lake Park System, Waller Creek to Fiesta Gardens Intensive-level HRSR.
39	Page 97/Historic Context	N/A	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Austin and World War II: Would like to see some text about segregation of military during WWII and the building of resources for Black military while in Austin, such as the Doris Miller Auditorium.	Thank you for this comment. While this is certainly an important aspect of Austin and WWII history, no resources directly associated with WWII-era military segregation were identified within the survey area. Therefore, additional detailed research on this topic would be outside the scope of this project.

## Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/Section	New Page/Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
40	Page 99/Historic Context	Page 103/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Last paragraph: Address that these were for white veterans only. The housing boom was in West Austin only.	Added a new paragraph addressing racially restrictive covenants and discriminatory lending practices that largely excluded veterans of color from GI Bill benefits. However, disagree that the housing boom was restricted only to West Austin. Aerial imagery dating to the postwar period demonstrates the development of suburbs on both sides of I-35 in both north and south Austin. See Figures 8, 9, 11, and 12 in the Historic Land Use section.
41	Page 100/Historic Context	Page 103/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Postwar Demographic Trends in Austin: Suburbs were mainly white.	New paragraph in the preceding section addresses the racial restrictions placed on Austin's postwar suburbs.
42	Page 100/Historic Context	Page 102/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Postwar Demographic Trends in Austin: This section needs to explain reasons why these trends were happening.	Thank you for this comment. The section briefly explain several factors for the trends identified. Additional detailed information on these demographic trends is also provided in the East Cesar Chavez Street HRSR Addendum. Added a reference to the East Cesar Chavez Street HRSR Addendum to the end of this section.



# Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/Section	New Page/Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
43	Page 101/Historic Context	N/A	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Highway Improvements of the Postwar Era: Why is San Antonio important.	This paragraph is quoted from the City of Austin 's East Austin Historic Resources Survey (HHM 2016) to provide general contextual information regarding early highway development in Austin and surrounding areas. San Antonio's relative importance as a military center does not directly relate to the significance of properties within the project survey area. Therefore, additional research on this topic would be outside the scope of this project.
44	Page 102/Historic Context	Pages 105-106/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Second paragraph: Mainly Latino families were displaced, and it cut the Mexican American neighborhood in half.	New paragraph explains the impacts of highway construction and specifically which ethnic groups were directly impacted.
45	Page 102/Historic Context	Pages 103-104/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Would be good context to discuss how the interstate cut through mostly Black and Latino communities in Texas.	Added a new paragraph explaining the national trends of negative impact of highway development on minority communities.
46	Page 106/Historic Context	Pages 120-122/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	<p>East Austin Development: Section lacks any mention of urban renewal and how that greatly affected East Austin. Context is not complete without the outlining of programs and consequences.</p> <p>I found it listed below but it still lacks details on consequences</p>	Thank you for this comment. Added additional text in the "Slum Clearance and Urban Renewal" section of the historic context, specifically on the University East and Brackenridge projects that affect portions of the study area. These programs and their impacts were an important aspect of Austin's development history. Additional discussion of Urban Renewal, Slum Clearance, racially restrictive covenants, and other economic discrimination in East Austin is provided in the East Cesar Chavez Street HRSR Addendum.

# Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/ Section	New Page/ Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
47	Page 106/Historic Context	Page 108/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	East Austin Development: returning white veterans	This paragraph is quoted from the City of Austin 's East Austin Historic Resources Survey (HHM 2016) and the information provided is accurate. Added a footnote to emphasize that discriminatory lending practices made the benefits of the G.I. Bill out of reach for most non-White veterans.
48	Page 106/Historic Context	N/A	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Last paragraph: Infrastructure also vastly improved in East Austin due to the public petitioning City Council for the additional infrastructure in East Austin.	Infrastructure improvements in East Austin are addressed in greater detail in both the East Cesar Chavez HRSR Addendum and the Butler Trail Intensive report. Please see these HRSRs for additional information.
49	Page 107/Historic Context	Page 112/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	First paragraph: These complexes were built north of the traditional East Austin area (Manor and MLK) for African Americans, so it's a stretch to say they re-integrated.	Added a footnote for clarification of the very slow nature of East Austin's reintegration progress.
50	Page 110/Historic Context	Pages 112-114/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Churches: This entire section is about white churches and needs to either go back and include Black and Latino churches or clarify in each paragraph that it is referring to white churches.	Added additional text throughout the Postwar Churches section to clarify where the trends being discussed are applicable to all racial groups and where they are more representative of the suburban churches observed in the project study area.
51	Page 110/Historic Context	Page 114/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Churches: First paragraph; second sentence: Is this for all of Austin or just West Austin? Both the African American and Latino citizens were church-centered since the late 1800s.	Included a footnote to clarify discussion is about postwar churches developed with or alongside postwar suburban developments in the project study area.

# Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/ Section	New Page/ Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
52	Page 110/Historic Context	Pages 112-114/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Churches: First paragraph; last sentence: Definitely need to clarify because they played this role for African Americans since emancipation.	This part of the discussion in this section is referring to the physical architectural design of postwar suburban churches. Churches in the postwar era were often specifically designed to serve the broad community-related functions for residents of new suburbs in the postwar era. Added clarification and examples of postwar church designs in and near the study area that served White, Black, and Hispanic communities.
53	Page 115/Historic Context	Page 117/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Second paragraph: Playground sports were integrated in 1963. Some pools and parks were integrated before that.	This section is quoted from the City of Austin's East Austin Historic Resource Survey (HHM 2016). Modified text slightly to clarify that all pools and parks were integrated by (rather than "in") 1963.
54	Page 115/Historic Context	N/A	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Second paragraph: There is a lot missing from this story: Overton lawsuit, white flight, HEW, closing old Anderson HS, busing, etc.	While these are all important aspects of Austin's desegregation history, this historic context is intended to serve as a general overview with more in-depth information on topics that directly relate to the historical significance of resources within the project survey area. As these issues do not directly relate to the surveyed resourced, further detailed research and discussion would be outside the scope of this project.
55	Page 117/Historic Context	Page 119/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Second paragraph: Sixth St and Red River still remained predominantly Black businesses.	Added additional text to explain that many Black-owned businesses remained downtown in these areas.

## Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/Section	New Page/Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
56	Page 119/Historic Context	Page 121/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	First paragraph after quote: Need more detail on how this affected East Austin.	Thank you for the comment. This topic is addressed in greater detail in the East Cesar Chavez HRSR Addendum Historic Context. Included a reference to the addendum for more information.
57	Page 120/Historic Context	Page 123/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Public Spaces in Postwar Austin: Pease Park, Emancipation Park - there were parks prior to Wooldridge beautifying that square.	Revised to include these parks in the discussion.
58	Page 122/Historic Context	Page 125/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	First paragraph: The city purchased Fiesta Gardens because it was a financial failure. It was the first public-private venture on Town Lake, and it failed quickly.	Clarified with additional information in a footnote. For more information on this topic see the Town Lake Park System, Waller Creek to Fiesta Gardens Intensive-level HRSR.
59	Page 122/Historic Context	Page 125/Historic Context	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	First paragraph: Many of the homes were purchased and condemned by the city.	Thank you for this information. Included a footnote to explain this history.
60	Page 124/National Register Eligibility	N/A	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	National Register Eligibility Recommendations: Missing Jeremiah Hamilton Building at 1101 Red River. Also need to touch on all buildings surrounding Symphony Square.	These resources are not within the project APE. Therefore they are not evaluated in this HRSR.
61	Page 124/National Register Eligibility	N/A	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	NRHP-listed Individual Properties: Is Oakwood Cemetery Annex within the APE?	Oakwood Cemetery Annex is outside the project APE.
62	Page 124/National Register Eligibility	Page 128/National Register Eligibility	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	NRHP-listed Individual Properties: first paragraph; The section was for "others" African Americans, Mexicans, and "strangers" - out of town visitors	Thank you for this information. Adjusted text to clarify the purpose of the "Others" section of the cemetery.

## Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/ Section	New Page/ Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
63	Page 180/National Register Eligibility	N/A	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Significance: Lady Bird Johnson's involvement of creating the trail is important and she is a specific historical figure. She is a specific historical figure that directly affected historic national policy in conservation and environmental activism and inspired generations of environmental stewards, work exemplified by the trail. The trail would likely not exist as a public amenity today if not for her involvement and support.	The NRHP eligibility evaluation for Resource 462 (Town Lake Park System from Waller Creek to Fiesta Gardens) provided in the draft reconnaissance-level HRSR was preliminary pending an intensive-level survey. Additional documentation, including a detailed NRHP eligibility evaluation is included in the intensive-level survey submitted to consulting parties in July 2022. City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department did not provide comment on the justification for lack of Criterion B significance provided in the intensive-level survey. Resource 462 remains recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and C. No changes made to this section of the HRSR.
64	Page 186/National Register Eligibility	N/A	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Swede Hill Historic District: Could the Swede Hill Pocket Park considered a contributing site to the Swedish Hill HD?	Resource 336 (Swede Hill Pocket Park) was considered and recommended contributing to the NRHP-eligible Swedish Hill Historic District Extension, which is evaluated in the "Recommended NRHP-eligible Historic District" subsection of the HRSR below. This property remains recommended as contributing to the NRHP-eligible district. No changes to this section of the HRSR.
65	Page 192	N/A	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	First paragraph; last sentence: Requesting evaluation and inclusion of Swede Hill Pocket Park as contributing site to the Swedish Hill NRHP	Please see response to comment # 64 above.

# Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/ Section	New Page/ Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
66	Overall		David Keene President, Wilshire Wood/Delwood1 Neighborhood Association	<p>After the recent Section 106 committee meetings, where our neighborhood was discussed, we'd like to call your attention to the following items:</p> <p>The Wilshire National Register Historic District (fully within WWD1) is of course protected (re: section 106) in the obvious way, re: U.S. Secretary of Interior Standards for historic preservation for any district, or individually designated building, in the National Register. Our previous correspondence with you outlines our concerns there - the newly designed/constructed-35 as a source of noise and air pollution in the WWD1 neighborhood, and federal guidelines pertaining; creation of sound mitigation walls; connectivity, including I-35 crossings and on- and off-ramps adjacent to WWD1; and other issues. We look forward to more details on all those matters. This includes the criteria/process for construction of noise-mitigating "sound walls" that would front the Wilshire National Register Historic District and Delwood1. While TxDOT has in past meetings alluded to a voting process that is limited to the owners of property that abuts I35, we ask that other homeowners in the Wilshire National Register Historic District</p>	<p>Thank you for the additional information on Wilshire Wood, Delwood I, and St. George's Episcopal Church and for sharing concerns regarding noise and visual effects. TxDOT recognizes that the Wilshire Wood neighborhood is listed in the NRHP; St. George's Episcopal Church and the Delwood I neighborhood are also recommended eligible for the NRHP and are subject to consideration and consultation under Section 106. Assessment of potential indirect effects to historic properties, including noise and visual effects, are ongoing at this time. Further explanation of ongoing project effects assessment is included in the latest version of the HRSR under "Determination of Section 106 Effects Recommendations." TxDOT is inviting Section 106 consulting parties to a October 13, 2022 virtual meeting via Zoom. The meeting will focus on project effects to historic properties and mitigation ideas.</p>

Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/ Section	New Page/ Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
				<p>and officers of the WWD1 Neighborhood Association should – according to U.S. Secretary of Interior Standards for historic preservation including environmental issues – have a role in this decision making process. It is incumbent on TxDOT, with our participation, to ascertain that all current Federal guidelines to achieve legally acceptable levels of air and noise pollution will be followed in the Interstate-35 Capital Express Central Project, for the entire affected portions of the neighborhoods, not just a handful of households.</p> <p>"But note also: WWD1 neighborhood extends beyond just the already-federally-designated Wilshire National Register Historic. Within the boundaries of WWD1, also are:</p>	

Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/ Section	New Page/ Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
				<p>Delwood 1: all the houses (and a church and school) on the north side of Ardenwood Rd, all the houses on Crestwood Rd., all the houses on Parkwood Rd., and all the houses on Wilshire Blvd. Note that the vast majority of these houses in Delwood1 were built in the late 1940s and 1950s with a consistent architectural style similar to the style of houses in Wilshire National Register Historic District. The character of this neighborhood is still largely intact. And the stories of that character are replete with the histories of many, many formerly underrepresented communities: women homeowners, women business owners, a long history of LGBTQ+ neighbors active in the community, a variety of prominent political leaders in the communities, organized outreach and support to people experiencing homelessness (very much a part of the mission of St. George's Church), and more.</p>	



Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/Section	New Page/Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
				<p>In addition, in Delwood1 is the Giles-Wright House on the campus of St George’s Episcopal Church, an important 19th century landmark in our neighborhood. Both that building, and St. George’s church and school, are eligible for inclusion in the National Register.</p> <p>Details:</p> <p>Wright-Giles house, built 1879. Address: 4301 N. I-35, Austin, 78722</p> <p>This Italianate farmhouse stands on the grounds of St. George’s Episcopal Church, in the Delwood1 neighborhood. The Wright family settled on a large estate near today’s intersection of I-35 and Airport Boulevard in 1852. Robert Wright purchased eighty-eight acres from his father before his 1874 marriage, and built this substantial home soon after. Bascom and Effie Dean Giles purchased the property in 1924. They renamed it Garwald Banks and raised their two sons here with their pet goat “Billy Whiskers.” In 1956 St. George’s acquired the much-diminished acreage to build its new church campus. The Wright-Giles House</p>	

## Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/ Section	New Page/ Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
				<p>became student housing for the Episcopal seminary but sat vacant by the early 1990s. St. George's entered into a unique partnership with the HIV Wellness Center, offering holistic counseling and therapy to AIDS patients, in 1994. "</p> <p>The church offered a 10-year, no-cost lease on the house if the nonprofit pledged to renovate it. A newly-rebranded Wright House Wellness Center launched a \$120,000 fundraising campaign and beautifully restored the house to its 1879 appearance. The center offered services in this comforting, home-like setting until 2005. The Wright-Giles House now serves as St. George's Episcopal Church offices and archives.</p>	

Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/Section	New Page/Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
				<p>St. George’s Episcopal Church, and School, built 1957. The Rt. Reverend Bishop Hines recruited ten parishioners from Austin’s existing Episcopalian churches to form St. George’s in 1949. The congregation purchased a tiny lot at 38th ½ Street and Basford Road along with a \$100 decommissioned chapel from Camp Swift, an Army training facility and German POW camp outside Bastrop. The chapel’s already-long journey to Austin was stalled by East Avenue construction. Parishioners worshipped in Maplewood Elementary’s cafeteria before dedicating their new church by Lundgren &amp; Maurer in 1957. The building’s mid-century take on the English Gothic style features a vaulted interior of exposed limestone and stained redwood. St. George’s numbered 700 members, half of whom were children, by 1962. The parish hired another prominent modernist firm, Barnes Landes Goodman Youngblood, for a distinctive education and office building with steeply-pitched gables. Completed in 1966, it still houses St. George’s thriving pre-school.</p>	

# Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/Section	New Page/Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
67	Page 294/ Determination of Section 106 Effect	N/A	City of Austin - Parks and Recreation Department	Check inconsistencies between distances from current ROW and distances from Alternatives ROW--why is the ROW getting 10 feet closer to the buildings if there is no proposed acquisition?	Thank you for your comment. There is no proposed ROW acquisition at Palm Park. I-35 ROW will not be closer to buildings.
68	Literature Review	Pages 40- 43/Literature Review	Preservation Austin	Given the immense scope of this project, we appreciate the extensive research conducted by the project team to evaluate all historic-age properties within the Area of Potential Effect. The literature review referenced existing surveys, National Register nominations, maps, historic landmark files, demolition permits, and other primary and secondary archival sources. In addition to these traditional academic research sources and methods, we strongly advise the project team to review the City of Austin's Cultural Asset Mapping Project (CAMP) and incorporate its conclusions into their findings. We strongly advise the project team to consider the preservation of culturally significant places identified by CAMP--both in East Austin and throughout the APE--in addition to the broader preservation recommendations set forth by Our Future 35.	Reviewed CAMP and added reference to the Literature Review section along with several other online GIS reviewing sources. No additional potentially NRHP-eligible properties were identified in review of CAMP. Thank you for the suggestion to consider broader cultural significant properties.

## Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/Section	New Page/Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
69	National Register Eligibility	Pages 196-203/National Register Eligibility	Preservation Austin	<p>We urge the project team to reconsider the determination of eligibility for the Delwood I &amp; II Subdivisions, which were found ineligible for listing as National Register Historic Districts in this report due to a lack of integrity. Delwood I and II are examples of postwar residential developments for lower- and middle-class Austinites. They share similar development patterns with the adjacent Delwood III (Duplex Nation) and Wilshire Wood neighborhoods, both listed in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A for Community Planning and Development. The spaces and places associated with the working and middle classes have too often been overlooked by traditional preservation, and we urge the project team to reevaluate Delwood I &amp; II's historic integrity with this consideration in mind.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. In response to these concerns, TxDOT coordinated a site visit with Preservation Austin, the THC, and Mead &amp; Hunt to discuss significance and reexamine integrity of the neighborhoods for NRHP historic district potential. Mead &amp; Hunt reevaluated both Delwood I and Delwood II. Based on additional information and consulting party input both subdivisions are now recommended eligible for the NRHP. The HRSR and appendices have been updated to reflect this change.</p>

## Appendix F: Section 106 Consulting Party Comments

Comment Number	Draft Page/Section	New Page/Section	Consulting Party	Comment	Response
70	National Register Eligibility	Page 158/ National Register Eligibility	Preservation Austin	<p>While Preservation Austin does not possess any unique information or insights into the historic significance of this property, it is our understanding that the Texas Historical Commission and other consulting parties dispute the report's finding that Mount Calvary Cemetery is not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. We support the current efforts underway to further investigate the potential historic significance of this property and ask that the project team defer its final determination pending the results of this ongoing research and analysis</p>	<p>Based on consulting party input and additional information, Mount Calvary Cemetery is now recommended eligible for the NRHP. The HRSR and appendices have been updated to reflect this change.</p>