



Historical Resources Survey Report

Windshield, Reconnaissance, & Intensive Survey

Project Name: I-30 East Corridor Project

Project Limits: From I-45 to Ferguson Road

District: Dallas

County: Dallas

CSJ Numbers: 0009-11-252 and 0009-11-251

Principal Investigator: Emily Reed

Report Completion Date: April 2023

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable Federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated 12-9-2019, and executed by FHWA and TxDOT.

This historical resources survey report is produced for the purposes of meeting requirements under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the Antiquities Code of Texas, and other cultural resource legislation related to environmental clearance as applicable.

Abstract

The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) proposes improvements to Interstate Highway (I-) 30 in Dallas County, Texas. A historic resources reconnaissance survey along the proposed I-30 project corridor was conducted by HNTB in early 2022 and updated by Stantec with HHM in late 2022. This document gives a brief historical context of the project area and discusses the property types typically found, describing their distinguishing characteristics and their distribution throughout the proposed project's Area of Potential Effects (APE). National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) criteria are defined, and justifications are provided for resources recommended eligible or not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. Finally, this document makes recommendations through the identification and assessment of individual resources and groups of resources that may be affected by the I-30 East Corridor Project.

The APE for the project is along I-30 from the I-45 interchange to Ferguson Road. The APE is 150 feet from all existing and proposed right-of-way (ROW)/easements as instructed by TxDOT Environmental Affairs Division (TxDOT-ENV) and authorized under the Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), TxDOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and the Advisory Council of Historic Preservation (ACHP). The APE was developed in consultation with TxDOT-ENV.

Based on the approved Historic Studies Research Design (HSRD), the survey documented all resources constructed in 1981 or earlier (45 years prior to the let date). A total of 563 resources on 333 parcels of land were evaluated in this historical resources survey report. The project team recommends seven districts as eligible for the NRHP, as well as 23 resources recommended individually eligible (7 outside of districts plus 16 within) as detailed in Table 1 below.

The effects of the current single build alternative for the proposed project are summarized in Table 2 below. As this table shows, the proposed project entails displacements that constitute adverse effects to three NRHP-eligible resources on three parcels of land, as well as minor right-of-way acquisitions on four parcels of land encompassing 17 NRHP-eligible resources. Individual Section 4(f) evaluations will be required for each of the three NRHP-eligible properties that would be adversely affected, including:

- The Cabell's Building at 710 Exposition Avenue (Resource ID 197), which is both individually eligible and a contributing resource within the recommended Commerce/Exposition Historic District;
- The contributing commercial building at 820 Exposition Avenue A (Resource ID 196A), within the recommended Commerce/Exposition Historic District; and
- The contributing Craftsman bungalow at 4937 Lindsley Avenue (Resource ID 69), within the recommended Mt. Auburn/Santa Fe Historic District.

All other identified direct effects would be minor or *de minimis*, would result in no adverse effect, and will not require Individual Section 4(f) evaluations.

Table 1. NRHP eligibility recommendations for all surveyed historic-age resources within the APE.

Eligibility Recommendation	Subtotal	Total
Not eligible	260	260
Individually eligible outside historic districts		
Maintain prior designation	1	7
Newly recommended eligible	6	
Within 7 recommended eligible/listed historic districts		
Contributing		
Contributing only	250	296
Contributing and individually listed (maintain prior designation)	2	
Contributing and individually listed/eligible	14	
Noncontributing	30	
TOTAL		563

Table 2. Summary of Section 106 effects recommendations.

Historic District	Displacement of NRHP-eligible Resources (Adverse Effect)			ROW-acquisition within NRHP-boundaries of NRHP-eligible Resources (No Adverse Effect/ de minimis)		
	Address	Resource Count	Parcel Count	Address/Boundary	Resource Count	Parcel Count
Deep Ellum				501 S 2nd Ave. A-F (Gulf Oil complex, Resource ID 11A-F, also NRHP-listed as a smaller district)	6	1
Mt. Auburn/ Santa Fe	4937 Lindsley Ave. (Resource ID 69)	1	1	4809 Ash Ln. (Resource ID 44)	1	1
Commerce/ Exposition Commercial	710 Exposition Ave. (Cabell's Inc., Resource ID 197, also individually eligible)	1	1			
	820 Exposition Ave. A (Resource 196A)	1	1	820 Exposition Ave. B-I (Resource 196B-I) 832 Exposition Ave. (same parcel as 820 Exposition Ave., Resource ID 195)	8 1	1
Jubilee Park				5115 Philip Ave. (Resource ID 269)	1	1
TOTAL		3	3		17	4

Table of Contents

Project Identification	1
Area of Potential Effects (APE)	2
Section 106 Consulting Parties/Stakeholders	2
Project Setting/Study Area	5
Methodological Description	13
Literature Review	18
Historical Context Statement	19
National Register Eligibility Recommendations	41
Determination of Section 106 Effects Recommendations	59
U.S. DOT Section 4(f) Applicability Statement	65
References Cited	67
Appendix A: Project Information and ROW Information	A-1
Appendix B: Tabular Inventory of Surveyed Properties	B-1
Appendix C: Survey Forms for All Surveyed Properties	C-1
Appendix D: Figures	D-1
Appendix E: Project Area Photographs	E-1
Appendix F: Consulting Party Comments	F-1
Appendix G: Approved Historic Survey Research Design Tables	G-1

Project Identification

- **Report Completion Date:** 04/21/2023
- **Dates of Fieldwork:** 12/24/2022 to 12/28/2022
- **Survey Type:** Windshield Reconnaissance Intensive
- **Report Version:** Draft Final
- **Regulatory Jurisdiction:** Federal State
- **TxDOT Contract Number:** 57202SH014
- **District:** Dallas
- **County:** Dallas
- **Highway or Facility:** Interstate Highway (I) 30
- **Project Limits:** I-30 East Corridor Project
 - **From:** I-45 Interchange
 - **To:** Ferguson Road
- **Main CSJ Number** 0009-11-252
- **Report Authors:** Emily Payne, HHM; Kristina Kupferschmid, HHM
- **Principal Investigator:** Emily Reed, Stantec
- **List of Preparers:** Emily Reed, Stantec, Principal Investigator, QA/QC; Emily Payne, HHM, fieldwork and primary author; Kristina Kupferschmid, HHM, co-author; Erin Tyson, HHM, GIS; and Adrienne Campbell, Stantec, QA/QC

Area of Potential Effects (APE)

▪	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing ROW <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 150' from Proposed ROW and Easements <input type="checkbox"/> 300' from Proposed ROW and Easements <input type="checkbox"/> Custom: <0'> from Proposed ROW and Easements
---	---

The APE is 150 feet from existing and proposed ROW and easements for the entire project length, as instructed by TxDOT ENV and authorized per the Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT), the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and the Advisory Council of Historic Preservation (ACHP). For the project description see Appendix A. For maps depicting the project see Appendix D.

- **Historic-Age Survey Cut-Off Date:** 1981
- **Study Area** 1,300 feet from edge of the APE

Section 106 Consulting Parties/Stakeholders

- **Public Involvement Outreach Efforts:**

All potential consulting parties listed below received an email on February 28, 2022, requesting additional information regarding historic properties in the study area. An in-person public meeting was held for the project on June 8, 2021, a virtual public meeting was open from June 8, 2021, to June 23, 2021, and a notice of opportunity to comment was available from June 8, 2021, to June 23, 2021. No comments regarding historic properties/historic places were received from the public.

- **Identification of Section 106 Consulting Parties:**

Future Section 106 coordination efforts should use the contact information below, updated as of February 2023:

Jason Harper, Executive Director
Preservation Dallas
2922 Swiss Avenue
Dallas, TX 75204
Email: jharper@echelonleadership.net

Julia Ryan, Interim Historic Preservation Officer
City of Dallas Historic Preservation Office
1500 Marilla Street, Room 5BN
Dallas, TX 75201
Email: julia.ryan@dallas.gov

Juanita Nanez, Chair
The Dallas County Historical Commission
3842 Medallion Ln.
Dallas, TX 75229

Justin Kockritz
Texas Historical Commission
Justin.Kockritz@thc.texas.gov

Karl Chiao
Dallas Historical Society
P.O. Box 150038
Dallas, TX 75315

Jason Harper, Executive Director (David Preziosi)
Preservation Dallas
2922 Swiss Avenue
Dallas, TX 75204

Dallas County Certified Local Government
Dallas City Hall
1500 Marilla Street
Dallas, TX 75201

Elaine Hill
City of Dallas Landmark Commission
1500 Marilla Street, Room 5BN
Dallas, TX 75201

Matt Wood
Friends of Fair Park
1121 First Avenue
Dallas, TX 75210

Dr. Harry Robinson
African American Museum of Fair Park
P.O. Box 1gu57
Dallas, TX 75315

Preston Cooley
Dallas Heritage Village
1515 South Harwood Street
Dallas, TX 75215

Evan Thompson
Preservation Texas
P.O. Box 3514
San Marcos, TX 78667

Marissa Castro MiKoy
Jubilee Park and Community Center
907 Bank Street
Dallas, TX 75223

▪ **Section 106 Review Efforts:**

TxDOT informally coordinated an earlier version of this historic resources report, based on a 2022 survey conducted by HNTB. As part of that earlier effort, TxDOT sent emails to the consulting parties listed above on February 28, 2022, notifying them of the project and requesting comment on known historic resources and local landmarks. Based on comments from THC, TxDOT determined that additional survey investigations were warranted (as documented in this report). TxDOT will initiate formal consultation with the THC and other parties in Spring 2023.

Note that some groups have experienced staff turnover since the initial coordination efforts from February 28, 2022. Future Section 106 coordination efforts should use the contact information above, updated as of February 2023.

▪ **Summary of Consulting Parties Comments:**

In September 2022, TxDOT coordinated with the THC regarding a preliminary draft HRSR for the I-30 East corridor. The THC provided comments to TxDOT in late September 2022, noting that the preliminary HRSR appeared to have missed at least 60 historic resources within the APE, that some eligibility evaluations were inconsistent with prior survey reports, and that historic district evaluations did not provide sufficient context. These comments led TxDOT to pursue resurvey, reevaluation, and revision of this survey report between November 2022 and April 2023.

▪ **Identification of Stakeholder Parties:**

Initial survey and research conducted in early 2022 identified two initial stakeholder parties:

- Alex Gonzalez, Owner of Excalibur Collision Center (within the APE at 710 Exposition Avenue, Dallas, TX 75226), and

- Fair Park Estates Neighborhood Association (outside of the APE to the south – located between Malcolm X Boulevard, Park Row Avenue, Jeffries Street, and South Boulevard).¹

Updated survey and research conducted in late 2022 and early 2023 identified four potential additional stakeholder parties, which TxDOT may include in future outreach efforts:

- Mount Auburn Neighborhood Association (intersecting the APE – roughly bound by Cameron Avenue, Munger Boulevard/I-30, E Grand Avenue/Graham Street, and Santa Fe Avenue),²
- Claremont Neighborhood Association (intersecting the APE – roughly bound by Ferguson Road, I30, Honeycutt, and Dorrington Drive),³
- Owenwood Neighborhood Association (intersecting the APE – roughly bound by Haskell/Military, I-30, Dolphin Road, and Henderson Avenue),⁴ and
- Jubilee Park Community Center (located at 917 Bank Street, Dallas, TX 75223 – outside of the APE but within the recommended Jubilee Park Historic District, which intersects the APE).⁵

- **Summary of Stakeholder Comments:**

No comments received to date.

Project Setting/Study Area

- **Historic-age Bridges in APE**

The APE for the proposed project includes 38 historic-age bridges, as detailed below.

Previously Documented Historic-age Bridges

Within the APE, 36 bridges were identified as historic-age per the National Bridge Inventory (NBI) but were not surveyed because of programmatic exemptions. These bridges are listed below in Tables 3 and 4, and their locations are depicted in Appendix D on Figure 1. Among these, 35 bridges are associated with the Interstate Highway System (Table 3). In 2006 the ACHP, in cooperation with the

¹ “Fair Park Estates,” Southfair CDC, accessed 04/12/2023, <https://southfaircdc.org/single-family-housing/#fair-park-estates>; “Fair Park Estates Neighborhood Association,” Facebook, accessed 04/12/2023, <https://www.facebook.com/groups/517697064997173/>.

² “Mount Auburn Neighborhood Association,” accessed 04/12/2023, <https://mountauburnneighborhood.org/about/>; “Neighborhood Association Map,” City of Dallas, accessed 04/12/2023, https://dallascityhall.com/departments/pnv/DCH%20Documents/NOM%20for%20Web_March2020.pdf.

³ “About CANA,” Claremont Addition Neighborhood Association, accessed 04/12/2023, <https://www.claremontaddition.org/>; “Neighborhood Association Map.”

⁴ “Owenwood Neighborhood Association,” Facebook, accessed 04/12/2023, <https://m.facebook.com/groups/owenwood/>; “Neighborhood Association Map.”

⁵ “Jubilee Park,” accessed 04/12/2023, <https://www.jubileecenter.org/>.

FHWA, approved an exemption that relieves federal agencies from the requirement of evaluating effects of their undertaking on the Interstate Highway System except for specific individual elements included in the “Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System.” The interstate highway and bridges within the project APE are not included on this list. Therefore, the previously documented historic age bridges present within the APE do not require further evaluation under Section 106. The APE also includes one post-1945 concrete culvert (Table 4), which was also exempt from Section 106 per the 2012 “Program Comment for Common Post-1945 Concrete and Steel Bridges” issued by the ACHP upon request from the FHWA.⁶

⁶ “Environmental Review Toolkit: Program Comment for Common Post-1945 Concrete and Steel Bridges,” FHWA, accessed 04/13/2023, https://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/env_topics/historic_pres/program_comment.aspx.

Table 3. Bridges within the APE under interstate exemption.

Location	NBI#	Date
IH 30/ Jim Miller Rd, 1.0 Mi W of LP 12	180570000911201	1961
Draw/ IH 30 ML & FR, 1.6 Mi W of LP 12	180570000911202	1961
Hunnicut Rd/ IH 30 EB, 1.8 Mi W of LP 12	180570000911203	1961
Drainage Ditch/ IH 30 ML & FR, 2.3 Mi W of LP 12	180570000911204	1961
Ferguson Rd./ IH 30 EB, 2.4 Mi W of Loop 12	180570000911205	1961
SH 352 Exposition etc/ IH 30 WB, 0.3 Mi E of IH 45	180570000911212	1961
E Grand Ave (SH 78)/ IH 30 WB, 2.2 Mi E of IH 45	180570000911243	1962
E Grand Ave (SH 78)/ IH 30 EB, 2.2 Mi E of IH 45	180570000911244	1962
Winslow Ave/ IH 30 WB, 2.4 Mi E of IH 45	180570000911245	1962
Winslow Ave/ IH 30 EB, 2.4 Mi E of IH 45	180570000911246	1962
IH 30/ Dolphin Rd, 2.9 Mi E of IH 45	180570000911247	1962
Union Pacific RR/ IH 30 WB, 3.2 Mi E of IH 45	180570000911248	1962
Union Pacific RR/ IH 30 EB, 3.2 Mi E of IH 45	180570000911249	1962
White Rock Crk & Samuell/ IH 30 WB, 2.9 Mi W of Loop 12	180570000911250	1962
White Rock Crk & Samuell/ IH 30 EB, 2.9 Mi W of Loop 12	180570000911251	1962
Peak St./ IH 30 EB, 1.2 MI E of IH 45	180570000911252	1963
CARROLL AVE/ IH 30 EB, 1.3 MI E OF IH 45	180570000911253	1963
Fitzhugh Ave/ IH 30 EB, 1.7 Mi E of IH 45	180570000911254	1963
Lindsley Ave/ IH 30 EB, 1.7 Mi E of IH 45	180570000911255	1963
Barry Ave/ IH 30 EB, 1.8 Mi E of IH 45	180570000911256	1963
IH 30/ Malcom X Blvd, 0.1 Mi E of IH 45	180570000911281	1966
IH 45 Conn C & D/ IH 30 WB Conn B, 0.3 Mi E of Preston St	180570000911312	1971
IH 45 Conn C & D/ IH 30 EB Conn A, 0.3 Mi E of Preston St	180570000911313	1971
IH 30/ IH 45 SB Conn D, 0.3 Mi E of Preston St	180570000911346	1961
Malcom X Blvd/ IH 30 WB Conn B-A, 0.1 Mi E of IH 45	180570000911360	1971
Ferguson Rd./ IH 30 WB, 2.4 Mi W of Loop 12	180570000911388	1961
White Rock Draw/ IH 30 EB Off-Ramp, 2.8 Mi W of Loop 12	180570000911389	1962
Peak St./ IH 30 WB, 1.2 MI E of IH 45	180570000911390	1963
CARROLL AVE/ IH 30 WB, 1.3 MI E OF IH 45	180570000911391	1963
Fitzhugh Ave/ IH 30 WB, 1.7 Mi E of IH 45	180570000911392	1963
Lindsley Ave/ IH 30 WB, 1.7 Mi E of IH 45	180570000911393	1963
Barry Ave./ IH 30 WB, 1.8 Mi E of IH 45	180570000911397	1963
SH 352 Exposition etc/ IH 30 EB, 0.3 Mi E of IH 45	180570000911410	1964
Hunnicut Rd/ IH 30 WB, 1.8 Mi W of LP 12	180570000911480	1961
IH 30 US 75 Dart Rail/ IH 345 SB, IH345 & IH30 Interchange	180570009214197	1971

Table 4. Bridge within the APE under post-1945 concrete culvert exemption.

Location	NBI#	Date
WHITE ROCK CREEK TRIB/ HUNNICUT ROAD, 0.10 MI N OF IH 30	1805709H9000001	1969

Newly Documented Historic-Age Bridges

The historic resources survey documented two additional historic-age bridges in the APE, neither of which are included in the NBI:

- Resource ID 137, a grade separation (over/under pass) located at 3700 Samuell Blvd., where Samuell Blvd. intersects the T&NO railroad tracks, constructed in 1936 and recommended individually eligible for listing in the NRHP
- Resource ID 141, a bridge-class culvert located in the 3900 block of Samuell Blvd. underneath I-30, constructed in 1936 and recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP

The proposed project would not affect either of these bridges.

▪ **Previously Evaluated Historic Resources**

Table G-1 within **Appendix G** consolidates information regarding the previously documented bridges listed above, as well as an additional 110 previously evaluated historic resources within the APE and/or study area. Previously evaluated resources also are mapped in **Appendix D**. Note that the data within Table G-1 is organized to differentiate between previously *evaluated* historic properties (both individual properties and districts) versus previously *designated* historic properties (both individual properties and districts, discussed below).

▪ **Previously Designated Historic Properties**

Table G-1 within **Appendix G** consolidates information regarding the 149 previously designated historic properties within the APE and/or the broader study area. These resources are either individually designated, contributing to a designated historic district, or both. An additional 32 resources within the APE/study area are noncontributing within a listed district, as detailed in Table G-1. Previously designated resources also are mapped in **Appendix D**. Note that the data within Table G-1 is organized to differentiate between previously *designated* historic properties (both individual properties and districts) versus previously *evaluated* historic properties (both individual properties and districts, discussed above).

▪ **Previously Designated/Pending Historic Districts**

As noted above, information regarding previously designated/pending historic districts is consolidated within Table G-1 within **Appendix G** and maps in **Appendix D**. A summary of previously designated/pending historic districts includes:

- The Deep Ellum Historic District, approved by the Texas State Board of Review on January 14, 2023, and currently pending official NRHP listing by the National Park Service; eligible under Criterion A at the local level of significance in the areas of Ethnic History, Commerce, and Social History;

period of significance from 1872 to 1973. The Deep Ellum Historic District remains extant, and this report recommends maintaining its listing. Boundaries of the district are shown within Figure 27 in **Appendix D**. This district's boundaries also encompass:

- A number of individually eligible/listed resources, as detailed in Table G-1 within **Appendix G**; and
 - The Gulf Oil Distribution Facility Historic District, listed in the NRHP in 2010 at the local level under Criterion A for Industry, period of significance from 1900 to 1974;⁷ also locally designed as a Dallas Landmark Structure.⁸ The district remains extant, and this report recommends maintaining the prior listing.
- Texas Centennial Exposition Buildings/Fair Park Historic District, listed in the NRHP in 1986 at the national level of significance (National Historic Landmark [NHL]) under Criterion A in the area of Entertainment/Recreation;⁹ also listed as a State Antiquities Landmark¹⁰ and a local Dallas Landmark District.¹¹ The district remains extant, and this report recommends maintaining the prior listing.

NRHP Evaluation Methods

To be eligible for the NRHP, a resource must meet a 50-year age threshold, must possess significance under at least one of the National Register Criteria, and retain sufficient physical integrity to convey its significance.¹² Research and analysis of historic significance is not necessary unless a resource retains sufficient integrity to be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP. A resource need not retain all seven aspects of integrity to be eligible for designation; conversely, a resource possessing all seven aspects of integrity is not necessarily eligible for designation. The degree to which an eligible resource should retain its integrity depends directly upon the criteria under which the resource possesses significance and is considered eligible for designation. For example, a property eligible under NRHP Criterion C in the area of Architecture should retain the aspects of integrity linked to physical qualities (design, materials, and workmanship) to a higher degree than one that is eligible for its historical

⁷ "Gulf Oil Distribution Facility," Texas Historical Sites Atlas, Texas Historical Commission, <https://atlas.thc.state.tx.us/Details/2010000144>.

⁸ "Gulf Refining Company / Hickory Street Annex," Dallas Structures and Sites, City of Dallas, <https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/Pages/Gulf-Refining-Company.aspx>.

⁹ "Fair Park Texas Centennial Buildings (1936-1937)," Texas Historical Sites Atlas, Texas Historical Commission, <https://atlas.thc.state.tx.us/Details/2086003488>.

¹⁰ "Fair Park," Texas Historical Sites Atlas, Texas Historical Commission, <https://atlas.thc.state.tx.us/Details/8200005923>.

¹¹ "Fair Park Historic District," Dallas Landmark Historic Districts, City of Dallas, https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/Pages/fair_park.aspx.

¹² National Register Criteria Consideration G provides an exception under which exceptionally significant properties may be eligible for listing if they are less than 50 years old. No resources less than 50 years old within the APE meet Criteria Consideration G.

associations. In some instances, alterations that are more than 50 years old may have helped to support ongoing historic activity and may have historic significance in their own right.

Similarly, the scale of an integrity evaluation should correspond to the scale of a resource. An individual resource must convey its story on its own. To do so, an individual resource must retain a high degree of integrity. On the other hand, a historic district contains a collection of resources that tell a small part of the overall story. For a historic district eligible for association with significant community planning and development trends, the overall integrity of streetscape patterns, landscape patterns, and building scale may hold more importance than each individual building's integrity of materials.

Based on preliminary understanding of the historic context of the survey area, the considerations below should be applied to NRHP evaluations. These considerations should be updated as needed after further research and historic context development for the HRSR, and earlier NRHP evaluations should be revisited as needed.

- A higher integrity threshold is required for individual eligibility than for contributing status within an eligible historic district, as detailed within Table G-2 in **Appendix G**
- Alterations not visible from the public right-of-way generally do not impair integrity for NRHP-eligibility evaluation purposes
- Compatibly designed alterations generally do not impair integrity
- Historic-age alterations should be noted and evaluated for potential significance in their own right (for example, a location adjacent to I-30 should not be considered a dealbreaker for integrity of setting since the highway's development has significance in its own right)
- Alterations that allow continuity of a significant cultural or historical activity should be evaluated differently, especially if reversible
 - In Deep Ellum, additions of canopies or roof decks that facilitate ongoing use as cultural arts venues should not be considered detrimental to integrity, provided that the original portion of the building retains its overall integrity
 - Along highways, historic-age alterations to add overhead rolling doors and loading docks to warehouses and industrial buildings helped facilitate the transition from rail-oriented transportation to highway transportation and therefore should be evaluated for significance in their own right
 - Where historic urban plans and zoning changes dictated changes in land use or demographics, those changes typically have significance in their own right

- In neighborhoods with documented history of structural segregation and discrimination, repairs and maintenance using affordable substitute materials should not be considered detrimental to integrity
- Culturally influenced landscape changes may have significance in their own right, such as the addition of fences or statuary to yards in neighborhoods that transitioned to predominantly Mexican American demographics

- **Historic Land Use**

The project study area was first settled for agricultural development in the 1840s and then gradually urbanized from the 1870s through the 1960s. The earliest urban development occurred at the northwestern edge of the study area, in Deep Ellum, which adjoins downtown Dallas. A series of railroad networks were constructed through Deep Ellum in the 1870s and 1880s, leading to development of the area as a dense mixed-use district from the 1880s through the 1930s. By the 1920s, industrial development also stretched south of Deep Ellum and into the southwestern edge of the study area, as indicated by the 1925 construction of a larger Ford Motor Company plant on Grande Avenue (south of present-day I-30). Around the same time, the development of streetcars led to suburban residential development stretching eastward from Deep Ellum, including the Mt. Auburn neighborhood found in the study area today. Typical of nationwide trends, park development accompanied suburban growth, as seen by the dedication of Samuell-Grand Park and Tenison Park Golf Course just east of Mt. Auburn in the 1920s. In 1930, the City of Dallas adopted a zoning ordinance that encouraged separation of residential uses from industrial and commercial uses, leading to further industrial development and residential displacement in Deep Ellum, as well as further suburban residential development at the edges East Dallas, as exemplified by the Owenwood neighborhood within the project area. The 1936 redevelopment of Fair Park for the Texas Centennial Exposition additionally encouraged commercial development and residential displacement at the western edge of the study area. A 1947 City of Dallas zoning ordinance zoned both Deep Ellum and the area of Fair Park for manufacturing, leading to further redevelopment of these areas and further pushing residential development eastward. Construction of I-30 in the 1960s perpetuated this trend, as exemplified by the development of the Claremont neighborhood at the northeastern edge of the study area. The highway's construction also cut through older neighborhoods, resulting in demolition of older fabric and redevelopment of many highway-adjacent lots with auto-oriented commercial buildings like gas stations and drive-through restaurants.

- **Current Land Use and Environment**

The city of Dallas is located at the center of Dallas County and is bisected by the Trinity River. The project APE extends through the southeast quadrant of the city,

beginning east of the I-30/I-45 interchange and continuing east to Ferguson Road. The western section of the APE includes commercial and industrial neighborhoods with numerous historic-age resources and several known historic districts – including Fair Park (listed as an NHL), the Deep Ellum Historic District (pending NRHP nomination), and the Commerce Street Warehouse District (determined eligible in 2001). Slightly further east, a series of historic-age neighborhoods line the project area along both sides of I-30. Historic names of residential neighborhoods intersecting the study area include Jubilee Park, East-We-Go, Mount Auburn, Owenwood, and Claremont.

Predominant land uses proximate to I-30 between I-45 and Ferguson Road are residential, commercial/industrial, open space, and institutional/cultural. Land uses in other sections of the study area are predominantly commercial, industrial, and/or warehousing/distribution. Specific land uses within the study area include the following:

- Most commercial uses in the APE are highway-oriented retail strip development, but the study area also includes neighborhood commerce and a rich array of music and arts venues in Deep Ellum and near Fair Park. Industrial development dates primarily from the early twentieth century, associated with the area's historic rail network. Warehousing and distribution center development dates from the mid- to late-twentieth century, associated with the city's interstate highway network.
- The primary locations of residential land use in the study area lie between Haskell Avenue and White Rock Creek, both north and south of I-30.
- Undeveloped open space or park land accounts for a small but significant portion of the study area. Fair Park is located near the eastern edge of the study area, south of I-30. The Santa Fe Trail is a bicycle/pedestrian trail that provides access between Fair Park, Deep Ellum, and the White Rock Lake and White Rock Creek trails north of the study area and Fair Park along an abandoned railroad corridor through the study area (entering the APE between Commerce Street and Hill Avenue). Samuell Grand Park and Tenison Park Golf Course are both adjacent to the west bank of White Rock Creek on the north side of I-30. Other open spaces are north of I-30 and east of Winslow Avenue, and Grove Hill Memorial Park and Cemeteries are south of I-30 and east of Lawnview Avenue.
- Miscellaneous institutional and cultural tracts within and intersecting the study area include police and fire stations, a community center, schools, hospitals, arts auditoriums, museums, sports arenas, and social/fraternal organizations.

Based on preliminary studies, historic-age property types in this area consist primarily of early and mid-twentieth century single family residences, commercial

buildings, and industrial buildings, as well as mid-twentieth century institutional buildings. Non-historic-age property types include multi-family dwellings and commercial buildings.

- **Historic Periods and Property Types**

The 2023 survey update found that about 79 percent of the historic-age resources within the APE were residential, with commercial resources accounting for about 18 percent, industrial resources about 1 percent, and the remaining 2 percent comprised a mix of transportation, health care, and educational resources.¹³ The period of significance for residential resources stretches from approximately 1900 through 1961, while significant commercial development stretched from 1872 through 1954 and significant industrial development from 1872 through 1965. Additional details regarding the development trends associated with each property type and historic period are included within the historic context.

- **Integrity of Historic Setting**

The completion of I-30 in the mid-1960s was the single greatest impact to the project area's historic setting. Historic maps and aerial photographs show that the interstate corridor entailed demolition of a mix of residential, commercial, and industrial buildings. In their place, new highway service roads and access ramps were constructed, along with new roadside commercial buildings. However, the APE for the proposed project extends into areas not previously directly disturbed by the construction of I-30. Although the construction of I-30 changed the original setting of these neighborhoods, the original construction of the highway was more than 50 years ago and now falls within the period of significance for many identified historic properties and historic districts. Therefore, the loss of integrity caused by construction of the interstate highway is not sufficient to render the historic resources ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

That said, some areas within the APE suffered from changes to their setting after the end of the historic period (1981). These include demolition of historic-age resources and construction of non-historic infill, especially immediately adjacent to highway service roads.

Survey Methods

- **Methodological Description**

The methodology below describes survey and data-management methods as well as methods for evaluating the NRHP eligibility of surveyed resources. The main

¹³ Note that the 2022 draft survey recorded property types inconsistently, making it difficult to calculate percentages accurately.

intent behind the methodology for this project was to incorporate prior survey data as much as possible, while ensuring that NRHP evaluations were consistent. To that end, the survey integrates findings from the 2020 HNTB survey of the I-30 Canyon corridor, the 2021–2022 HHM & Associates survey of Downtown Dallas and Deep Ellum prepared for the City of Dallas and Preservation Dallas, data from a 2022 preliminary survey of the I-30 East corridor by HNTB, and updated survey data gathered along the I-30 East corridor by HHM in 2022–2023. The methods for including and consolidating these different data sets were refined in consultation with TxDOT during development of the updated Historic Resources Research Design in November 2022, as well as during review of the first draft of this HRSR in March 2023.

Survey and Data Management Methods

The methods described herein were followed for the resurvey of the project area to ensure compliance with TxDOT standards, integrating all prior designations/evaluations listed in Table G-1, as well as data from the September 2022 HNTB Draft HRSR (which were checked and reevaluated).¹⁴ To expedite documentation and evaluation, survey efforts for this project combined several different levels of documentation based on different property types and the likelihood of NRHP eligibility. The following levels of documentation are detailed within this section:

- Desktop analysis of CAD data and aerial photographs to eliminate parcels unlikely to include historic-age resources and prepare data for field survey
- Integration of previously evaluated/designated resources listed in Table G-1 (i.e., no new field survey or NRHP reevaluation unless the prior evaluation is more than 10 years old)
- Compilation of individual documentation of all historic-age resources within the APE, using a combination of prior survey data and new survey data
- Collective windshield-level documentation of potential historic districts that intersect the APE, based on analysis of historic patterns presented in Figures 15–26 in **Appendix D**

Each of these levels of documentation is described in greater detail below. All data were consolidated into a single tabular inventory, as well as a single set of survey forms and maps following TxDOT standards.

Desktop Analysis and Data Preparation

- Integrate Dallas County CAD data

¹⁴ As noted above, the September 2022 HNTB Draft HRSR did not identify any new eligible resources; all resources recommended eligible were based on earlier designations and evaluations. See page 15 of the September 2022 HNTB Draft HRSR.

- Create GIS-compatible point data for each individual resource within the APE
 - Use GIS to assign latitude and longitude coordinates to each point
 - Pull geographic information from CAD (including the Property Identification No., address, owner identification, and acreage)
 - Determine likelihood of historic-age resources by filtering CAD construction date estimates to use earliest construction date for each resource and analyzing historic aerial photographs
 - Tag non-historic age (post-1981) data points in the GIS layer/spreadsheet that were used for field survey (no field documentation required for these points)
- Integrate Previously Designated/Evaluated Resources
 - Consolidate data regarding prior eligibility determinations and/or historic designations
 - Link compiled data to the points created above
 - Cite the prior survey and prior documentation date
 - Encode reconnaissance-level survey data as possible using prior survey reports and/or nominations
 - Encode eligibility recommendations based on prior survey reports and/or nominations (no further field documentation or evaluation required)
- Integrate prior HNTB survey data, as possible
 - Link prior HNTB survey data for this project area to the GIS-compatible points created above
 - Retain a note field with the old Resource ID No. from the HNTB survey to facilitate comparison of drafts if necessary
 - Check HNTB data for accuracy and revise based on professional judgement – especially integrity and eligibility fields
 - Flag records that require additional field survey, for example:
 - Resources where integrity is not clearly visible in HNTB photos
 - Resources with associated auxiliary buildings that require new photography
- Create database records for historic-age resources that will require new field survey, prepopulated with CAD data linked above
 - Ensure that all missed properties noted by the THC in their review of the HNTB HRSR are included among the new records for additional survey
- Identify potential historic districts across the study area

- Use GIS to color-code all parcels within the study area based on subdivision names available in CAD (resulting in Figures 15–26; note that subdivision names in CAD are incomplete and subdivision analysis was supplemented with original plats in the HRSR)
- Compare the map of CAD subdivision names with historic maps
- In addition to subdivisions, note any other historically associated clusters or groupings of parcels that extend into the APE (such as the Grove Hill Memorial Park Cemetery if historic maps indicate that its boundaries included the present-day Grove Hill Funeral Home parcel)
- Draw GIS-compatible polygons representing boundaries of potential historic districts based on a combination of subdivision patterns, historic maps, and aerial photos (resulting in the district polygons shown in Figure 1 in **Appendix D**)

Individual Survey within the APE

- Ensure that each individual historic-age resource within the APE is represented by a point in the field survey database
- Follow a consistent methodology regardless of whether ROW acquisition is proposed for the parcel, which will help ensure that survey data remains reliable even if project schematics change
- For all points within the APE (even if they overlap with subdivisions):
 - Identify points where prior survey data is missing or insufficient and resurvey is needed
 - Where resurvey is needed, document all reconnaissance-level fields of data as succinctly as possible, to include:
 - Resource ID#
 - Documentation date
 - Address/Location
 - Function/ Sub-function
 - Architectural Style
 - Dates
 - Integrity/Comments
 - NRHP Eligibility
- Attach two photographs per TxDOT standards (as possible)
- Log the location and date of each photo

Collective Desktop/Windshield Survey of Potential Historic Districts

Eight previously unevaluated potential historic districts extend into the APE. Methods for surveying these resources are described below. Potential effects to these resources were assessed within this HRSR. Most of the potential historic districts in the APE were developed before 1945, and only one district (the

recommended Claremont Historic District), but all neighborhoods were impacted by the construction of I-30 to some degree. As a result, the following customized methodology was used for all evaluating historic-age residential neighborhoods within the APE:

- Survey every resource within the APE at the reconnaissance level, even if it lies within a residential neighborhood evaluated as a historic district
- Drive or review Google StreetView for every street/block within the potential historic districts that intersect the APE, based on boundaries indicated on the maps in **Appendix D**
- Complete a district-level survey form for each potential district that intersects the APE, with fields of data designed to flow the tabular inventory of individual resources, to include:
 - Potential district name
 - Documentation date
 - Subdivision/neighborhood name(s) encoded in the Address/Location field
 - Estimated range of construction dates
 - District-wide integrity notes and estimated percentage of contributing/noncontributing resources encoded in the Integrity/Comments field
 - District-level eligibility recommendation encoded in the NRHP Eligibility field
 - Additional fields only if the district retains sufficient integrity for potential NRHP eligibility (per Table G-2):
 - Representative property types encoded in the Function/Sub-function field
 - Representative architectural styles encoded in the Architectural Style field
- Photograph at least two representative streetscapes within the district
 - If the district retains sufficient integrity for potential NRHP eligibility, photograph examples of each representative property type and representative architectural style
- Log the location and date of each photo

Data Analysis and Processing

- Review the old and new survey data for accuracy and consistency
- Integrate property-specific research provided by the THC in comments on the HNTB draft report, as well as information from the historic context
- As needed, conduct additional property-specific research using Sanborn maps, City Directories, and/or newspapers to evaluate eligibility

- Format the data to facilitate seamless reporting of the existing HNTB data alongside new survey data in the HRSR for ease of interpretation
 - Assign new Resource ID Nos. based on map location (retaining a note field with the old Resource ID No. from the HNTB survey to facilitate comparison of drafts if necessary)
 - Ensure that all primary historic-age resources on parcels within APE receive an independent Resource ID No., even if they are evaluated as part of a potential historic district (as opposed to the subset lettering—A, B, C, etc.—that was inconsistently used in the HNTB HRSR for some resources within some district groupings)
 - Ensure that all historic-age accessory buildings receive separate subset lettering (reconciling inconsistencies in documentation of accessory buildings in the HNTB HRSR)
 - Assure that numbering is consistent among the inventory, maps, and survey forms (expanding upon prior survey information)
 - Assure that all historic-age resources—both primary and accessory—are included within the inventory, maps, and survey forms (correcting HNTB inconsistencies)
 - Paste detailed information and images from HNTB survey forms into HHM’s standard TxDOT survey forms as possible

▪ **Comments on Methods**

None

Literature Review

Preparation of the updated Stantec/HHM Research Design for this project, as well as this updated Stantec/HHM HRSR, entailed review of the prior HNTB Research Design and draft HRSR, as well as all sources proposed in the Research Design and listed in under the References Cited heading within this HRSR. Key resources are listed below:

- Historic aerial photographs
- Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps from the University of Texas Libraries and the Library of Congress
- Murphy & Bolanz plat books from the Dallas Public Library
- Vertical Files from the Dallas Public Library
- HHM National Register Nomination for the Deep Ellum Historic District, 2022
- HHM citywide thematic historic context statements for the City of Dallas, 2022

Historical Context Statement

▪ Introduction

The City of Dallas was founded by John Neely Bryan in 1841 in the center of Dallas County. Development in the project APE generally began after the arrival of the railroad in 1872. Though a majority of resources date to the early and mid-twentieth century, development occurred through the historic period into the 1970s. The resources in the project area reflect the themes discussed in the historic context. Resources surveyed eligible under the themes discussed in the context may be eligible in the following areas of significance: Commerce, Community Planning and Development, Entertainment/Recreation, Ethnic History, Industry, and Transportation. Periods of significance span from 1872 to 1973, the 50-year mark.

▪ Railroad Development (1872–1910)

Prior to the arrival of the railroad in 1872, development in the project area was sparse and small-scale. Most of the project area was rural and undeveloped. Areas closer to downtown, in Deep Ellum, were semi-rural with scattered residential development, while further east was characteristically agricultural. The arrival of the railroad profoundly impacted the development of the city and project area, spurring industrial, commercial, and residential growth into the first decade of the twentieth century. Resources associated with this theme may be eligible for the NRHP in the following areas of significance: Community Planning and Development, Industry, Commerce, Transportation, and Ethnic History.

Between 1872 and the early twentieth century, railroad companies built a network of rail lines in the city. In the project area, the Houston & Texas Central (H&TC) formed the western boundary of Deep Ellum, and the Texas & Pacific Railroad (T&P), which arrived in 1873, bordered Deep Ellum to the south and separated it from East Dallas to the east. The construction of the H&TC depot one mile east of the courthouse pushed rail-related development eastward and spurred the construction of more rail lines. Throughout the rest of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, the Missouri–Kansas–Texas (MKT), the Gulf, Colorado and Santa Fe (GC&SF), the Texas & New Orleans (T&NO), and the Texas Trunk Railroad built lines through the project area.

“The locations of the railroads generally corresponded to land grants from the State of Texas, but they also resulted from efforts of a prominent banker and real estate developer named William H. Gaston.”¹⁵ “Gaston was a powerful force in Dallas' early development. Within a few years of his arrival in 1867, he purchased

¹⁵ HHM & Associates, “Deep Ellum Historic District,” National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form, Texas Historical Commission, Austin, 2022.

vast tracts of land in South and East Dallas, founded Dallas' first bank, donated land for the County Fair (present site of Baylor Hospital), and eventually parlayed the small exposition into the State Fair. Most importantly, Gaston, with backing from local businessmen, brought the railroads to Dallas in 1872 and 1873, which ultimately made the city's fortune. His impact in East Dallas was achieved by maneuvering both the Houston and Texas Central (H&TC) and the Texas and Pacific (T&P) railroads to a junction approximately one and a half miles to the east of the Courthouse. In doing so, Gaston helped orchestrate Dallas' growth away from the Trinity River towards the railroad station on his lands in East Dallas.”¹⁶ To accommodate anticipated growth along the rail lines, Gaston and other property owners divided their land into small lots, creating new subdivisions including Gaston Addition and Jefferson Peak.¹⁷

In Deep Ellum, “situated just east of the city's burgeoning downtown business district, the project corridor grew to serve Dallas' rapidly increasing population. From the early to the mid-twentieth century, the area's numerous busy rail lines spurred construction of warehouses, cold storage facilities, industrial plants, and residential neighborhoods to house the workers and their families. Early twentieth-century industrial development in this portion of Dallas included the Texas Ice House (Resource 19), the original Pearlstone Mill and Grain Elevator (Resources 8A and 8B), warehouses along Exposition Avenue and Commerce Street, and the second Ford Motor Company manufacturing plant (Resources 271 A–G), all of which were completed in the first half of the twentieth century.”¹⁸

”Located along a spur of the T&NO rail line, the Pearlstone Mill and Grain Elevator (built between 1905 and 1921, and reconstructed following a 1928 fire) and the Texas Ice House (built in 1913) reflect the industrialization of Deep Ellum spurred on by the railroad.

“While commerce and industry clustered near railroads and streetcar lines [in Deep Ellum], residences populated the areas between. Residential areas included both dense lines of shotguns for worker housing and more generous houses grouped together on the same block as well, as shown by Sanborn maps from 1885. Sanborn maps show that this pattern continued into the early twentieth century, with the areas adjoining the H&TC line growing exclusively commercial and commercial development gradually moving eastward along Elm Street.”¹⁹

¹⁶ City of Dallas, “Peak’s Suburban Addition/Millcreek Neighborhood,” Dallas Landmark Commission Nomination Form. City of Dallas, 1993, from the City of Dallas, https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/DCH%20documents/Peaks_Suburban_Dallas_Landmark_Nomination%20Form.pdf.

¹⁷ Robert W. Glover, “Gaston, William Henry,” *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed July 15, 2022, <https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/gaston-william-henry>.

¹⁸ HNTB, “Draft Historical Resources Survey Report, Reconnaissance Survey & Intensive Survey, I-30 East Corridor Project, Dallas,” Texas Department of Transportation, September 2022.

¹⁹ HHM & Associates, “Deep Ellum Historic District.”

Outside the city limits at the time, northeast and east of Deep Ellum, a separate, though smaller, rail-boom occurred in what was then East Dallas (annexed by the City of Dallas in 1890). In anticipation of the railroad and ensuing construction boom, estate owners in the area subdivided their lands in the late nineteenth century. Jefferson Peak was among the landowners who platted a large portion of his estate. Characteristic of development in East Dallas as the time, the Peak's Suburban Addition was "marked by the construction of stately suburban estates and country homes."²⁰ At the then far reaches of Dallas, and inaccessible by the streetcar, "the original development of the addition was more a piecemeal sale of lots and blocks over a period of about 15 years by Peak's children and son-in-law, developer Thomas Field, than part of an overall plan. Thomas Field, in particular, envisioned the addition as a grand collection of country homes set on quarter- and half-block parcels of land, but he offered little in the way of unifying concept or design. Between 1879 and 1893, elaborate 2- and 3-story houses on spacious grounds dotted with greenhouses, barns and servant's quarters characterized the physical composition of Peak's Suburban Addition."²¹ East Dallas's growth was also boosted when the Texas State Fair and Dallas Exposition at Fair Park opened in 1887. Subsequent redevelopment of Fair Park and East Dallas has left little from this earliest phase of development intact.

In areas further from downtown, the railroad's impact was less immediate. Large homesteads and agricultural practices continued in the easternmost half of the project area and southwest of the study area where "there is evidence of an even earlier African-American community in the vicinity of the Queen City additions, dating to the 1890s and possibly the 1870s."²²

- **Streetcar Suburbs (1884–1920s)**

Residential and commercial development in the project area was also influenced by the city's streetcar network. Beginning in 1873 with a one-and-a-quarter mile track running between the H&TC depot and the courthouse, the streetcar entered the project area in 1884 with lines on Main, Elm, and Commerce streets in Deep Ellum. By the time the streetcar ceased operation in 1956, there were over 100 miles of streetcar lines across the city and project area (Figure 79).²³ Resources

²⁰ Hardy-Heck-Moore, Inc., "Alcalde Street-Crockett School Historic District," NRHP Nomination Form. Texas Historical Commission, Austin, 1995 (p. 12), from the THC Atlas, <https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/NR/pdfs/95000330/95000330.pdf>.

²¹ Hardy-Heck-Moore, Inc., "Alcalde Street-Crockett School Historic District," NRHP Nomination Form. Texas Historical Commission, Austin, 1995 (p. 12), from the THC Atlas, <https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/NR/pdfs/95000330/95000330.pdf>.

²² Hardy-Heck-Moore, Inc. (HHM), "National Register Multiple Property Submission [MPS] Form: Historic and Architectural Resources of East and South Dallas, Dallas County, Texas," Texas Historical Commission, Austin, 1995, from the HHM archives and/ or the City of Dallas, <https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/HP%20Documents/Resources%20Page/Historic%20and%20Architectural%20Resources%20of%20East%20and%20South%20Dallas%201990.pdf>. Note that some pages are missing within the PDF from the City of Dallas.

²³ *Dallas, Texas, City Directory, 1925*, (Dallas, Texas: John F. Worley Directory Co., 1925) 3, digitized in "U.S. City Directories, 1822-1995," database, Ancestry, www.ancestry.com.

associated with this theme may be eligible for the NRHP in the areas of Community Planning and Development and Ethnic History.

In Deep Ellum, the streetcar encouraged commercial and industrial development along its lines. Similar to land along the railroad lines, land along the streetcar increased in value for adjacent property owners, who in turn divided their land into small lots for commercial and industrial construction. The streetcar in Deep Ellum also contributed to the emergence of the area as an entertainment and recreation center for the Black community by making these venues accessible to the Black community outside of the neighborhood.

Further from downtown, in East and South Dallas, residential development quickened with the growth of the city's streetcar network. Following the pattern set by the city's first streetcar suburb, The Cedars in South Dallas (outside the study area), "real estate investors and streetcar companies collaborated and purchased large sections of land outside of the central business district. They then subdivided it and built streetcar lines to bring in prospective buyers. Because development in Dallas had not expanded much past one square mile, the streetcar essentially dictated the ensuing real estate boom. Advancements in technology prompted new steam-powered streetcars. While easing some of the issues caused by the mules, the new technology also allowed streetcars to extend even further from downtown. Throughout the 1880s, the existing lines (now owned by one company: the Dallas Consolidated Street Railway Company) extended their tracks and added more routes, while other companies applied for City franchises." New lines spurred development across the city, including in East Dallas where "the extension of streetcar lines to the suburbs after the turn of the century precipitated a real estate boom that resulted in the further breakup of the old estates and contributed to the area's piecemeal redevelopment throughout the remainder of the 20th century."²⁴

Areas within existing additions, such as Alcalde Street within the Queen City and Peak's additions (just north of the study area), filled in with new occupants, many of whom worked for a streetcar company.²⁵ New additions, including Junius Heights and Munger Place north of the study area, marketed themselves as upscale suburbs. They had deed covenants—zoning was not yet a tool—excluding Black residents and featured larger lots and houses than the additions platted in the study area. New additions in the study area catered to workers and low- and middle-income families. The Santa Fe Addition and East-We-Go Addition developed between the 1900s and 1920s, with the East-We-Go Addition

²⁴ HHM, "National Register MPS Form: Historic and Architectural Resources of East and South Dallas."

²⁵ Hardy-Heck-Moore, Inc., "Alcalde Street-Crockett School Historic District."

“designed as low to lower-middle income family housing.”²⁶ Also in the study area, Mt. Auburn, which was serviced by the Mt. Auburn streetcar line, was subdivided in the early 1910s. Compared to the upper-class additions, these additions had smaller lots and more modest housing.

In South Dallas, the streetcar spurred development of White upper- and middle-class suburbs, like Colonial Hill and Edgewood (both southeast of the study area) in areas further from downtown and existing industrial nodes. In areas closer to the railroad tracks and industrial development, however, worker housing and housing for lower-class families developed. In particular, many Black men and families settled in South Dallas during this period. “There is some evidence that a black farming community existed in the area prior to this time but the establishment of several additions specifically platted for black residents between 1904 and 1911, particularly on Atlanta and Latimer streets, solidified its identity as an exclusively African-American community.”²⁷ In South Dallas, White developers platted segregated additions like the Wah Hoo Addition for workers of nearby lumber mills and the railroad (south of the study area), and near the Trunk rail line in between East and South Dallas “a number of small, wood-frame houses along the tracks are shown north of Warren on the 1905 Sanborn maps. There were probably more such dwellings trailing the line to the south but the area, including the fairgrounds, was not annexed into Dallas until about 1905. Typical of construction near or on railroad rights-of-way, the housing along the Trunk line consisted of poorly constructed frame dwellings and shotgun houses for renters, many of whom were African American, who provided cheap labor for industries that built along the tracks. Rows of shotgun houses [no longer extant] are shown on the 1922 Sanborn maps near the Trunk line.”²⁸

In areas not reached by the streetcar, in the eastern half of the project area, land remained agricultural and characteristically undeveloped. Some of the earliest settlers and their descendants who remained in the area established Grove Hill Memorial Park Cemetery (just outside the APE, in the study area) in 1911 on a small hill next to White Rock Creek.

- **The Kessler Plan (1910–1940)**

By the turn of the twentieth century, Dallas had experienced tremendous population and land area growth. “The Dallas County population jumped 150 percent between 1870 and 1880. Rapid new construction resulted as well, with an estimated 700 buildings constructed between 1872 and 1873. The land area covered by the city rose from less than one square mile in 1870 to nine square

²⁶ “Neighborhood Study: Mt. Auburn, Owenwood, Santa Fe, East Dallas, Texas,” prepared by the University of Texas at Arlington Senior Planning Studio, 1978, from the Dallas Public Library.

²⁷ HHM, “National Register MPS Form: Historic and Architectural Resources of East and South Dallas.”

²⁸ HHM, “National Register MPS Form: Historic and Architectural Resources of East and South Dallas.”

miles by 1890.”²⁹ Growth during this period largely occurred without oversight and planning, leaving development and property susceptible to floods and fires. To oversee future growth and development, and to protect property values, the City hired George Kessler, one of the country’s prominent urban planners, to develop a plan for Dallas. “Although the plan offered little guidance for implementing recommendations [zoning was a legal tool yet], the City of Dallas moved forward with implementing some important changes...and many additional developments echoing the Kessler plan were completed in decades to come.”³⁰ Resources associated with this theme may be eligible for the NRHP in the areas of Community Planning and Development and Entertainment/Recreation.

The plan placed an emphasis on flood control and park creation, and Kessler envisioned using the two together to achieve this goal. Though the plan’s focus was on the Trinity River, where Kessler recommended the construction of levees, the plan envisioned a system of parks and boulevards in some of the city’s most flood-prone areas, including along Mill Creek through Deep Ellum (it was never implemented). Though the three large opens spaces in the project area—Grove Park Memorial Cemetery, Tenison Park, and Samuell-Grande Memorial Park—were not specific proposals in the plan, their location along White Rock Creek follows Kessler’s principle of creating parks in flood-prone areas. Both Tenison and Samuell-Grande met another recommendation in the Kessler plan – that all neighborhoods be within walking distance to a park. Though they were both large regional parks, they also served as neighborhood parks to the suburbs that were opening and developing around them between the 1920s and 1930s.

Another major focus of the plan was “on consolidating and improving transportation networks. Kessler’s transportation plan proposed to remove railroads and highways from central neighborhoods like Deep Ellum, instead consolidating transportation routes into a beltway at the edge of the city. Kessler also recommended that railroad lines and the accompanying industry should be situated in the lowest topographical areas, just beyond the flood plain, so that higher land could be reserved for residences. In the decades to come, this tenet would be applied to the location of new highways as well.”³¹ In the late 1910s, the City began implementing Kessler’s recommendation to shift the city’s railroad hub in Deep Ellum to the West End. During this time, “the City and rail companies began working to construct a “belt railroad” consistent with the Kessler plan – circling the city and consolidating rail traffic, freight terminals, and a passenger station that would serve multiple rail lines. The new Dallas Union Terminal was constructed on the West End of downtown in 1916, and multiple railroad lines

²⁹ HHM & Associates, “Volume II - Thematic Historic Context Statements,” Prepared for the City of Dallas and Preservation Dallas, 2022, 118.

³⁰ HHM, “Volume II – Thematic Historic Context Statements,” 119.

³¹ HHM, “Deep Ellum Historic District.”

were consolidated there. In the meantime, rail passenger traffic migrated to the West End, leading to the eventual demolition of the depot along Central Avenue in Deep Ellum in 1935.”³² This relocation helped usher in the transition from railroad- and streetcar-based commerce and industry in Deep Ellum to businesses more reliant on the automobile.

- **Parks (1886–1970)**

The demand for parks in Dallas by groups and clubs like neighborhood, women’s, library, and charitable organizations grew in the early twentieth century as new streetcar and auto-based subdivisions opened across the city. By 1905, Dallas only had two public parks – City Park downtown and the recently acquired Fair Park in the study area. Home to the Texas State Fair since 1886, Dallas acquired Fair Park in 1904. “In 1905, City Council established a Board of Park Commissioners (evolving over time to the current Parks and Recreation Department) to oversee Fair Park, and while its focus was Fair Park, the creation of the board signaled the City’s growing interest in parks and ‘opened the door to land donations and purchases,’” for new public parks.³³ Resources associated with this theme may be eligible for the NRHP in the areas of Entertainment/Recreation, Community Planning and Development, and Social History.

After the creation of the Board of Park Commissioners, support for expanding the city’s public park inventory was bolstered by Kessler’s plan that recommended all neighborhoods be within walking distance to a park and the 1913 passage of a \$500,000 bond issue for the development of parks and playgrounds.³⁴ The City also relied on private land and monetary donations for the creation of parks in the early twentieth century. “In the 1920s alone, Dallas was gifted over 650 acres of land worth more than half a million dollars. Among the most significant was the donation of 104 acres in Northeast Dallas [just north of the APE] by banker and civic leader Edward Tenison and his wife Annie in 1923.”³⁵ Located on the Bankhead Highway at the edge of Dallas at the time, the land was wooded with rolling hills and likely prone to flooding due to its proximity to White Rock Creek. The City built its first public golf course at the park, Tenison Glen, and over the next decade continued improving and expanding its acreage. Developers of new suburbs in the park’s proximity, like Owenwood, used the park in advertisements as a selling point.

Between the Great Depression and World War II, the City relied even more heavily on donations as park investment diminished. During this period, “the city added

³² HHM, “Deep Ellum Historic District.”

³³ HHM, “Volume II – Thematic Historic Context Statements,” 279.

³⁴ Bond Issue to Be Voted on Tuesday, April 1,” *Dallas Morning News*, March 23, 1913.

³⁵ HHM, “Volume II – Thematic Historic Context Statements,” 282.

17 new parks totaling 3,282 acres, of which a large portion can be attributed to the donation of Dr. William Samuell.”³⁶ “When wealthy surgeon and benefactor to Dallas, Dr. William Samuell died in 1937, his concise, handwritten will left the bulk of his estate to the Dallas Park Board. Motivated by his appreciation of city parks and wanting to give the city a great regional park, Samuell left around \$18 million in today’s dollars in land and investments – more than twice the city’s annual park budget. His contribution, still the largest single donation to the department, resulted in the addition of thousands of acres of new parkland and was a significant factor in establishing one of the country’s richest park systems. From his donation, the City created more than a dozen parks, including Samuell-New Hope Park (1938), Oak Cliff Founders Park (1938), Samuell-Garland Park (1938), Samuell Farm (1938), and what is considered the crown jewel of his bequeathment, Samuell-Grand Memorial Park (1937) [next to Tenison Park in the study area].”³⁷ Located on the Bankhead Highway and the most centrally located of the park areas bequeathed by Samuell, Samuell-Grand Park served as both a regional park as well as a neighborhood park for the nearby lower-middle class and upper-lower class neighborhoods.

New Deal programs also supported City parks in the late 1930s and early 1940s. In the survey area at Tenison Park, in cooperation with the Works Program Administration (WPA) funds, the City improved park drainage by building storm sewers, adding bathrooms, constructing bridges, landscaping, and improving the golf course with a new clubhouse and greens maintenance. At Fair Park, the WPA, CCC, and PWA programs contributed to the massive redevelopment in preparation for the 1936 Centennial Exposition: the WPA funded landscaping and the PWA funded the construction of the Museum of Nature and Science.³⁸

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, improvement work at the parks in the study area continued. Park acquisition and improvement in this period was guided by several city-sponsored park plans. The first, Hare and Hare’s 1942 plan that was incorporated into the city’s *Master Plan for Greater Dallas* in 1944, called for new playgrounds, recreation fields, and neighborhood parks. The second, the Department of City Planning and Department of Parks and Recreation’s *Parks and Open Spaces*, reinforced many of Hare and Hare’s recommendations, calling for park improvements and more neighborhood parks and playgrounds. In the project area, at Tenison, a bond program funded clubhouse enlargement, course rebuilding, and land acquisition for an adjacent new nine-hole course.³⁹ At

³⁶ HHM, “Volume II – Thematic Historic Context Statements,” 287.

³⁷ HHM, “Volume II – Thematic Historic Context Statements,” 287.

³⁸ “Leonhard Lagoon – Fair Park – Dallas TX,” The Living New Deal, accessed Feb. 6, 2022, <https://livingnewdeal.org/projects/leonhardt-lagoon-fair-park-dallas-tx/>; “Museum of Nature and Science – Dallas TX,” The Living New Deal, accessed Feb. 6, 2022, <https://livingnewdeal.org/projects/museum-of-nature-and-science-dallas-tx/>.

³⁹ Harry Jebson, Jr., et al, “Centennial History of Dallas Texas Park System,” Prepared for the City of Dallas, Department of Park Administration, 1976, 672.

Samuell-Grand Memorial Park, where legal issues surrounding Samuell's will delayed development, tennis facilities, a pool, sports fields, and a gymnasium and recreation center were added. In 1966, the Samuell-Grande tennis facility hosted the Davis Cup and the Dallas Invitational Tennis Tournament. These events were relocated from the all-White Dallas Country Club to Samuell-Grand so that Arthur Ashe could compete.

▪ **Impacts of Auto Development (1910–1955)**

The dawn of the automobile era in the 1910s impacted Dallas and the project area in a multitude of ways. Between the 1910s and 1955, it helped shape the project area by ushering in new auto-oriented commercial and industrial development. The automobile also played a role in shaping the recreational facilities and residential areas in the project area while encouraging the development of new suburbs. Resources associated with this theme may be eligible for the NRHP in the areas of Community Planning and Development, Transportation, Industry, Commerce, and Entertainment/Recreation.

In the early 1900s, automobile sales slowly climbed, and local citizens began organizing auto clubs in Dallas. These groups lobbied for improved streets, roads, and highways. Though still largely a hobby for the city's affluent, automobile ownership rose in Dallas in the late 1900s and early 1910s following the introduction of the Model T, the world's first mass-produced car, and implementation of some of Kessler's recommendations for an improved network of roadways. These events and the proliferation of automobiles in Dallas generated support for the Good Roads Movement. "The almost complete lack of federal and state highway involvement led several automobile enthusiasts to propose grandiose schemes to expand the nation's fledgling highway network. Although the earliest efforts were modest in size and scope, advocating highways from city to nearby city, they soon expanded to promoting highways that extended into multiple states. Among the earliest and most important in Texas were the Bankhead Highway [in the project area] and the King of Trails Highway, both of which passed through Dallas and signified the city as an early highway hub in the state. Passage of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1916 changed that dynamic and led to the organization of the THD in 1917. The agency soon established a network of state highways, four of which serviced Dallas."⁴⁰

One of the immediate impacts of the automobile in the project area was the construction of auto-oriented businesses. Particularly along the Bankhead Highway, which ran through Deep Ellum on Commerce Street and jogged past Fair Park before turning north on Grand Avenue and then east onto Samuell Boulevard, new auto-oriented businesses opened. "By 1910 there were thirty-

⁴⁰ HHM, "Volume II – Thematic Historic Context Statements," 162.

seven [auto-related] companies and an "automobile row" had developed near Dallas City Hall in the 2000 block of Commerce Street between Ervay and Good Streets [in downtown]. In that same year the State Fair held the first automobile show in Texas."⁴¹ "The public's insatiable appetite for new motor vehicles brought about the formation of an equally large service industry for gasoline, oil, automobile accessories and repairs, and above all, rubber tires. Consequently, an explosive growth of tire companies accompanied that of the local dealerships. Comparable listings in the city directories of the period indicated that an equal number of tire companies had opened in the city. Also located along Commerce Street [in Deep Ellum], they were interspersed among the showrooms."⁴² By the 1920s and 1930s, this development extended through Deep Ellum east toward Fair Park. Among the resources in the study area associated with this trend include the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company Building at 3809 Parry Avenue (Resources 198 A–C).

New auto-related industries also opened in the project area. In 1914, Ford Motor Company opened its first plant in Dallas at 2700 Commerce Street in Deep Ellum (now known as the Adam Hats building). By 1924, having outgrown the Deep Ellum plant, Ford relocated to a larger site at 5200 East Grand Avenue (in the APE). "The largest single historic-age industrial site within the project area is the Ford Motor Company manufacturing plant, which was constructed in 1924 on the south side of East Grand Avenue in Old East Dallas, surrounded by predominantly single-family residential properties. The Ford Motor Company manufacturing plant...was a major employer for residents of present-day Jubilee Park and Owenwood, among other neighborhoods. The Ford plant was an active part of the community and hosted monthly square dances and other activities for the employees and their families. Cars and trucks manufactured at the plant had an oval sticker on the rear window that read "Built in Texas by Texas Labor."⁴³ Between the auto-dealerships, the Ford manufacturing plant, and the annual car show held at Fair Park, "Dallas had become by the 1920s what one period writer described as "the chief distributing center for automobiles and [automotive products]."⁴⁴ In 1920 alone, the "wholesale business in automobile-related products had succeeded in reaching \$200,000,000—[roughly] one-third of the total wholesale business of [the city] for that year."⁴⁵ The Ford plant contributed to the development in much of the surrounding area. Surrounding neighborhoods

⁴¹ "Goodyear and Goodrich Building," Dallas Landmark Structures and Sites, City of Dallas Historic Preservation, accessed March 3, 2021, <https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/HP%20Documents/Landmark%20Structures/Goodyear%20and%20Goodrich%20Building%20Landmark%20Nomination.pdf>.

⁴² "Goodyear and Goodrich Building," Dallas Landmark Structures and Sites, City of Dallas Historic Preservation.

⁴³ HNTB, "Draft Historical Resources Survey Report, Reconnaissance Survey & Intensive Survey, I-30 East Corridor Project, Dallas."

⁴⁴ *Dallas Magazine* 1922: 24.

⁴⁵ *Dallas Magazine* 1922: 24.

filled in after the plant's opening and E Grand Avenue, the main street to the plant, filled in with commercial businesses. As an integral part of the livelihood of the surrounding neighborhoods, the closure of the plant in 1970 "had a detrimental effect on the surrounding neighborhoods and impacted the area for decades after."⁴⁶

The automobile contributed to the industrialization of other parts of the project area as well, particularly in Deep Ellum. As the auto-industry grew in the early twentieth century, so too did demand for oil. At the time, Dallas was in a position to become a center for the petroleum industry. Not only was Dallas an auto-manufacturing center, but with the establishment of the Federal Reserve Bank in 1914, it was a major banking center, as well. "In turn Dallas bankers were the first in the nation to lend money to oil companies using the underground oil reserves as collateral. This move made Dallas an important center for petroleum financing and exploration," and distribution.⁴⁷ As part of this trend, the Gulf Oil Company constructed a distribution facility in Deep Ellum (in the APE) in 1921 (listed in the NRHP). At the facility the company stored and distributed oil drilled in nearby fields. The facility took advantage of the area's railroad tracks and auto transportation, utilizing "the adjacent GC&SF and T&NO railroad tracks for distribution, but they also had auto garages for trucks used to bring oil from oilfields to the distribution facility."⁴⁸

"World War I disrupted the improvement to the highway and street networks in Dallas; however, local voters approved a number of bond programs in the late 1920s and early 1930s to fund a wide range of transportation-related enhancements. Relying on many ideas presented in Kessler's master plan of 1911, a citizens advisory group led by businessman Charles E. Ulrickson (better known as the Ulrickson Committee) lobbied for and oversaw a series of public works projects that included the construction of bridges, elimination of many at-grade railroad crossings, street paving and upgrades, and other enhancements."⁴⁹ The designation of the Bankhead Highway to United States Highway 80 combined with federal funding in the Depression Era helped with a number of these safety projects, including the construction of the bridge-class culvert in the 3900 block of Samuell Boulevard (Resource 141) and the railroad overpass at 3700 Samuell Boulevard (Resource 137), both in 1936. Federal monies also supported the widening of Good Street in Deep Ellum to four lanes, creating the Good-Latimer Expressway. "During the build-up toward World War II,

⁴⁶ HNTB, "Draft Historical Resources Survey Report, Reconnaissance Survey & Intensive Survey, I-30 East Corridor Project, Dallas."

⁴⁷ Devlin Shelton, Jay Firsching, and Emily Smith, "Gulf Oil Distribution Facility," NRHP Nomination Form. Texas Historical Commission, Austin, 2010 (p. 11), from the THC Atlas, <https://atlas.thc.state.tx.us/Details/2010000144>.

⁴⁸ HHM, "Deep Ellum Historic District."

⁴⁹ HHM, "Volume II - Thematic Historic Context Statements," 163.

the highest federal priority was providing fast, direct transportation for US military installations and essential military-industrial plants, which were to be located along the US highway system. In the project area, the route of US 80 continued to jog along Exposition Avenue and Commerce Street, but this inefficient and congested path posed a problem for military transportation that would become critical with Dallas's heightened military importance during and after World War II."⁵⁰

Early Auto-Oriented Suburbs (1910–1950)

The popularity of the automobile and the growing street and highway network greatly encouraged the development of new suburbs that catered to the automobile. Resources associated with this theme may be eligible for the NRHP in the following areas: Community Planning and Development and Ethnic History.

In the early twentieth century, many of the suburbs that developed around streetcar lines also advertised their auto-readiness, “representing a transition from streetcar to automobile-based residential development.”⁵¹ The transition was spurred by growing automobile ownership and an expanding highway network. Meanwhile, the passage of a zoning ordinance greatly impacted development patterns—location, occupant demographics, lot size, housing style, etc.—of pre-World War II auto-oriented suburbs. “Between 1920 and 1930, Dallas drafted and adopted a Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance. Typical of zoning codes of the era, the Dallas zoning code separated areas for residential use from land devoted to commercial and industrial purposes. For each zone, the ordinance defined which types of land use were allowable where, as well as building heights and setbacks, lot dimensions, and yard sizes. It also plotted where land should be developed beyond the current city limits and segregated residential areas by race.”⁵²

In the project area, these changes saw “the northern half of Deep Ellum zoned for business and the southern half for industry, removing residential zoning from the district.”⁵³ By the 1930s, the City buried Mill Creek and incorporated the waterway into an underground storm-sewer system. The flood-control effort entombed the creek in underground pipes, leaving no trace of the historic waterway. With residents removed and the risk of flooding mitigated, the southern portion of Deep Ellum lay ripe for industrial redevelopment. The City also invested in redevelopment of nearby Fair Park in anticipation of the 1936 Texas Centennial

⁵⁰ HHM, “Deep Ellum Historic District.”

⁵¹ HHM, “Volume II – Thematic Historic Context Statements,” 184.

⁵² HHM, “Deep Ellum Historic District.”

⁵³ HHM, “Deep Ellum Historic District.”

Exposition, with hopes that the “cleanup” of the southern portion of Deep Ellum would encourage tourist-friendly redevelopment of land adjoining Fair Park.”⁵⁴

While the changes saw Deep Ellum become less residential, areas to the east developed and filled in with new auto-oriented suburbs. To the east of Deep Ellum, the Owenwood Addition opened in the early 1920s and the Jubilee Park neighborhood—comprised of multiple additions—began to fill in during the period. Though further from downtown than earlier streetcar suburbs—much of Owenwood was part of the homestead of one of the city’s earliest settlers—these areas were close enough to industrial and commercial zones to be more affordable than new suburbs opening further from the city center.⁵⁵ As such, Owenwood and Jubilee Park were originally working and middle-class neighborhoods. With the opening of the nearby Ford Motor Company plant on Grand Avenue in 1924, many workers moved into the two neighborhoods. Advertisements for Owenwood tout its community center, “beautifully well paved, wide streets, sidewalks and curbs,” and its proximity to the newly opened Tenison Park.⁵⁶ While Owenwood was mostly White, Jubilee Park was a mix of Black and White residents. Within the neighborhood though, there were Black sections with shotgun-lined streets and White sections with bungalows.⁵⁷

The rise in popularity of automobile-based suburbs also impacted South Dallas. Here, White families began moving out of earlier streetcar suburbs like Colonial Hill and into new auto-based suburbs in North Dallas and farther east in the 1920s. These new suburbs often had covenants restricting Black residents and further segregated the city. In the South Dallas streetcar suburbs, “Some large houses were split into apartments, and remaining lots were developed with apartments or smaller and more affordable housing. As a result, African American families began to move into all sections of South Dallas by the 1940s and 1950s.”⁵⁸

Fair Park and Auto-oriented Commerce, Tourism, and Recreation (1886–1936)

Fair Park played a significant role in the history of the project area and is linked to multiple themes. The history of Fair Park is connected to residential, transportation network, industrial, and commercial development; each shaping one another’s development. Resources associated with this theme may be eligible for the NRHP under the following areas: Commerce, Community Planning and Development, Entertainment/Recreation, Ethnic History, and Industry.

⁵⁴ HHM, “Deep Ellum Historic District.”

⁵⁵ “Prices 65 Years Ago,” *The Hearne Democrat*, March 14, 1930, 12.

⁵⁶ *Dallas Morning News*, June 30, 1923, 7.

⁵⁷ “How a Highland Park Church is Trying to Save Jubilee Park, One of the Poorest Areas in Dallas,” *D Magazine*, July 23, 2008, <https://www.dmagazine.com/publications/d-magazine/2008/august/how-a-highland-park-church-is-trying-to-save-jubilee-park-one-of-the-poorest-areas-in-dallas/>.

⁵⁸ HHM, “National Register MPS Form: Historic and Architectural Resources of East and South Dallas.”

“One of the earliest large-scale public amenities to be constructed within the survey area was the Fair Park fairgrounds, which was chartered under the Dallas State Fair Association in 1886. Exposition Avenue first appears on a Sanborn Map in 1888, the same year that the fairgrounds are first recorded. The first Dallas State Fair was held in 1886 and saw over 14,000 visitors. It is likely that Exposition Avenue was named for its location connecting the more populated areas of Dallas to the expositions showcased at the fairgrounds. Following a fire in 1902, the fairgrounds were rebuilt and converted into a year-round facility rather than only opening for the annual state fair.”⁵⁹ “Assuming ownership of the grounds in 1904, the City oversaw park improvements that included the construction of a museum in 1908, an auditorium (Music Hall) in 1925, and a new open-air 46,000-seat stadium, Fair Park Stadium in 1930. Fair Park Stadium, later renamed the Cotton Bowl, became host to the annual “Red River Showdown” between the University of Texas and University of Oklahoma football teams.”⁶⁰

Early on, Fair Park, the surrounding neighborhood, transportation networks, and auto-industry all helped shape one another’s development. The site, one of the main tourist attractions in the city, encouraged commercial development and residential displacement in the surrounding areas, particularly at the western edge of the study area. Coinciding with the growing automobile industry, auto-manufacturers saw the surrounding areas as prime locations to showcase their products to “representatives from cities and towns all over Texas” who attended the State Fair.⁶¹ From the dealerships they constructed near Fair Park, city officials “could see the latest models of fire trucks and engines and order one custom-made for their community.”⁶² An example of this trend in the study area is the American La France Fire Engine Company dealership on Commerce Street (just outside the APE) in Deep Ellum, built in 1924.

The 1936 Texas Centennial Exposition also reflects this interconnectedness. The relationship between Fair Park and the automobile and surrounding transportation networks factored into bringing the 1936 Texas Centennial Exposition to Fair Park, an event that further impacted the development of the area. The State of Texas selected Dallas and Fair Park over other contenders, including San Antonio and Houston, as the host for the 1936 Centennial celebration, “due in part to the campaign led by the Dallas Chamber of Commerce and its president, R. L. Thornton, who touted the City’s financial

⁵⁹ HNTB, “Draft Historical Resources Survey Report, Reconnaissance Survey & Intensive Survey, I-30 East Corridor Project, Dallas.”

⁶⁰ HHM, “Volume II – Thematic Historic Context Statements,” 401.

⁶¹ John W. Miller, “La France Building,” Dallas Landmark Commission Landmark Nomination Form, 1997 (p. 4), from the City of Dallas, <https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/HP%20Documents/Landmark%20Structures/La%20France%20Building%20Landmark%20Nomination.pdf>.

⁶² John W. Miller, “La France Building.”

commitment and benefits of using the existing fairgrounds,” and its prime location directly along the Bankhead Highway.⁶³ “The City hired architect George Dahl as “Centennial Architect” to oversee the expansion of Fair Park for the centennial. In preparation for the fair, the grounds expanded to almost 300 acres, and more than 50 new buildings and structures, many designed in the Art Deco style, were added to the site, while some existing buildings were reskinned in the Art Deco style for the event. The fair featured various pageants, speeches, parades, exhibitions, and even a scale model of the Alamo. The fair, which was segregated, also included the Hall of Negro Life (not extant). The first exhibition to recognize Black culture at a world’s fair, the hall highlighted Black history and culture and featured the works of Black musicians and artists.”⁶⁴

The connection between Fair Park and the auto-industry and the nearby Ford Plant also impacted the site’s redevelopment and expansion. Edsel Ford, President of the Ford Motor Company, considered the benefits of this proximity and determined it to be “of paramount importance that Ford be a major exhibitor at the fair. Nathan Adams, chairman of the centennial board, and Ray Foley, assistant director general of the exposition, were in constant communication with Edsel Ford... and his staff throughout the spring of 1935 to secure a firm commitment from the company to exhibit in Dallas... A headline in *The Dallas Morning News* proclaimed that Henry Ford would spend the astonishing sum of \$2,250,000 (over \$110 million in today's dollars) on his exhibit hall at the centennial exposition... One of the principle [sic] features of the Ford exhibition was to be a display showing the use of raw materials from the Southwest in the manufacture of Ford cars.”⁶⁵ (See Figure 80.) “A visitor from Williamsport, Pennsylvania, described his experience in the Ford building to the *Morning News* as “... surely keen ... the way they show you just what you get for your money when you buy a Ford and how they go about putting one of their cars together.”⁶⁶ “Visitors concluded their Ford experience by taking a ride on the “Roads of the Southwest,” which featured reproductions of nine historic and modern trails, roads and highways.”⁶⁷

Promoted heavily by the Texas Highway Department, the Texas Centennial Exposition attracted over six million people during its six-month run.⁶⁸ Afterward, the site became the permanent host of the Texas State Fair, the city’s main tourist attraction. These events contributed to the continued residential displacement of the surrounding area. Changes to the surrounding

⁶³ HHM, “Volume II – Thematic Historic Context Statements,” 402.

⁶⁴ HHM, “Volume II – Thematic Historic Context Statements,” 402.

⁶⁵ Willis Winters, “The Ford Motor Company at the Texas Centennial Exposition,” *Legacies* v. 23 no. 1 (Spring 2011), 6-7, from the Portal, <https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metaph204538/>.

⁶⁶ Winters, “The Ford Motor Company at the Texas Centennial Exposition,” 12.

⁶⁷ Winters, “The Ford Motor Company at the Texas Centennial Exposition,” 15.

⁶⁸ HHM, “Volume II – Thematic Historic Context Statements,” 402.

neighborhoods were again impacted in 1947 when the City zoned Fair Park (and Deep Ellum) for manufacturing. The new zoning contributed to suburban sprawl and “White flight” and resulted in demographic changes near Fair Park.

- **Shift from Rail to Truck and Highway-oriented Industry (1920–1965)**

“While the railroad maintained its role in distribution, advances in transportation and construction of highways in the early-to-mid-twentieth century saw trucking emerge as a viable means of shipping. While this trend saw the construction of new warehouse districts further from downtown, including the Trinity Industrial District north of downtown, it also led to the construction of new industrial and distribution facilities and buildings in existing industrial areas. As in the new industrial districts, the railroad was not immediately made obsolete by trucks, but rather was supplemented by the new mode of transport. This trend saw the construction of new buildings that could accommodate trucks. Unlike the brick, multi-story buildings of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, many of the new industrial buildings were one- to two-stories of reinforced concrete construction with large loading docks for trucks. Resources associated with this trend may be eligible for the NRHP in the following areas: Industry.

In the project area, this pattern appeared in the 1930s in and south of Deep Ellum, coinciding with the construction of the Good-Latimer Expressway, a four-lane highway built along Good Street. The post-war manufacturing boom and the construction of Central Expressway near Deep Ellum in the late 1940s and 1950s, and Highway 80 (now Interstate Highway 30) in the late-1950s further supported this trend. The Alamo Park Industrial District in the project area exemplifies this trend. Buildings in the area date from the 1930s to 1970 and include processing facilities and warehouses. Within the district, the warehouse at 1840 Chestnut Street (Resource 185) individually reflects this trend. The warehouse stored goods for the Cullum & Boren Sporting Goods store downtown from the late 1950s to 1970 when the business relocated further away from downtown. Other examples of this trend include the 1960s building at 502 2nd Avenue (Resource 12) and the Cabell’s Inc. Building (Resource 197). The building at “502 Second Avenue is a mid-century modern warehouse and office building that was originally located along the Gulf, Colorado, & Santa Fe Railroad line, which ran along its rear elevation loading dock. Though research did not suggest that any prominent businesses operated at the location, the building is a fine example of mid-century modern architecture and speaks to the commercial vibrancy of Deep Ellum and the surrounding area. The Cabell’s Inc. Building was a later construction but served an important purpose as a distribution center for dairy products manufactured approximately 250 feet northwest at the Cabell’s Dallas ice cream plant (Resource 28 in the IH-30 Canyon HRSR). Though it was built in 1962 after the 1959 sale of Cabell’s Inc. to the Southland Corporation,

the building was important to the continued successful operations of a locally founded business.”⁶⁹

- **Segregation and Urban Renewal (1915–1965)**

For much of the historic period, Dallas was racially segregated. In the nineteenth century, Jim Crow policies segregated public spaces including schools and parks, and Black neighborhoods lacked the city services provided to White residential areas. To fill the void left by the City, Black churches often provided support within their community. Despite the efforts of churches and other organizations, the Jim Crow policies created a system of structural inequality. The patterns set in the nineteenth century not only influenced development patterns but were strengthened in the twentieth century by tools including deed restrictions, zoning, loan practices, and transportation policies. Resources associated with this theme may be eligible for the NRHP in the following areas: Community Planning and Development and Ethnic History.

Zoning policies in particular helped enforce racial segregation and inequality in the project area. “At the time of the Kessler plan, zoning was not a legally viable tool for land-use planning in Texas, and mixed-use neighborhoods still remained common. By 1915, though, the City of Dallas attempted to implement a use-based zoning ordinance that prohibited non-residential uses in some areas, despite legal challenges to zoning laws at the state level. In 1916, Dallas enacted an ordinance that officially segregated public facilities and amenities on the basis of race, leading to the segregation of Black communities.”⁷⁰ The City’s Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance, adopted in 1930, implemented use-based zoning, which contributed to displacement.⁷¹ For example, the ordinance zoned Deep Ellum for business and industry, removing residential zoning and ultimately contributing to the displacement of residents, many of them Black. The implementation of land-use zoning also influenced later redlining practices.

Redlining was another discriminatory practice that reinforced segregation and contributed to systemic disinvestment in Black communities in the 1930s through the 1950s. Due to Jim Crow policies and zoning ordinances, Black and poor communities lived in areas characterized by older homes, with fewer city services, and often near industrial sites. The Home Owners’ Loan Corporation (HOLC) identified these areas on maps as “hazardous” and “declining” and labeled the predominantly White neighborhoods as “still desirable” and “best.” The federal government’s mortgage insurance policy from the Federal Housing Authority gave preference to loans in the predominantly White areas, leaving

⁶⁹ HNTB, “Draft Historical Resources Survey Report, Reconnaissance Survey & Intensive Survey, I-30 East Corridor Project, Dallas.”

⁷⁰ HHM, “Deep Ellum Historic District.”

⁷¹ *Dallas Morning News*, “Zoning Bill to be Written,” July 31, 1926, p. 6, from proquest.com.

residents of the lower rated neighborhoods with few options for mobility or improving their housing situation. In the study area, Owenwood was the only area not labeled “hazardous” or “declining” (the undeveloped eastern half of the project area was not labeled).

During World War II and the postwar era, urban renewal and infrastructure projects displaced a number of racial minority groups and poor communities. South Dallas was solidified as the predominant Black community in this period, as many Black families moved to the area in the aftermath of “a program of ‘slum clearance’ in their central city neighborhoods around Thomas, Good, and Hall streets. A comparison of 1922, 1934 and 1945 city directories shows the relocation of prominent black families, identified in Black Presence in Dallas, from central Dallas addresses to those in South Dallas.”⁷² Infrastructure projects in the study area, including the construction of Central Expressway at the western edge and IH 30 throughout the area, also reflect racist governmental policies and projects (discussed in more detail under the Interstate Highway Development theme).

- **Interstate Highway Development (1949–1970)**

Following the construction of the first major thoroughfare in the project area, the Good-Latimer Expressway in the 1930s, highway and interstate construction continued at a frenzied pace in the postwar period. The City’s master plan, prepared in 1943 by Harland Bartholomew & Associates, had recommended a number of transportation initiatives, including highway construction, in part to support new industrial sites, as well as the mobilization and defense efforts. Limited in funding though, the plan’s ambitious highway and interregional interstate recommendations were bolstered by the passage of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956. Calling for 41,000 miles of interstate highways across the nation, the Act changed the “funding for states and allowed the federal government to pay 100 percent of land acquisition costs and 90 percent of construction costs.”⁷³ The act helped herald in a “new generation of superhighways in Dallas including Interstate Highway (IH) 30 [in the project area], IH 45, and IH 35 East” (Figures 81–82).⁷⁴

Postwar highway and interstate construction altered land-use patterns across the city and project area. At the outer edges of the city, the interstates helped facilitate new residential, commercial, and industrial development, while older, more central residential and commercial areas were disrupted and sometimes destroyed by highway construction. Resources associated with this theme may be

⁷² HHM, “National Register MPS Form: Historic and Architectural Resources of East and South Dallas.”

⁷³ HHM, “Volume II – Thematic Historic Context Statements,” 157.

⁷⁴ HHM, “Volume II – Thematic Historic Context Statements,” 167.

eligible for the NRHP in the following areas: Community Planning and Development, Ethnic History, Industry, and Transportation.

The interstates typically followed the routes of existing federal highways, but “the rights-of-way were widened and improved and sometimes re-routed.”⁷⁵ Often in tandem with the roadway construction, zoning changes along the highways further contributed to land-use changes.

Following the national trend, new highways in Dallas were typically built on the most affordable land. Oftentimes, this meant low-lying areas along railroad corridors, which were home to lower income and non-White communities. Maps of Dallas from 1935 to 1940 show the central areas as “hazardous” and “declining,” the lowest grades by HOLC standards (Figure 83), and the outskirts as “improving” in desirability. Authorities acquired large areas of this land and demolished homes and businesses, oftentimes dividing and isolating historic neighborhoods. The disruption of historic neighborhoods through the demolition of business and homes and the displacement of people led to the destabilization of neighborhoods. The Black community was disproportionately impacted as a result of this trend. Displaced from their homes and restricted by zoning from many of the new suburbs and existing White communities, Black citizens “settled in small pockets, mostly surrounded by White people. For example, in 1950, “South Dallas, a fan-shaped area spreading southeast from downtown, was home to whites, and to blacks segregated into some nine separate areas.”⁷⁶ As Black housing grew more limited, the Black population was growing in Dallas. Even so, “the Dallas political leadership resisted constructing public housing because of pressure from the private construction industry. Instead, the City actively destroyed existing housing supply” for the construction of new road ways and other urban renewal projects in the postwar.⁷⁷ As a result, Black citizens and neighborhoods encroached into historically White neighborhoods. The community was often unwelcome and met with threats and violence. The integration prompted White families to relocate to new outlying, predominantly White suburbs. The changing neighborhood demographics ultimately led to disinvestment in these historic neighborhoods through exclusionary loan practices based on race and ethnicity.

One of the first examples of this trend in the project area was the construction of the Central Expressway. Implementation of the highway started in 1943, when the City contracted with the Texas State Highway Department to construct the roadway following recommendations in Bartholomew plan. In 1946, the H&TC tracks were removed from Central Avenue north of Deep Ellum, and in 1947,

⁷⁵ HHM, “Volume II – Thematic Historic Context Statements,” 157.

⁷⁶ HHM, “Volume II – Thematic Historic Context Statements,” 58.

⁷⁷ HHM, “Volume II – Thematic Historic Context Statements,” 58.

construction of the Central Expressway north of Deep Ellum began.⁷⁸ At the project area's western edge, Central Expressway was designated US Highway 75 and expanded during the late 1960s and early 1970s. As part of expansion, a six-lane elevated overpass above Good-Latimer Expressway was constructed. During the construction and expansion of Central Expressway, many buildings, including clubs and theaters associated with the area's blues and jazz scene, were demolished. Zoning changes made in 1947 compounded the impact the construction of Central Expressway had on Deep Ellum. Zoned along with an area of Fair Park for manufacturing, Deep Ellum saw some commercial businesses, particularly pawn shops, relocated to E Grand Avenue. These changes together "discouraged commerce in Deep Ellum and simultaneously made suburban shopping more accessible, causing many retailers to move to other parts of the city."⁷⁹

The construction of IH 30 in the 1960s through the project area also reflects this trend. Completed in the 1960s, the alignment roughly follows US 80 to the north in the eastern half of the project area before diverging from the route at E Grand Avenue. Here the interstate follows a more northwesterly approach, cutting through Owenwood, Jubilee Park, and the southeastern section of Deep Ellum near Fair Park (Figure 84). In these areas, "land use adjacent to I-30 changed from largely single-family residential to a mix of single-family residential, commercial, and light industrial businesses. Based on historic aerials, this land use pattern continued through the 1970s and 1980s."⁸⁰ In Mt. Auburn, near IH 30, zoning changes passed in 1965 contributed to this change by allowing multifamily housing.⁸¹ The construction of IH 30 had an even bigger impact in Jubilee Park, where it "'acted as a kind of belt that just cut it off from resources into the city'. The pedestrian and vehicular barrier of I-30 altered the fabric of historic neighborhoods, and following the closure of the Ford Motor Company manufacturing plant just a few years later, some Old East Dallas neighborhoods, including Jubilee Park, fell into disrepair."⁸² Owenwood, the only neighborhood in the project area labeled "still desirable" by the HOLC in the 1930s, was also impacted by the interstate and the Ford closure, though it was "less negatively affected than Jubilee Park and remained largely intact and unblighted."⁸³

⁷⁸ HHM, "Deep Ellum Historic District."

⁷⁹ HHM, "Deep Ellum Historic District."

⁸⁰ HNTB, "Draft Historical Resources Survey Report, Reconnaissance Survey & Intensive Survey, I-30 East Corridor Project, Dallas."

⁸¹ "Neighborhood Study: Mt. Auburn, Owenwood, Santa Fe, East Dallas, Texas," prepared by the University of Texas at Arlington Senior Planning Studio, 1978, from the Dallas Public Library.

⁸² HNTB, "Draft Historical Resources Survey Report, Reconnaissance Survey & Intensive Survey, I-30 East Corridor Project, Dallas."

⁸³ HNTB, "Draft Historical Resources Survey Report, Reconnaissance Survey & Intensive Survey, I-30 East Corridor Project, Dallas."

In Deep Ellum and Fair Park, historic commercial networks were severed as a result of the postwar highway construction. Central Expressway acted as a barrier to downtown, while IH 30 cut off Deep Ellum from Fair Park, further separating it from downtown. “Longtime business owners and customers mourned the change, as documented by newspaper articles at the time. “‘It’s too quiet,’ one pawnbroker noted recently. The ‘two-bit, walk-up’ hotels have closed and the area’s inhabitants, sometimes called ‘characters,’ took off elsewhere.”⁸⁴

▪ **Postwar Residential and Commercial Suburbanization (1955–1975)**

The new interstate network spurred the development of new suburbs on the outskirts of Dallas in areas previously undeveloped. New development included residential suburbs, as well as commercial suburban construction. Resources associated with this theme may be eligible for the NRHP in the following areas: Commerce and Community Planning and Development.

The new interstate network combined with "numerous factors—a postwar population boom, a shortage of available housing in the city center, low-cost federal mortgages [through the Federal Housing Administration and G. I. Bill], and advances in building technology—created a social and economic climate favorable to sudden and rapid suburban expansion. These factors compounded with an “aggressive postwar annexation policy,” with the City of Dallas absorbing huge swaths of land in anticipation of growth, drastically increasing its land area.”⁸⁵ Developers in turn purchased large swaths of undeveloped land along and near new highways for new subdivisions in the outlying areas of the city. The design of postwar suburbs generally incorporated principles advocated by the Federal Housing Administration, such as curvilinear streets and standards for minimum lot sizes, setbacks, and street widths. Embracing popular architectural trends, subdivisions of the era filled in with like-sized and styled Ranch houses.

Suburbanization was not limited to residential development in the postwar period. “Suburban growth provided new markets for goods and services in previously peripheral areas. This, combined with the increased use of trucking, led to rampant commercial growth in suburban and other outlying areas. Commercial centers, offices, banks, schools, parks, churches, and industry all relocated to suburban areas. These auto-based commercial amenities made suburban living feasible for car owners and created a new lifestyle where all aspects of daily life were accessible by car.”⁸⁶ Oftentimes developed at the same time as adjacent residential subdivisions, suburban commercial nodes typically included shopping

⁸⁴ Doug Domeier, “Demolition Leveling Once-Noisy Deep Elm,” *Dallas Morning News*, Oct. 19, 1968, from the Deep Ellum Vertical File, Dallas Public Library.

⁸⁵ HHM, “Volume II – Thematic Historic Context Statements,” 188.

⁸⁶ HHM, “Volume II – Thematic Historic Context Statements,” 191.

centers and strip malls with businesses such as grocery stores that catered to local residents.

This trend played out in the eastern end of the project area. Early in the postwar period, the area east of Tenison and Samuell Grand Parks remained relatively undeveloped. Aerial images from the early 1950s show the area's limited development generally confined to small clusters along US 80. The surrounding large swaths of land remained mostly undeveloped, save for an orphanage, Buckner Orphans Home, and athletic fields south of the project area, and a small privately owned airport, White Rock Airport, north of the project area. Residential development in the area began in the mid-1950s, with the Claremont Subdivisions [partially within the APE]. Coinciding with the completion of IH 30 through the area in the 1960s, the neighborhood filled in during the late 1950s and early to mid-1960s. Houses in the subdivision typify postwar buildings and include Mid-century Modern and Ranch style single-family and duplex houses. The neighborhood also includes a school and a shopping center.

- **Arts and Culture as Catalysts for Revitalization (1974–today)**

Beginning in the mid-1970s, a growing arts and culture scene helped spur the revitalization of some parts of the study area. Resources associated with this trend may be eligible for the NRHP in the following areas:
Entertainment/Recreation.

“Declining property values and depopulation in Deep Ellum in the 1970s and 1980s led some Dallasites to perceive Deep Ellum as blighted and dangerous. In 1975, the City responded to this perception by razing a swath of historic buildings just southeast of the historic district’s boundaries to construct a new police facility.”⁸⁷ City-led demolition and redevelopment efforts continued into the 1980s. “At the same time, though, affordable property values facilitated a cultural and artistic renaissance in the district, taking advantage of the longstanding cultural richness of the area. Live blues music continued, with some older performers resiliently repositioning themselves to take advantage of changing audiences and venues.”⁸⁸ “Visual artists also gravitated to the neighborhood, seeking out the large spaces in underused warehouses and manufacturing facilities for reuse as studios and galleries. Murals and public art became a vibrant part of the neighborhood’s character by the 1980s. By the early 1980s, approximately 200 artists lived in Deep Ellum, despite that it was zoned as a manufacturing district.”⁸⁹ Just outside the study area, the Interstate Forwarding Building at 3200 Main Street was refurbished and turned into galleries, shops and studios, exemplifying the trend. In response, the City of

⁸⁷ HHM, “Deep Ellum Historic District.”

⁸⁸ HHM, “Deep Ellum Historic District.”

⁸⁹ HHM, “Deep Ellum Historic District.”

Dallas rezoned Deep Ellum in 1984, legalizing residential and gallery use. To ensure the historic character of the area was retained, Dallas City Council approved a plan that “to maintain the low-rise warehouses of Deep Ellum and to legalize the homes and studios established there by area artists. The Planned Development District proposal calls for the city to provide landscaping, to maintain narrow streets instead of condemning buildings for road widenings and to offer reduced parking lot requirements – especially for those establishing shops or restaurants.”⁹⁰ These changes, along with the investment in Deep Ellum by the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community, led to the area’s revitalization and a proliferation of new arts and entertainment venues in the 1980s and 1990s.

National Register Eligibility Recommendations

- **Eligible Properties/Districts within the APE**

NRHP eligibility recommendations are summarized in the table below and detailed on the following pages.

Table 5. NRHP eligibility recommendations for all surveyed historic-age resources within the APE.

Eligibility Recommendation	Subtotal	Total
Not eligible	260	260
Individually eligible outside historic districts		
Maintain prior designation	1	7
Newly recommended eligible	6	
Within 7 recommended eligible/listed historic districts		
Contributing		296
Contributing only	250	
Contributing and individually listed (maintain prior designation)	2	
Contributing and newly recommended individually eligible	14	
Noncontributing	30	
TOTAL		563

Individually Eligible Historic Resources

For discussion of individual resources previously listed in the NRHP in the study area, refer to maps in **Appendix D** and Table G-1 in **Appendix G**. In addition to these previously designated resources, the 20 historic resources listed below were identified during field survey and are newly recommended eligible for individual NRHP designation (nine outside historic districts plus 17 within historic districts):

- Resource 8A, industrial building at 1622 PEARLSTONE ST A (Pearlstone Mill), eligible under Criteria A and C in the areas of Industry and Architecture at the local level (also contributing within the pending Deep Ellum Historic District)

⁹⁰ HHM, “Deep Ellum Historic District.”

- Resource 9, industrial building at 3200 HICKORY ST (Pearlstone Mill), eligible under Criteria A and C in the areas of Industry and Architecture at the local level (also contributing within the pending Deep Ellum Historic District)
- Resource 12, commercial building at 502 S 2ND AVE, eligible under Criterion C in the area of Architecture at the local level (also contributing to the pending Deep Ellum Historic District)
- Resource 19, industrial building at 4008 COMMERCE ST (Texas Ice House), eligible under Criterion C in the area of Architecture at the local level (also contributing to the pending Deep Ellum Historic District)
- Resource 28, residential building at 500 ANN AVE, eligible under Criterion C in the area of Architecture at the local level
- Resource 102, commercial building at 5421 E R. L. THORNTON FWY, eligible under Criterion C in the area of Architecture at the local level (also contributing to the recommended eligible Mt. Auburn/Santa Fe Historic District)
- Resource 104A, commercial building at 2810 SAMUELL BLVD A, eligible under Criterion C in the area of Architecture at the local level
- Resource 137, bridge at 3700 SAMUELL BLVD, eligible under Criterion C in the area of Engineering at the local level
- Resource 197, commercial building at 710 EXPOSITION AVE (Cabell's Incorporated), eligible under Criteria A and C at the local level in the areas of Commerce and Architecture
- Resource 200, commercial building at 4118 COMMERCE ST, eligible under Criterion C in the area of Architecture at the local level (also contributing to the recommended eligible Commerce/Exposition Commercial Historic District)
- Resource 210, residential building at 714 FLETCHER ST, eligible under Criterion C in the area of Architecture at the local level
- Resource 245A, residential building at 4839 PARRY AVE A, eligible under Criterion C in the area of Architecture at the local level (also contributing to the recommended eligible Jubilee Park Historic District)
- Resource 247A, residential building at 4843 PARRY AVE A, eligible under Criterion C in the area of Architecture at the local level (also contributing to the recommended eligible Jubilee Park Historic District)
- Resource 271A, industrial building at 5200 EAST GRAND AVE A, eligible under Criterion C in the area of Industry at the local level (also contributing to the recommended eligible Ford Motor Company Historic District)
- Resource 271B, industrial building at 5200 EAST GRAND AVE B, eligible under Criteria A and C in the areas of Industry and Architecture at the local level

(also contributing to the recommended eligible Ford Motor Company Historic District)

- Resource 271C, 5200 EAST GRAND AVE C, eligible under Criterion C in the area of Industry at the local level (also contributing to the recommended eligible Ford Motor Company Historic District)
- Resource 271E, industrial building at 5200 EAST GRAND AVE E, eligible under Criterion C in the area of Industry at the local level (also contributing to the recommended eligible Ford Motor Company Historic District)
- Resource 290A, religious building at 5710 E R. L. THORNTON FWY A, eligible under Criteria A and C in the areas of Ethnic History, Religion, and Architecture at the local level (also contributing to the recommended eligible Owenwood Historic District, meets Criteria Consideration A)
- Resource 349, commercial building at 4529 SAMUELL BLVD (gas station), eligible under Criterion C in the area of Architecture at the local level
- Resource 354, residential building at 4721 SAMUELL BLVD, eligible under Criterion C in the area of Architecture at the local level

Details on each of these resources are included within the inventory in **Appendix B** and the survey forms in **Appendix C**.

Eligible Historic Districts

The APE for the proposed project encompasses seven listed or eligible NRHP Historic Districts, as summarized in the table below. For discussion of previously designated/pending NRHP Historic Districts in study area, refer to page 7 above, maps in **Appendix D**, and Table G-1 in **Appendix G**. Each newly recommended historic district is described in greater detail below, as well as in the survey forms in **Appendix C**.

Table 6. Eligible or listed NRHP Historic Districts within the study area, with contributing/noncontributing status for surveyed historic-age resources within the APE. Note that these counts do not represent the entire district.

Historic District	Contributing resources		Noncontributing resources		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	
Deep Ellum (previously listed, encompasses Gulf Oil NRHD)	16	89%	2	11%	18
Mt. Auburn/ Santa Fe	65	84%	12	16%	77
Claremont	16	100%	0	0%	16
Commerce/ Exposition	22	96%	1	4%	23
Jubilee Park	54	89%	7	11%	61
Ford Motor Co.	7	100%	0	0%	7
Owenwood	86	91%	8	9%	94
TOTAL					296

**Note that the survey also identified the Grove Hill Memorial Park Historic District (south of I-30 and east of White Rock Creek), but the recommended boundaries*

for that district do not overlap with the APE, and therefore the district is not described in detail in this report.

Mt. Auburn/ Santa Fe Historic District

The recommended Mt. Auburn/ Santa Fe Historic District is located north of I-30 and roughly bounded by the W R. L. Thornton Access Road on the south, Willow Street/Santa Fe Trail (the former Santa Fe rail corridor) on the west, Cameron Avenue on the north, and E Grand Avenue on the east. (See Figure 28 in **Appendix D**.) The street layout uses a grid skewed to the northeast/southwest, with smaller lots closer to the railroad tracks and slightly larger lots to the east. Property types within the proposed district are predominantly residential and include a collection of intact bungalows and shotgun houses that exemplify typical working-class housing in Dallas in the early twentieth century. Within the surveyed portion of the neighborhood that extends into the APE, representative contributing buildings date from between 1902 and 1950 and illustrate the National Folk, Craftsman, Minimal Traditional, and Tudor Revival styles. A commercial and institutional corridor also runs along E Grand Avenue; several small commercial nodes are scattered through the district, and numerous large lots scattered through the district include significant historic religious buildings. Representative photos are included in the district survey forms in **Appendix C**.

As described in the historic context, streetcar suburbs began developing in East Dallas in the late nineteenth century, as large landowners subdivided their estates. The earliest examples—like the nearby Munger Place and Junius Heights Historic Districts—catered to upper-class homebuyers seeking larger homes and more greenspace outside of downtown.⁹¹ By the early to mid-twentieth century, the most affluent homebuyers were moving to newer suburbs like Highland Park in North Dallas, and East Dallas developers began to target a more working-class demographic. When Mt. Auburn was first subdivided in 1913, it included small, narrow lots designed to accommodate narrow shotgun or bungalow building forms (Figure 72).⁹² Early advertisements for Mt. Auburn in 1913 showed a small, tidy row of bungalows and newly planted trees (Figure 85). The adjacent “East-We-Go” subdivisions platted around 1915 similarly used small, narrow lots (Figures 69, 73–74).⁹³ A 2002 article describes the early twentieth-century development of the district as follows:

⁹¹ City of Dallas, “Peak’s Suburban Addition/Millcreek Neighborhood,” Dallas Landmark Commission Nomination Form. City of Dallas, 1993, from the City of Dallas, https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/DCH%20documents/Peaks_Suburban_Dallas_Landmark_Nomination%20Form.pdf.

⁹² Margaret Culberson, “Early Dallas Bungalows,” *Legacies* v. 14 no. 2 (Fall 2002), 19, from the Portal, <https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metaph35097>.

⁹³ “Neighborhood Study: Mt. Auburn, Owenwood, Santa Fe, East Dallas, Texas,” prepared by the University of Texas at Arlington Senior Planning Studio, 1978, from the Dallas Public Library.

The development of Mount Auburn, a smaller subdivision in East Dallas, was similar. Murphy & Bolanz offered lots for sale in newspaper advertisements in 1907, but a 1911 Mount Auburn Development Company advertisement showed no visible houses in its view of street and sidewalk construction. Two years later, a Mount Auburn advertisement included a photograph of a row of recently-constructed bungalows, but there were still plenty of empty lots in 1916, when building permits recorded a flurry of building. A drive through the neighborhood today confirms that the five- and six room "frame cottages" recorded in the permits were, in fact, bungalows...both homeowners and small-scale speculative builders bought lots in Mount Auburn. One of the homeowners was Mrs. O. A. Jeansonne, who bought a lot on Mount Auburn Street in 1914 that had passed from the Mount Auburn Development Company through two other owners without improvement. In 1916 she obtained a building permit to build a bungalow on the lot, and she was still living there when the 1920 U.S. Census was taken." Of the speculative builders, the Metropolitan Investment Company obtained the largest number of building permits for Mount Auburn houses in 1916, but J. A. Traylor, W. B. Power, and W. L. Provine also were active...In a sample block of Mount Auburn, the 1920 Census records the following occupations: motorman with the street railway, accountant, post office clerk, manager of a cotton seed company, and a salesman with a furniture company.⁹⁴

Construction in the district evolved slowly, though, with the affordable small lots near the Santa Fe railroad and S Carroll Avenue filling in by 1920, then the lots further east developing in the 1920s and 1930s.⁹⁵ Sanborn maps from 1922 illustrate this trend (Figures 41–44, 47–48, 52–57). The neighborhood's Mt. Auburn School was constructed in 1922 as well, located adjacent to Samuell-Grand Park at 6012 E Grand Avenue (extant, outside the APE.)⁹⁶

Just to the south of the proposed Mt. Auburn/Santa Fe Historic District, construction of the Ford Motor Company assembly plant (Resource IDs 271A–G) in 1925 likely helped encourage the final wave of construction. Shortly thereafter, in 1929, the City of Dallas zoned the area to allow both single-family homes and duplexes, leading to continued development of middle-class housing.⁹⁷ By 1930, aerial photos showed the subdivision fully developed, with the Fort Motor Company plant and the Jubilee Park neighborhood easily accessible via E Grand Avenue (Figure 78).⁹⁸ The 1930 aerial also shows the emergence of a commercial strip along E Grand Avenue between Fairview and Beacon Streets, at the eastern edge of the district, where it remains today. Yet, by the 1930s, the

⁹⁴ Margaret Culberson, "Early Dallas Bungalows," *Legacies* v. 14 no. 2 (Fall 2002), 19-22, from the Portal, <https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metaph35097>.

⁹⁵ "Neighborhood Study: Mt. Auburn, Owenwood, Santa Fe, East Dallas, Texas," prepared by the University of Texas at Arlington Senior Planning Studio, 1978, from the Dallas Public Library.

⁹⁶ Renee Umsted, "Mount Auburn Elementary celebrates centennial anniversary," *Advocate Lakewood/East Dallas*, Oct. 6, 2022, <https://lakewood.advocatemag.com/mount-auburn-centennial/>.

⁹⁷ "Neighborhood Study: Mt. Auburn, Owenwood, Santa Fe, East Dallas, Texas," prepared by the University of Texas at Arlington Senior Planning Studio, 1978, from the Dallas Public Library.

⁹⁸ "East Dallas, Samuel Boulevard - East Grand Avenue (Labeled)" [Photo], Dallas Historic Aerial Photographs, 1930 Fairchild Survey, SMU Libraries, <https://digitalcollections.smu.edu/digital/collection/dmp/id/183>.

Home Owners' Loan Corporation (HOLC) graded the neighborhood as “Declining” (yellow) (Figure 83)—despite the fact that many houses were relatively new—discouraging mortgage lending and initiating a pattern of disinvestment.

After World War II, changes in zoning and increased suburban sprawl furthered change in the neighborhood. When the 1947 City of Dallas zoning ordinance zoned both Deep Ellum and the area of Fair Park for manufacturing, Deep Ellum's affordable retail establishments (especially pawn shops) moved to E Grand Avenue, within the recommended Mt. Auburn/Santa Fe Historic District. By 1950, Sanborn maps showed that the dense commercial strip along E Grand Avenue included auto repair shops, gas stations, a movie theater, numerous stores, and the bank at 5421 E Grand Avenue (Resource ID 102, recommended individually eligible for the NRHP). (See Figures 63–64.) In 1965, a new City of Dallas zoning ordinance brought multifamily zoning to areas closer to the Santa Fe railroad line and the newly constructed I-30 freeway, resulting in integrity loss in those areas (outside of the recommended district boundaries).⁹⁹ These changes, combined with the closure of the Ford plant in 1970 and City disinvestment in urban areas, made the neighborhood more affordable and accessible to an increasingly diverse population. In 1970, mean and median incomes within the neighborhood fell “well below the totals for the city,” marked by its “stable population consisting of moderate income people, with lower percentage of blacks than the city [10 percent versus 25 percent citywide] but with over half of its population being Spanish [or of Latino descent].”¹⁰⁰ Around the same time, the neighborhood's population saw the “noticeable addition of professionals of all ethnic backgrounds.”¹⁰¹ This demographic evolution contributed to the rich community fabric in the neighborhood and the significant reinvestment in the area that began in the 1970s and continues today. Beginning in 1978, based on the recommendations of City and University of Arlington analysis, the Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS) program began making grants and low-interest loans for home improvements in the Mt. Auburn, Santa Fe, and adjacent Owenwood areas, resulting in over \$4 million in investments between 1976 and 1982 (over \$12 million in 2023 dollars).¹⁰²

The district is recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and C in the areas of Architecture for its collection of recognizable styles and property types

⁹⁹ “Neighborhood Study: Mt. Auburn, Owenwood, Santa Fe, East Dallas, Texas,” prepared by the University of Texas at Arlington Senior Planning Studio, 1978, from the Dallas Public Library.

¹⁰⁰ City of Dallas Department of Urban Planning. “Mount Auburn, Santa Fe, and Parkview neighborhoods analysis and recommendations, zoning case #Z812-114/5648-E,” City of Dallas (1981), from the Dallas Public Library.

¹⁰¹ “Neighborhood Study: Mt. Auburn, Owenwood, Santa Fe, East Dallas, Texas,” prepared by the University of Texas at Arlington Senior Planning Studio, 1978, from the Dallas Public Library.

¹⁰² City of Dallas Department of Housing and Neighborhood Services, “Mount Auburn/Santa Fe/Owenwood: a neighborhood planning guide for the Mount Auburn/Santa Fe/Owenwood reinvestment area,” City of Dallas, (1982), from the Dallas Public Library

from the early twentieth century, Community Planning & Development for its association with the trend of streetcar suburb development in Dallas in the early twentieth century, and Ethnic Heritage for its association with the Mexican-American community in Dallas – all at the local level of significance. The period of significance dates from 1902 through 1973 (50 years ago). The recommended boundaries of the proposed district presented in Figure 28 in **Appendix D** were based on a combination of historic plat maps and windshield-level analysis to evaluate integrity and cohesion of property types. Windshield analysis suggests that the vast majority of buildings within the proposed district are historic-age and maintain sufficient physical integrity to contribute to the district, as defined by the integrity threshold set forth in the research design and reproduced in **Appendix G**. The scope of this project entailed reconnaissance-level survey of historic-age resources within the APE only. Within the APE, survey of the proposed district documented 77 resources, with 65 contributing resources (84 percent) and 12 noncontributing (16 percent). Individual resources within the district are listed in the inventory in **Appendix B** and depicted in maps in **Appendix D**.

Claremont Historic District

The recommended Claremont Historic District is located north of I-30 and roughly bounded by the W R. L. Thornton Access Road on the southwest, Hunnicut Road on the southeast, Dorrington Drive on the northeast, and, on the northwest, Ferguson Road/the creek between Claremont Drive and Bar X Street. (See Figure 29 in **Appendix D**.) The street layout follows the curvilinear pattern typical for American post-World War II suburbs. The portion of the district northeast of Highland Road consists primarily of single-family residences, as well as the 1961 Bayles Elementary at 4444 Telegraph Avenue (extent, outside the APE). The portion of the district that lies southwest of Highland Road (closer to I-30) includes a combination of single-family houses, duplexes, and apartment buildings. All housing types constructed from the late 1950s until about 1965 are unified by typical midcentury construction materials like brick and asbestos shingles and reflect the Ranch style.¹⁰³ Representative photos are included in the district survey form in **Appendix C**.

The eligibility evaluation for the district was based upon *National Register Bulletin 46: Historic Residential Suburbs: Guidelines for Evaluation and Documentation for the National Register of Historic Places*, which establishes Claremont as a recognizable example of the “Postwar Curvilinear Suburb” type, retaining sufficient integrity to communicate that significant association.¹⁰⁴ Because the

¹⁰³ “Claremont Addition (neighborhood),” Vertical Files, Dallas Public Library.

¹⁰⁴ David L. Ames and Linda Flint McClelland, *National Register Bulletin 46: Historic Residential Suburbs: Guidelines for Evaluation and Documentation for the National Register of Historic Places*, National Park Service (2002), https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB46_Suburbs_part1_508.pdf.

proposed project would not adversely affect any resources within the recommended Claremont Historic District, limited additional research was conducted to establish its significance. The district is presumed eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A in the area of Community Planning and Development for its association with the trend of post-World War II suburbanization at the local level of significance, with a period of significance of 1955 through 1970. The recommended boundaries of the proposed district presented in Figure 29 in **Appendix D** were based on historic subdivision boundaries combined with windshield-level analysis to evaluate integrity. Windshield analysis suggests that the vast majority of buildings within the proposed district are historic-age and maintain sufficient physical integrity to contribute to the district, as defined by the integrity threshold set forth in the research design and reproduced in **Appendix G**. The scope of this project entailed reconnaissance-level survey of historic-age resources within the APE only. Within the APE, survey of the proposed district documented 16 resources, with all resources (100 percent) contributing to the character of the district. Individual resources within the district are listed in the inventory in **Appendix B** and depicted in maps in **Appendix D**.

Commerce/ Exposition Historic District

The recommended Commerce/Exposition Historic District is located south of I-30 and roughly bounded by the Texas & Pacific (T&P) railroad tracks at the north, Parry Avenue at the east, the alley between 1st Avenue and Exposition Avenue at the south, and Ash Lane at the west. (See Figure 30 in **Appendix D**.) The Texas Centennial Exposition Buildings/Fair Park NHL lie immediately east of this proposed district. The street layout uses a grid pattern that historically connected seamlessly with the Deep Ellum Historic District to the west, although I-30 divides this district from Deep Ellum today. Property types in the proposed district are commercial and generally fill the entire lot and share party walls with adjacent resources, with the exception of a few auto-oriented resources that are set back to allow for auto access. Within the surveyed portion of the district that extends into the APE, representative contributing buildings date from between 1923 and 1976 and illustrate the American Commercial, Renaissance Revival, and Prairie styles. Representative photos are included in the district survey form in **Appendix C**. A number of individual resources within the proposed districts have been previously listed in the NRHP or determined eligible, including the NRHP-listed BF Goodrich Building at 3809 Parry Avenue (Resource ID 198C), the NRHP-listed Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company Building at 3809 Parry Avenue (Resource ID 198A), the individually eligible Cabell's Incorporated Building at 710 Exposition Avenue (Resource ID 197), and the individually eligible building at 4118 Commerce Street (Resource ID 200). In addition, a historic resources survey

conducted in 2001 in association with construction for the Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART) system identified a smaller potential historic district along Commerce Street, encompassed by the historic district recommended herein.¹⁰⁵

The land that would become the Commerce/Exposition Avenue Historic District lies within the “Gaston Homestead,” owned by William H. Gaston, founder of East Dallas (as discussed in the Historic Context). By the 1890s, this land had been subdivided into “J.J. Berry’s Subdivision” and the “Exposition Park Addition” (Figures 67–68). Sanborn maps from 1899 show Mill Creek traversing the land, as well as the T&P railroad tracks, with the Central Stock Yards located adjacent to the railroad and modest dwellings and stores nearby (Figure 38). The adjacency to flood-prone Mill Creek and the noxious stockyards suggest that this was a somewhat undesirable location. Following the recommendations of the 1910 Kessler Plan, a flood control system was constructed along Mill Creek around 1915. By 1917, the route of the Bankhead Highway extended along Commerce Street from Fair Park through Deep Ellum and Downtown, prompting development of auto-oriented commerce along its path, known as “Auto Row.”¹⁰⁶ By 1922, Sanborn maps show increased commercial use emerging in the formerly residential district, including the cinema at 3711 Parry Avenue (present-day 820 Exposition Avenue G, Resource ID 196G), as well as a string of stores and auto-repair shops along the 800 block of Exposition Avenue (Figure 58). Streetcar service reached the district by the 1920s as well, connecting it with Deep Ellum and Downtown (Figure 79). The redevelopment of Fair Park for the 1936 Texas Centennial Exposition also led to significant commercial redevelopment within the district, especially for auto-oriented businesses that leveraged the auto advertising presented within the fair. One example is the 1929 Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. Building at 3809 Parry Avenue (Resource ID 198A), which took advantage of the nearby railroad and highway for shipping, as well as the fairgrounds for commercial visibility.¹⁰⁷

By 1950, Sanborn maps show the district entirely redeveloped for commercial uses (Figure 65). Examples of businesses shown that remain extant today include the baking school warehouse at 820 Exposition Avenue A (Resource ID 193A), the small restaurant at 832 Exposition Avenue G (Resource ID 195), the bottling works at 820 Exposition Avenue C and E (Resource IDs 196C and 196E), the electric equipment warehouse at 820 Exposition Avenue F (Resource ID 196F),

¹⁰⁵ Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc. (MF&A), “Request for Determination of Eligibility for the Southeast Corridor Light Rail Transit Project,” prepared for the Federal Transit Administration for Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART), August 2001.

¹⁰⁶ “Bankhead Highway,” Texas Historical Commission, accessed Feb. 15, 2023, <https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/historic-texas-highways/bankhead-highway>.

¹⁰⁷ “Goodyear and Goodrich Building,” Dallas Landmark Structures and Sites, City of Dallas Historic Preservation, accessed March 3, 2021, <https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/HP%20Documents/Landmark%20Structures/Goodyear%20and%20Goodrich%20Building%20Landmark%20Nomination.pdf>.

the Sherwin Williams Co. paint warehouses at 4100–4118 Commerce Street (Resource IDs 200–202) and 820 Exposition Avenue D (Resource ID 196D), a wholesale auto tires shop at 4130 Commerce Street (Resource ID 199B), and the Parks Investment Co. auto supplies warehouse at present-day 3809 Parry Avenue C (Resource ID 198C). Commercial development continued into the 1960s with the construction of the Cabell's Incorporated warehouse at 710 Exposition Avenue in 1962 (Resource ID 197).

As a representative example of an auto-oriented commercial district reflecting significant local trends in the mid-twentieth century, the district is recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and C in the areas of Architecture and Commerce at the local level of significance. The period of significance dates from 1922 through 1962. The recommended boundaries depicted within Figure 30 in **Appendix D** were based on the concentration of intact early and mid-twentieth century commercial buildings identified through windshield-level analysis only. Windshield analysis suggests that the vast majority of buildings within the proposed district are historic-age and maintain sufficient physical integrity to contribute to the district, as defined by the integrity threshold set forth in the research design and reproduced in **Appendix G**. The scope of this project entailed reconnaissance-level survey of historic-age resources within the APE only. Within the APE, survey of the proposed district documented 23 buildings, with 22 contributing resources (96 percent) and 1 noncontributing (4 percent). Individual resources within the district are listed in the inventory in **Appendix B** and depicted in maps in **Appendix D**.

Jubilee Park Historic District

The recommended Jubilee Park Historic District is located south of I-30 and roughly bounded by Ash Lane on the northwest, the E R. L. Thornton Access Road on the north, Philip Avenue on the southeast, and S Carroll Avenue on the southwest. (See Figure 31 in **Appendix D**.) The street layout uses a grid skewed to the northeast/southwest, with smaller lots clustered in the district's southern corner – especially on and around Congo Street. Property types within the proposed district are predominantly residential and include a collection of intact shotgun houses and bungalows—both single-family and duplexes—that exemplify typical working-class housing in Dallas in the early twentieth century. Within the surveyed portion of the neighborhood that extends into the APE, representative contributing buildings date from 1910 to 1938 and illustrate the National Folk, Craftsman, Minimal Traditional, and Tudor Revival styles. Religious buildings within the district are typically modest in scale and style, drawing connections with the district's significant associations with the Black community in Dallas, with extant examples including the 1953 St. Mark Missionary Baptist Church at 5435 Philip Avenue, the Fair Park Church of God in Christ at 1036 S Carroll Avenue, and the Friendly Memorial Full Gospel Baptist Church at 1113 S Fitzhugh

Avenue. Representative photos are included in the district survey form in **Appendix C**.

The portion of the district that developed earliest seems to have been the Blenheim Place subdivision, located along the western edge of the district, between present-day Bank Street and S Carroll Avenue, platted in 1905 by the Herman Evans Realty Company (Figure 70). The plat for Blenheim Place shows the present-day location of Congo Street unsubdivided and owned by Jerry Crawford. The bulk of the Jubilee Park, though, lies on the land historically known as the “RD Caldwell’s 200 Acre Tract,” stretching from present-day Bank Street to Henderson Street and extending from Grand Avenue north to the Santa Fe railroad tracks – historically adjoining the Mt. Auburn/Santa Fe neighborhood (Figure 71). Survey findings indicate that construction on the RD Caldwell land began around 1910. The original O.M. Roberts Elementary School also was constructed beginning in 1910, located on the same site as the extant non-historic school (4919 E Grand Avenue, outside the proposed district boundary).¹⁰⁸ In 1914, a large portion of the Caldwell Tract was replatted as the “East Side Addition” by the East Side Realty Company (Figure 75). Reconnaissance-level research revealed little information about the developers of the district, but city directories from 1918 indicate that the “East Side Realty Co” operated as a “Land Company” with offices in the Busch Building located downtown at present-day 1509 Main Street.¹⁰⁹

Each of the subdivisions associated with present-day Jubilee Park experienced gradual development through the late 1930s. Sanborn maps from the 1920s show the entire district platted, with the exception of the future Congo Street tract, which remained unsubdivided and contained a single dwelling and stable (Figure 49). Most of the lots in Blenheim Place had been developed with small wood dwellings, with sparser development moving eastward into the Caldwell Tract and the East Side Addition (Figures 41–43, 45–47, 49–51).

Originally, the neighborhood was integrated, populated largely by workers from the Ford Motor Company assembly plant that opened nearby in 1925. According to one source, “narrow wooden shotgun houses mark what had been the black section in segregation’s day,” while “Whites lived in the ‘rock houses,’ the brick homes” that were more common toward the eastern half of the district.¹¹⁰ By 1922 Sanborn maps also document the district’s association with the Black

¹⁰⁸ “How a Highland Park Church is Trying to Save Jubilee Park, One of the Poorest Areas in Dallas,” *D Magazine*, July 23, 2008, <https://www.dmagazine.com/publications/d-magazine/2008/august/how-a-highland-park-church-is-trying-to-save-jubilee-park-one-of-the-poorest-areas-in-dallas/>; Sanborn Fire Insurance Company, *Dallas, Tex.* [Map], 1922, sheet 374.

¹⁰⁹ John F. Worley, *Dallas City Directory* (1918), p. 1203, from the Portal to Texas History crediting the Dallas Public Library, <https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metaph806922/m1/1199>.

¹¹⁰ “How a Highland Park Church is Trying to Save Jubilee Park, One of the Poorest Areas in Dallas,” *D Magazine*, July 23, 2008, <https://www.dmagazine.com/publications/d-magazine/2008/august/how-a-highland-park-church-is-trying-to-save-jubilee-park-one-of-the-poorest-areas-in-dallas/>.

community, marking the New Zion Baptist Church (Figure 45) and “St. Mark Church (Colored)” (Figure 49). By the 1930s, though, the HOLC marked the entire area as “Declining” to discourage mortgage investment (Figure 83). The dense cluster of shotgun houses on Congo Street appears to have been developed in the early 1930s as Black housing; according to local lore, “The narrowest lane in the city and just one block long, it was given its name, historians say, to warn whites attending the 1936 Texas Centennial at the nearby fairgrounds that the area was black and should be avoided.”¹¹¹ By 1950, the district was predominantly Black, and Sanborn maps documented additional religious institutions, including “Roe’s Chapel Baptist Church (Colored)” (Figure 60), the “Bethel Baptist Tabernacle” (Figure 61), and “Fair Park Mission Holiness Church (Colored)” (Figure 62). With the absence of City services in the Jim Crow era, these religious institutions played a significant role in the community. The lack of City investment in amenities, however, further discouraged investment in the neighborhood, and construction of I-30 in the 1960s cut off pedestrian access to the parks and businesses located in the historically adjacent Mt. Auburn neighborhood. Despite several decades of depopulation and disinvestment, the neighborhood’s churches continued to bind together a community with significant roots in the district. In 1997, when St. Michael and All Angels Episcopal Church wanted to celebrate its jubilee year by giving back to its local community, the church decided to revitalize the area with a community center and renamed the neighborhood “Jubilee Park.” Religious groups and the City initiated a series of additional revitalization efforts in the 1990s and early 2000s, rehabilitating houses and constructing new amenities. Some of these efforts—like construction of the community center and the new Roberts Elementary School—entailed demolition of historic fabric and consequently these areas are excluded from the boundaries of the proposed district. Within the district’s core, though, rehabilitation efforts have respected the neighborhood’s historic scale and massing, enabling the district to retain its overall character and integrity of setting and feeling.

The district is recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A in the areas of Ethnic Heritage (Black) and Community Planning and Development at the local level of significance, with a period of significance from 1910 through 1973. The boundaries illustrated in Figure 31 in **Appendix D** were based on a combination of historic plats and windshield-level analysis to evaluate integrity and identify concentrations of similar property types. Windshield analysis suggests that the vast majority of buildings within the proposed district are historic-age and maintain sufficient physical integrity to contribute to the district, as defined by the

¹¹¹ “How a Highland Park Church is Trying to Save Jubilee Park, One of the Poorest Areas in Dallas,” D Magazine, July 23, 2008, <https://www.dmagazine.com/publications/d-magazine/2008/august/how-a-highland-park-church-is-trying-to-save-jubilee-park-one-of-the-poorest-areas-in-dallas/>.

integrity threshold set forth in the research design and reproduced in **Appendix G**. The scope of this project entailed reconnaissance-level survey within the APE only. Within the APE, survey of the proposed district documented 61 buildings, with 54 contributing resources (89 percent) and 7 noncontributing (11 percent). Individual resources within the district are listed in the inventory in **Appendix B** and depicted in maps in **Appendix D**.

Ford Motor Company

The recommended Ford Motor Company Historic District is located south of I-30, and the proposed district boundaries match the parcel boundaries, defined roughly by E Grand Avenue on the northwest, Barry Avenue on the southwest, an irregular line partially defined by a rail spur on the southeast, and the alley paralleling S Henderson Avenue on the northeast. (See Figure 32 in **Appendix D**.) The auto manufacturing complex was constructed beginning in 1925 to replace the earlier 1913 Ford plant at 2700 Canton Street in Deep Ellum (contributing to the Deep Ellum Historic District and individually designated as a local Dallas Landmark).¹¹² By 1926, the new Grand Street campus included rail spurs connecting to the nearby T&P line, a series of utilitarian brick buildings with large steel-frame windows and shed-roofed clerestories to allow natural light to enter the space, and a water tower (Resource IDs 271A–271E, Figures 78, 86–87). Historic aerial photographs and Sanborn maps illustrate construction of additions to the northeast and southeast elevations of the main factory building (Resource ID 271A) between 1950 and 1952. (See the survey forms in Appendix C.) The plant was again expanded between 1958 and 1968 when preexisting housing on the northeastern edge of the campus was removed and several more buildings were added to the site (Resource IDs 271F–271G).¹¹³ Buildings have continued to be added and removed from the property, but the core of the Ford Motor Co. plant remains intact. (See aerial photos in survey forms in **Appendix C**.)

Because the proposed project would not directly affect the district, limited research and analysis was conducted. However, prior scholarship clearly documents the significance of the Ford Company and the Grand Avenue plant to the industrial development of Dallas:

The company quickly outgrew the [earlier Ford building in Deep Ellum], and in 1925 the assembly plant was relocated to a new building at 5200 E. Grand Avenue in Dallas [near] Fair Park. The new location had ample square footage, a large

¹¹² Kate Singleton, "Ford Assembly Plant/Adam Hats Building," Dallas Landmark Commission Nomination Form, City of Dallas, (1996), from the City of Dallas,

<https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/HP%20Documents/Landmark%20Structures/Adam%20Hats%20Building%20LMC%20Nomination.pdf>.

¹¹³ "Timeline: Dallas in the 1960s," *Legacies* v. 10 no. 2 (Fall 1998), 7, from the Portal,

<https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metaph35105/m1/9>. As this source notes, in 1968: "Ford Motor Company completes a \$3.5 million expansion of its Dallas Assembly Plant, originally built in 1925 on the 40-acre Grand Avenue site."

construction yard, and direct access to the rail network. Dallas was a growing manufacturing center during the first few decades of the 20th century that focused on oil production, banking, cotton, and textiles. No other cars were manufactured in Dallas, or Texas for that matter, during this time. Most cars left the Dallas assembly plant with a sticker that read “Built in Texas by Texans,” a fact which became a source of pride for locals... The production of the Model T had been discontinued in 1927, and around this time Ford lost dominance over the auto industry to competitors ...the company laid off thousands of workers nationwide during the Depression in response to slumping sales, and the Dallas plant shut down from 1933 until 1934. ...In February 1942, Ford converted his plants solely to military production. The Dallas assembly plant built military Jeeps, G8T and GT8A cargo trucks. Over 93,000 Jeeps and over 6,100 cargo trucks were produced at this plant alone by the end of the war...Normal production at the Dallas Ford plant resumed in July 1945 – after the Allied victory against Germany, but before the end of the war with Japan....The Dallas Ford assembly plant remained open until February 20, 1970. ¹¹⁴

The district is recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A in the area of Industry at the local level of significance. The period of significance stretches from 1925 through the plant’s closure in 1970. The recommended boundaries of the presented in Figure 32 in Appendix D were based on the current tax parcel for the property. Windshield analysis suggests that the majority of buildings within the proposed district are historic-age and maintain sufficient physical integrity to contribute to the district. The scope of this project entailed reconnaissance-level survey within the APE only. Within the APE, survey of the proposed district documented 7 buildings, with all contributing (100 percent). Individual resources within the district are listed in the inventory in **Appendix B** and depicted in maps in **Appendix D**.

Owenwood Historic District

The recommended Owenwood Historic District is located south of I-30 and is roughly bounded by the E R. L. Thornton Access Road/Culver Street on the north, Boone Avenue/Dolphin Road on the east, Alpine Street on the south, and Beeman Avenue/Henderson Avenue/Fairview Avenue on the west. (See Figure 33 in **Appendix D**.) The street layout follows a grid pattern, with some diagonal streets reflecting earlier railroad alignments. Lots are generally narrow and consistently sized, accommodating bungalow forms – primarily single-family houses but also duplexes, all “designed as low to lower-middle income family housing.”¹¹⁵ All housing types were constructed between 1918 and 1955. Architectural styles among surveyed resources reflect National Folk, Craftsman,

¹¹⁴ Jennifer Anderson, “The History of Ford Motor Company in Dallas,” City of Dallas Office of Historic Preservation, accessed January 27, 2023, <https://cityofdallaspreservation.wordpress.com/2018/12/07/the-history-of-ford-motor-company-in-dallas/>.

¹¹⁵ “Neighborhood Study: Mt. Auburn, Owenwood, Santa Fe, East Dallas, Texas,” prepared by the University of Texas at Arlington Senior Planning Studio, 1978, from the Dallas Public Library.

Tudor Revival, and Minimal Traditional influences. The Methodist Church at 5710 E R. L. Thornton Freeway (Resource ID 290A) serves as the district's primary religious node and hub of community activity. Representative photos are included in the district survey form in **Appendix C**.

The earliest section of the district is Parkview Place, located in the district's northeast corner (Figure 76). The subdivision is triangular, organized by a street grid intersected by the diagonal alignments of Fairview Avenue and Henderson Avenue. Surveyed resources in Parkview Place date from 1918 through 1926, and the Parkview Park at Fairview and Culver Streets was acquired by the City in 1919.¹¹⁶ The bungalows in this section of the district are primarily wood framed with wood siding and modest architectural detailing. Moving eastward, the Owenwood Addition was platted in 1923, with resources constructed from 1923–1924.¹¹⁷ Typical housing included more brick bungalows with Tudor Revival or Craftsman stylistic influences. At the eastern edge of the proposed district, the Beeman Estates subdivision includes houses constructed between 1935 and 1955, including a combination of brick, stone, and wood bungalows with Tudor Revival and Minimal Traditional stylistic influences.¹¹⁸ The land for the Methodist Church was donated by the owners of the Owenwood Addition, Everett Owens and Charles Mitchell, in 1923.¹¹⁹ At that time, prior to construction of I-30, its site was at the heart of the neighborhood rather than on the access road. The “Owenwood Methodist Church” was constructed beginning in 1923, then appeared in city directories by 1924.¹²⁰ By 1949 the church remodeled and constructed a two-story west wing, creating the footprint visible on Sanborn maps by 1950 (Figure 64).¹²¹

Initially, the proposed Owenwood Historic District developed as a working-class White neighborhood. HOLC maps from the 1930s label the area as “still desirable,” facilitating continued mortgage lending and build-out of the neighborhood (Figure 83). Demographic change came to the neighborhood in the 1960s, caused by the highway but also by City rezoning of nearby areas for multifamily housing, prompting White homeowners to move to newer suburbs

¹¹⁶ City of Dallas Department of City Planning and Department of Parks and Recreation, “Parks and Open Spaces,” prepared for the Dallas Area Master Plan Committee (1959), p. 29, from the Dallas Public Library and HHM archives.

¹¹⁷ “Neighborhood Study: Mt. Auburn, Owenwood, Santa Fe, East Dallas, Texas,” prepared by the University of Texas at Arlington Senior Planning Studio, 1978, from the Dallas Public Library. Note that the original subdivision plat for the Owenwood addition was not located but surveyed parcels with legal descriptions noting the Owenwood subdivision lie roughly between St. Charles Avenue and Dolphin Road and include 3001-2355 Culver Street (Resource IDs 291-317).

¹¹⁸ Reconnaissance-level research did not locate the Beeman Estates plat but surveyed parcels with legal descriptions noting the Beeman Estates subdivision stretch from roughly Dolphin Road to Boone Avenue and include 3301-3539 Culver Street (Resource IDs 318-343).

¹¹⁹ “Ground-Breaking Services Held for New Owenwood Methodist Church,” *Dallas Morning News*, Jul. 9, 1923, from GenealogyBank.

¹²⁰ John F. Worley, *Dallas City Directory* (1924), p. 43, from the Portal to Texas History crediting the Dallas Public Library, <https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metaph806924/m1/43>.

¹²¹ “Owenwood Methodists Remodel Church,” *Dallas Morning News*, Jan. 16, 1949, from GenealogyBank.

that they perceived to be more stable. A neighborhood planning study from the 1970s noted that, around 1970, neighborhood demographics began to change from predominantly White to a mix of White, Mexican American, and Black and included a “noticeable addition of professionals of all ethnic backgrounds.”¹²² The evolution of the Methodist Church at the neighborhood’s core provides a poignant illustration of this trend. By 1975, city directories document the relocation of the predominantly White Owenwood Methodist congregation to a new building north of I-30 at 1451 John West Road (extant today). Around the same time, the predominantly Black St. Luke’s congregation sought to relocate from its 1945 building on Wahoo Street (just south of Owenwood) and transform its mission to be more active in the community and social justice issues.¹²³ City directories document that St. Luke Community Methodist Church opened in the old Owenwood Methodist building around 1978. By that year, the church began hosting “a bread basket program for the area and an active youth and elderly program.”¹²⁴ From the time of its establishment through today, St. Luke’s has been widely recognized as the center of community development and outreach in this diverse, vibrant neighborhood.¹²⁵

As a result, the district is recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and C in the areas of Architecture, Ethnic Heritage (Black), and Community Planning and Development at the local level of significance, with a period of significance from 1923 through 1973 (50 years ago) – encompassing the neighborhood’s demographic shift as part of its significance. The boundaries depicted in Figure 33 in **Appendix D** were based on a combination of historic plats and windshield-level analysis to evaluate integrity. Windshield analysis suggests that the vast majority of buildings within the proposed district are historic-age and maintain sufficient physical integrity to contribute to the district, as defined by the integrity threshold set forth in the research design and reproduced in **Appendix G**. The scope of this project entailed reconnaissance-level survey within the APE only. Within the APE, survey of the proposed district documented 94 buildings, with 86 contributing resources (91 percent) and 8 noncontributing (9 percent). Individual resources within the district are listed in the inventory in **Appendix B** and depicted in maps in **Appendix C**.

¹²² “Neighborhood Study: Mt. Auburn, Owenwood, Santa Fe, East Dallas, Texas,” prepared by the University of Texas at Arlington Senior Planning Studio, 1978, from the Dallas Public Library.

¹²³ “St. Luke celebrates 85 years of ‘Community,’” North Texas Conference of the United Methodist Church, accessed Feb. 17, 2023, <https://ntcumc.org/news/st-luke-celebrates-85-years-of-a-community>.

¹²⁴ “Neighborhood Study: Mt. Auburn, Owenwood, Santa Fe, East Dallas, Texas,” prepared by the University of Texas at Arlington Senior Planning Studio, 1978, from the Dallas Public Library.

¹²⁵ “Owenwood Neighborhood,” Vertical File, Dallas Public Library.

- **Ineligible Properties/Districts within the APE**

Properties to be Displaced

- Resource ID 13, 601 S 1ST AVE, previously determined not eligible by 2020 I-30 Canyon survey
- Resource ID 175, 1938 residential building at 2911 DAWSON ST, lacks integrity
- Resource ID 176, 1901 residential building at 2913 DAWSON ST, lacks integrity
- Resource ID 177, 1914 residential building at 2917 DAWSON ST, lacks integrity
- Resource ID 178, 1901 residential building at 2921 DAWSON ST, lacks integrity
- Resource ID 179, 1703 CHESTNUT ST, previously determined not eligible by 2020 I-30 Canyon survey
- Resource ID 184, 3001 HICKORY ST, previously determined not eligible by 2020 I-30 Canyon survey
- Resource ID 186, 1947 warehouse at 1717 BAYLOR ST, lacks significance and integrity, surrounding context lacks sufficient integrity for district eligibility
- Resource ID 203A, 4000 ASH LN A, previously determined not eligible by 2020 I-30 Canyon survey
- Resource ID 203B, 4000 ASH LN B, previously determined not eligible by 2020 I-30 Canyon survey
- Resource ID 204, 619 S HILL AVE, previously determined not eligible by 2020 I-30 Canyon survey
- Resource ID 345A, 1964 commercial building at 3909 SAMUELL BLVD A, lacks significance
- Resource ID 345B, 1964 commercial accessory building at 3909 SAMUELL BLVD B, lacks significance
- Resource ID 345C, 1964 commercial accessory building at 3909 SAMUELL BLVD C, lacks significance
- Resource ID 346, 1967 gas station at 3939 SAMUELL BLVD, lacks significance

Other Ineligible Individual Resources

Of the 563 resources that were evaluated for this report, 260 are recommended not eligible for inclusion on the NRHP *and* do not fall within the boundaries of a recommended historic district. Among these, 199 lack significant associations

that would meet one or more NRHP criterion, 33 buildings hold potentially significant associations but lack integrity, and 28 lack both significance and integrity. The resources that lack integrity are predominantly residential and constructed prior to 1950; common alterations include incompatible replacement of exterior wall materials, porch alterations, fenestration pattern alterations, and/or additions that change the original scale and massing of the residence. Resources lacking significance typically are commercial and constructed after 1940—especially after 1960—following an auto-oriented commercial strip pattern with little district-level design orientation or architectural detailing. Large-scale residential apartment complexes constructed from 1970 onward and lacking recognizable architectural character also are considered to lack significance. The individual survey forms in **Appendix C** contain detailed evaluations of each resource’s significance and integrity.

Noncontributing Resources within Eligible Districts

Among the 30 identified noncontributing resources within eligible districts, the vast majority (27) are all residential, mostly constructed between 1910 and 1950. Nearly all are recommended noncontributing because they lack integrity; only two residential resources were considered noncontributing because they were constructed after the end of the district’s period of significance. Common alterations include incompatible replacement of exterior wall materials, porch alterations, fenestration pattern alterations, and/or additions that change the original scale and massing of the residence. The three identified noncontributing commercial resources all were constructed after the end of the periods of significance for their respective districts.

Ineligible Districts

Alamo Park Industrial Area

The southeastern portion of the study area—roughly bound by the E R. L. Thornton access road on the north, S Malcolm X Boulevard on the southwest, Oak Lane on the southeast, and S Second Avenue on the northeast—includes a cluster of industrial buildings that the project team evaluated for NRHP historic district eligibility but determined not eligible. By the 1880s, multiple rail lines traversed the area, including the Gulf, Colorado, & Santa Fe (GC&SF), the Texas Trunk Railroad (later the Texas & New Orleans railroad, or T&NO), and the Texas & Pacific (T&P) lines. The land remained undeveloped, however, until the early 1900s. Historically, this area was known as Alamo Park, echoing the name of the ca. 1900 school and 1919 park historically located at the southeastern corner of Hickory Street and S Malcolm X Boulevard (Figure 39).¹²⁶ (The “Alamo Swimming

¹²⁶ City of Dallas Department of City Planning and Department of Parks and Recreation, “Parks and Open Spaces,” prepared for the Dallas Area Master Plan Committee (1959), p. 29, from the Dallas Public Library and HHM archives.

Pool,” owned by the Dallas Independent School District, historically was associated with this school and remains extant on this site today.) By 1905 Sanborn maps show the emergence of the Dallas Oil & Refining Company plant adjacent to both the GC&SF and the T&NO lines, on the site of the present-day non-historic DART complex (Figure 40). Subsequent development, however, included a sparse mix of industry and working-class housing, perhaps due to flooding along Mill Creek. As late as 1930, aerial photos show patches of open space to the west and south of the Dallas Oil & Refining Company site (Figure 77). (Note that the labels on the 1930 aerial note “36. Baylor Hospital” and “42. Cuero Court,” neither of which is extant today.) By 1950, some additional industrial development appeared around the intersection of Chestnut Street and Hickory Street, including a laundry, welding shop, various warehouses, and a filling station (Figure 59). The area along the Trunk railroad developed with warehouses around the same time (Figure 66). In the decades following the construction of I-30, though, many resources in the area were abandoned or demolished. Many of the area’s residential resources were lost after mid-twentieth-century zoning changes separated manufacturing and residential districts and discouraged mixed-use neighborhoods. The historic Alamo School was demolished at some point after 1973, and the Dallas Oil & Refining Company complex underwent extensive redevelopment for reuse by DART in the early 2000s. Although some industrial resources remain intact in the area, the lack of integrity of setting inhibits the area’s ability to communicate its historic character. As a result, the district is not recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP.

- **Recommendations for Further Study**

For the purposes of the proposed project, no further study is required.

Determination of Section 106 Effects Recommendations

- **Direct and Indirect Effects**

Analysis of schematic drawings depicting the proposed project suggests that that three NRHP-eligible resources on three parcels of land would be displaced, constituting adverse effects under Section 106, as summarized within Table 7 below. In addition, the project would entail minor right-of-way acquisitions from four parcels of land encompassing 17 NRHP-eligible resources, as summarized within Table 7. Each of these proposed locations of minor ROW acquisitions would not adversely affect contributing resources or character-defining features of the historic properties.

Effects caused by traffic noise and noise barriers are not anticipated to be adverse. Any increases in traffic noise levels within would not diminish the ability of any of the historic properties in the APE, including districts and contributing resources, to convey historic significance. Plans for potential noise barriers have not been finalized. More concrete plans for the noise barriers will be determined

after the project receives environmental clearance, developed in conjunction with affected property owners and residents. Noise barriers are not anticipated to result in any adverse effects, as no ROW is expected to be acquired from historic properties and scenic qualities are not part of any of the historic properties' significance.

Regarding visual effects, the proposed project would include the construction of a depressed roadway to replace the existing elevated structure for most of the project's length and the construction of new surface-level street crossovers. The highway itself is historic-age and therefore a prominent feature of the setting of the historic resources and historic districts, particularly those constructed contemporary to or after its construction date. The highway would remain and its relationship to these resources would largely be retained, while the depression of the roadway would partly restore the setting of the historic resources and districts that predated its construction. In addition, this design removes the physical barrier (visual and structural) and restores visual and physical connectivity between the neighborhoods north and south of the existing highway that were severed when the highway was constructed. As a result, the project poses no visual adverse effects to historic properties.

Table 7. Summary of Section 106 effects recommendations from displacements and right-of-way acquisitions within recommended NRHP-eligible historic districts.

Historic District	Displacements (Adverse Effect)			Minor ROW Acquisitions (No Adverse Effect)		
	Address	Resource Count	Parcel Count	Address	Resource Count	Parcel Count
Deep Ellum				501 S 2nd Ave. A-F (Gulf Oil complex, Resource ID 11A-F, also NRHP-listed as a smaller district)	6	1
Mt. Auburn/ Santa Fe	4937 Lindsley Ave. (Resource ID 69)	1	1	4809 Ash Ln. (Resource ID 44)	1	1
Commerce/ Exposition	710 Exposition Ave. (Cabell's Inc., Resource ID 197, also individually eligible)	1	1			
	820 Exposition Ave. A (Resource 196A)	1	1	820 Exposition Ave. B-I (Resource 196B-I) 832 Exposition Ave. (same parcel as 820 Exposition Ave., Resource ID 195)	8 1	1
Jubilee Park				5115 Philip Ave. (Resource ID 269)	1	1
TOTAL		3	3		17	4

Deep Ellum Historic District

The boundaries of the Deep Ellum Historic District encompass 162.25 acres; the proposed project entails taking 0.007734 acres of land within those boundaries (0.005 percent), as depicted in Figure 34 in **Appendix D**. Design of the single build alternative conscientiously avoided or minimized adverse effects to known historic resources in Deep Ellum to the extent possible. Effects are limited to right-of-way acquisition on the parcel of land encompassing the Gulf Oil complex at 501 S 2nd Avenue (Resource IDs 11A–F), as discussed below. The district as a whole would retain sufficient integrity of design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling, and association to continue to be NRHP-eligible. No contributing resources would be physically damaged. In addition, the district’s setting is already affected by the adjacent elevated I-30 highway corridor, but the proposed project would remove the current elevated highway and sink the highway below grade in this section, bringing the integrity of setting closer to its historic condition rather than impairing it. In addition, at-grade pedestrian bridges would restore connectivity to the adjacent recommended Commerce/Exposition Historic District, enhancing the integrity of association.

ROW Acquisition from Individually Eligible NRHP Properties/ Contributing Resources to the Deep Ellum Historic District

- The Gulf Oil Distribution Facility at 501 S 2nd Avenue (Resource IDs 11A–F) is listed in the NRHP as a small historic district under Criterion A for Industry; all six resources on the property also contribute to the Deep Ellum Historic District. The smaller NRHP district boundary follows S 2nd Avenue to the northeast, Hickory Street to the northwest, the property line to the southeast, and Trunk Avenue to the southwest. Current schematics for the proposed project would acquire 0.008 acres (0.51 percent) of the 1.569 acres of land within the NRHP boundary. The proposed right-of-way acquisition is confined to the southmost corner of the parcel, adjacent to Resource ID 11C. The distance between the proposed new right-of-way and Resource 11C would be between about 13 feet and 60 feet; the distance to the current right-of-way is between about 60 feet and 112 feet. The proposed project would not entail removal or destruction of any contributing resources or associated character-defining features, commercial use of the resources would remain feasible, and access to the resources would not be impeded. As a result, the project poses no adverse effects to 501 S 2nd Avenue (Resource IDs 11A–F) or the Deep Ellum Historic District.

Commerce/Exposition Historic District

The proposed boundaries of the Commerce/Exposition Historic District encompass 19.73 acres; the proposed project entails taking 0.1357 acres of land within those boundaries (0.025 percent), as depicted in Figure 35 in **Appendix D**. In addition, the project would entail displacing the buildings at 710

Exposition Avenue (Resource ID 197) and 820 Exposition Avenue A (Resource ID 169A) and acquire ROW from the parcel of land encompassing 820 Exposition Avenue B-I (Resource IDs 196B-I) and 832 Exposition Avenue (Resource ID 195). Each eligible displacement and right-of-way acquisition is further discussed below. Despite these effects, the district as a whole would retain sufficient integrity of design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling, and association to continue to be NRHP-eligible. Reconnaissance-level survey documented 23 resources in the APE – 22 contributing (96 percent) and 1 noncontributing (4 percent); loss of two contributing buildings would result in a ratio of 20 contributing resources (95 percent) to 1 noncontributing (5 percent). In addition, the district's setting already is affected by the adjacent elevated I-30 highway corridor, but the proposed project would remove the current elevated highway and sink the highway below grade in this section, bringing the integrity of setting closer to its historic condition rather than impairing it. In addition, at-grade pedestrian bridges would restore connectivity to the adjacent Deep Ellum Historic District, enhancing the integrity of association.

Displacement of Individually NRHP-Eligible and Contributing Resources to the Commerce/Exposition Historic District (Adverse Effect)

- 710 Exposition Ave. (Cabell's Inc., Resource ID 197) was previously determined individually eligible for the NRHP and also contributes to the recommended Commerce/Exposition Historic District. The recommended individual NRHP boundary is the parcel boundary. At this location, I-30 currently has four main lanes in each direction. An elevated entrance ramp connects 1st Avenue to I-30 eastbound by crossing over Exposition Avenue and running along the west elevation of the resource. Resource 197 directly abuts the I-30 ROW and is approximately 5 to 15 feet from the eastbound upper deck structure. The proposed project would require acquisition of 100 percent of the 0.1545-acre parcel and would thus result in displacement and removal of Resource 197. As defined by the criterion of adverse effects within 36 CFR 800.5, "Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property" would constitute an adverse effect to Resource 197 and, as a result, the Commerce/Exposition Historic District.¹²⁷
- 820 Exposition Ave. A (Resource ID 196A) is recommended eligible as a contributing building within the Commerce/Exposition Historic District. Today, the legal parcel that encompasses this resource has been consolidated with the adjacent parcels, so that the present-day parcel contains 3.8207 acres. (Resource IDs 195 and 196B-I sit on this same parcel and all also contribute to the recommended historic district.) As illustrated in Figure 13, the proposed

¹²⁷ Code of Federal Regulations, Title 36, Chapter VIII, Part 800, Subpart B (36 CFR 800.5), National Archives, accessed Feb. 21, 2023, <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-36/chapter-viii/part-800/subpart-b/section-800.5>.

project would entail acquiring 0.1447 acres (3.787 percent) from this parcel and would displace Resource 196A. As defined by 36 CFR 800.5, “Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property” would constitute an adverse effect to Resource 196A and, as a result, the Commerce/Exposition Historic District.

ROW Acquisition from Contributing Resources to the Commerce/Exposition Historic District

- As noted above, the parcel of land encompassing 820 Exposition Avenue A (Resource ID 196A) also encompasses 820 Exposition Avenue B-I (Resource IDs 196B-I) and 832 Exposition Avenue (Resource ID 195), all of which contribute to the proposed historic district. This parcel contains 3.8207 acres, and the build alternative would entail acquiring 0.1447 acres (3.787 percent) from this parcel. Based upon proposed schematic drawings of the build alternative, the distance between the proposed new right of way and the closest remaining building—820 Exposition Avenue B (Resource ID 196B)—would range between about 95 feet and 115 feet. Currently, a paved surface parking lot occupies most of this space. The proposed right-of-way acquisition would not adversely affect the use of Resources 195 or 196B-I or impede access to these resources. This right-of-way acquisition poses no adverse effect to the Commerce/Exposition Historic District.

Mt. Auburn/ Santa Fe Historic District

The proposed boundaries of the Mt. Auburn/Santa Fe Historic District encompass 549.703 acres; the proposed project entails taking 0.1357 acres of land within those boundaries (0.025 percent), as depicted in Figure 36 in **Appendix D**. In addition, the project would entail displacing the residential resource at 4937 Lindsley Avenue (Resource ID 69) and acquire ROW from the parcel of land encompassing 4809 Ash Lane (Resource ID 44) – as detailed below. Despite these effects, the district as a whole would retain sufficient integrity of design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling, and association to continue to be NRHP-eligible. Reconnaissance-level survey documented 77 resources in the APE – 65 contributing (84 percent) and 12 noncontributing (16 percent); loss of one contributing building would result in a ratio of 64 contributing resources (84 percent) to 12 noncontributing (16 percent). Schematic drawings depict a proposed new roundabout at the intersection of S Munger Boulevard and Lindsley Avenue, but much of this roundabout lies outside of the proposed district boundaries, and the district as a whole retains enough of its historic street network to counterbalance the change proposed at this one location. In addition, the district’s setting is already affected by the adjacent at-grade I-30 highway corridor, and the proposed new corridor would sink below grade, reducing the effects to the district’s integrity of setting rather than increasing them.

Displacement of Individually NRHP-Eligible and Contributing Resources to the Mt. Auburn/Santa Fe Historic District (Adverse Effect)

- The Craftsman bungalow at 4937 Lindsley Avenue (Resource ID 69) is a contributing resource within the recommended Mt. Auburn/Santa Fe Historic District. Schematic drawings of the build alternative indicate that the proposed project would acquire 0.1344 acres (57.757 percent) from this 0.2327-acre parcel. The proposed new right-of-way would require displacement of Resource 69. As defined by 36 CFR 800.5, “Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property” would constitute an adverse effect to Resource 69 and to the Mt. Auburn/Santa Fe Historic District.

ROW Acquisition from Contributing Resources to the Mt. Auburn/Santa Fe Historic District

- 4809 Ash Lane (Resource ID 44) is a contributing resource within the recommended Mt. Auburn/Santa Fe Historic District. Current project schematics depict acquisition of 0.0012 acres (0.622 percent) along the front edge of the associated 0.1607-acre parcel. The proposed new right-of-way would be between 15 and 20 feet from the resource. However, the current right-of-way is almost as close – between 15 and 23 feet from the resource. Residential use of the building would remain feasible, and access would not be adversely affected. As a result, this right-of-way acquisition poses no adverse effect to Resource 44 or to the Mt. Auburn/Santa Fe Historic District.

Jubilee Park Historic District

The boundaries of the Jubilee Park Historic District encompass 106.262 acres; the proposed project entails taking 0.0002 acres of land within those boundaries (0.0002 percent), as depicted in Figure 37 in **Appendix D**. Effects are limited to right-of-way acquisition on the parcel of land encompassing 5115 Philip Avenue (Resource ID 269), as discussed below. The district as a whole would retain sufficient integrity of design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling, and association to continue to be NRHP-eligible. No contributing resources would be physically damaged. In addition, the district’s setting is already affected by the adjacent elevated I-30 highway corridor, but the proposed project would remove the current elevated highway and sink the highway below grade in this section, bringing the integrity of setting closer to its historic condition rather than impairing it.

ROW Acquisition from Contributing Resources to the Jubilee Park Historic District

The contributing resource at 5115 Philip Avenue (Resource ID 269) lies on a parcel measuring 0.1378 acres, of which the proposed project entails taking 0.0002 acres (0.145 percent), confined to the back edge of the parcel. The proposed new right-of-way would be about 25 to 30 feet from the resource.

However, the current right-of-way is almost as close – between 30 and 45 feet from the resource. Residential use of the building would remain feasible, and access would not be adversely affected. As a result, this right-of-way acquisition poses no adverse effect to Resource 44 or to the Jubilee Park Historic District.

▪ **Cumulative or Reasonably Foreseeable Effects**

No adverse cumulative, or reasonably foreseeable effects have been identified. Over time, the enhanced pedestrian connections from one side of the highway to the other may provide some *positive* effects to commerce and pedestrian/bicycle accessibility.

U.S. DOT Section 4(f) Applicability Statement

As defined in 23 CFR 774.17, a direct use of a Section 4(f) property occurs when property is permanently incorporated into a proposed transportation project. As the project would result in permanent incorporation of three historic properties into a transportation facility, the project would result in a direct use of three Section 4(f) historic sites:

- The Cabell’s Building at 710 Exposition Avenue (Resource ID 197), which is both individually eligible and a contributing resource within the recommended Commerce/Exposition Historic District
- The contributing commercial building at 820 Exposition Avenue A (Resource ID 196A), within the recommended Commerce/Exposition Historic District; and
- The contributing Craftsman bungalow at 4937 Lindsley Avenue (Resource ID 69), within the recommended Mt. Auburn/Santa Fe Historic District.

Individual Section 4(f) evaluations will be required for each of these three properties.

The requirements of Section 4(f) are satisfied with respect to a Section 4(f) resource if a transportation project would have only a “*de minimis* impact” on the Section 4(f) resource. The provision allows avoidance, minimization, mitigation, and enhancement measures to be considered in making the *de minimis* determination. A finding of a *de minimis* impact on a historic site may be made when the Section 106 process results in a determination of “no adverse effect” to the resource.

The proposed project’s use of the below properties would be *de minimis* under Section 4(f), as a Section 106 finding of no adverse effect is recommended:

- The Gulf Oil Distribution Facility at 501 S 2nd Avenue (Resource IDs 11A–F), which is both listed as a small historic district and contributing to the pending Deep Ellum Historic District, proposed ROW acquisition of 0.007734 acres (0.342 percent) of the 2.26 -acre NRHP-listed district;
- 4809 Ash Lane (Resource ID 44), contributing to the recommended Mt. Auburn/Santa Fe Historic District, proposed ROW acquisition of 0.0012 acres (0.622 percent) of the 0.1607-acre parcel;

- 820 Exposition Avenue B-I (Resource IDs 196B-I) and 832 Exposition Avenue (Resource ID 195), all of which lie on the same parcel as 820 Exposition Avenue A and also contribute to the proposed Commerce/Exposition Historic District, proposed ROW acquisition of 0.1447 acres from the 3.8207-acre parcel (3.787 percent); and
- 5115 Philip Avenue (Resource ID 269), contributing to the recommended Jubilee Park Historic District, proposed ROW acquisition of 0.0002 acres (0.145 percent) of the 0.1378-acre parcel.

References Cited

- "A Primer on Jubilee." KERA News, <http://stories.kera.org/inside-neighborhood/jubilee-primer/>.
- "About CANA." Claremont Addition Neighborhood Association. Accessed 04/12/2023, <https://www.claremontaddition.org/>.
- Ames, David L. and Linda Flint McClelland. Historic Residential Suburbs: Guidelines for Evaluation and Documentation for the National Register of Historic Places. Washington, D.C.: US Department of the Interior. National Park Service, 2002, 10–37.
- Anderson, Jennifer. "The History of Ford Motor Company in Dallas," City of Dallas Office of Historic Preservation, accessed March 15, 2021, <https://cityofdallaspreservation.wordpress.com/2018/12/07/the-history-of-ford-motor-company-in-dallas/>.
- Besser, Susan A. "Fair Park." Dallas Landmark Commission Nomination Form. City of Dallas, 1987. From the City of Dallas, <https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/HP%20Documents/Districts%20Page/Fair%20Park%20Designation%20Report.pdf>.
- Bird's Eye view map of Dallas. 1872. Dallas Historical Society via Wikimedia Commons, accessed October 13, 2021, https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/8/84/Old_map-Dallas-1872.jpg.
- Bosse, Paula. [Various articles.] Flashback: Dallas. <https://flashbackdallas.com>.
- [Cabell family, various articles.] Dallas Morning News via genealogy bank.
- "Cabell." Surname vertical file, Dallas Public Library, index at <https://dallaslibrary2.org/genealogy/docs/verticalfile.pdf>.
- "Cabell's vs. 7-Eleven." Dallas Historical Society, <http://phorum.dallashistory.org/read.php?2,71931>.
- Cardenas-Salcedo and Associates. "Conceptual study for Jubilee Commons." Dallas Institute of Humanities and Culture, 1991. From the Dallas Public Library, catalog link <https://catalog.dallaslibrary.org/polaris/search/title.aspx?ctx=1.1033.0.0.6&pos=2&cn=2610876>.
- City of Dallas Department of City Planning and Department of Parks and Recreation. "Parks and Open Spaces." Prepared for the Dallas Area Master Plan Committee, 1959. From the Dallas Public Library and HHM archives.
- City of Dallas Department of Housing and Neighborhood Services. "Mount Auburn/Santa Fe/Owenwood: a neighborhood planning guide for the Mount Auburn/Santa Fe/Owenwood reinvestment area." City of Dallas, 1982. From the Dallas Public

Library, catalog link

<https://catalog.dallaslibrary.org/polaris/search/title.aspx?ctx=1.1033.0.0.6&pos=1&cn=289778>.

City of Dallas Department of Urban Planning. "Mount Auburn, Santa Fe, and Parkview neighborhoods analysis and recommendations, zoning case #Z812-114/5648-E."

City of Dallas, 1981. From the Dallas Public Library, catalog link

<https://catalog.dallaslibrary.org/polaris/search/title.aspx?ctx=1.1033.0.0.6&pos=3&cn=354109>.

City of Dallas Historic Preservation Department,

<https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/Pages/default.aspx>.

Code of Federal Regulations. Title 36. Chapter VIII. Part 800. Subpart B (36 CFR 800.5).

National Archives. Accessed Feb. 21, 2023, <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-36/chapter-VIII/part-800/subpart-B/section-800.5>.

Collins, Courtney. "A Primer on Jubilee Park." KERA, published 2017,

<https://stories.kera.org/inside-neighborhood/jubilee-primer/>.

Conger, W. R. "W.R. Conger Cemetery Studies, 1961-1962." Manuscript Material Collection, Texas/Dallas History and Archives Division, Dallas Public Library, catalog link

<https://catalog.dallaslibrary.org/polaris/search/title.aspx?ctx=1.1033.0.0.6&pos=2&cn=2787430>.

City of Dallas Parks and Recreation. Various dates. <https://www.dallasparcs.org/>.

City of Dallas. "Peak's Suburban Addition/Millcreek Neighborhood." Dallas Landmark Commission Nomination Form. City of Dallas, 1993. From the City of Dallas,

https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/DCH%20documents/Peaks_Suburban_Dallas_Landmark_Nomination%20Form.pdf.

"[Continental Gin Co]." Photograph. Date Unknown. From The Portal to Texas History, crediting the Texas Historical Commission,

<https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metaph930545/m1/1/?q=continental%20gin%20dallas>.

"Check out These Vintage Ford Assembly Line Pictures." Western Slope Auto Official (blog), accessed March 15, 2021,

<https://www.westernslopeauto.com/blog/ford-assembly-linehistory-in-vintage-pictures/>.

Cram, George Franklin. 1841-1928, Dallas Texas [map]. 1900. From the Portal to Texas History, crediting University of Texas at Arlington Library,

<https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metaph231402/>.

- Culberson, Margaret. "Early Dallas Bungalows." *Legacies* v. 14 no. 2 (Fall 2002), 19. From the Portal, <https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth35097>.
- Dallas County Appraisal District, <http://www.dallascad.org/>.
- "Dallas District ADA and Sidewalk Improvements Historic Resources Survey Report." Prepared for TxDOT, March 2018.
- "Dallas-Fort Worth." Texas Freeway, <http://www.texasfreeway.com/dallas/>.
- "Dallas Ry. Co's. Key & Guide to Dallas 1925." From DART, accessed August 2, 2021, <https://dartdaily.dart.org/home/dallas-streetcar-flashback-see-dallas'-streetcar-map-from-1925>.
- Dallas Texas Street Cars [map]. N.p., 1941. From Maps of the Past, <https://www.mapsofthepast.com/dallas-tx-city-railway-terminal-co-1941.html>.
- Dase, Amy E. "A Field Guide to Industrial Properties in Texas" [Historical Studies Report No. 2003-01]. Prepared for TxDOT, 2003.
- Doty, Mark, 1975- author. *Lost Dallas*. Charleston, South Carolina: Arcadia Publishing, 2012. From the Dallas Public Library, catalog link <https://catalog.dallaslibrary.org/polaris/search/title.aspx?ctx=1.1033.0.0.6&pos=1&cn=2186565>.
- Dunsavage, Lyn. *Historic old east Dallas*. Dallas, Tex.: Historic Preservation League, [1974?]. From the Dallas Public Library, catalog link <https://catalog.dallaslibrary.org/polaris/search/title.aspx?ctx=1.1033.0.0.6&pos=1&cn=165126>.
- "East Dallas, Samuel Boulevard - East Grand Avenue (Labeled)" [Photo]. Dallas Historic Aerial Photographs. 1930 Fairchild Survey. SMU Libraries, <https://digitalcollections.smu.edu/digital/collection/dmp/id/183>.
- "East-We-Go" [subdivision plats]. *Murphy & Bolanz Addition Books – Dallas County 1880–1920*, Book 2, p. 239.5, Book 3, pp. 401–403. From the Dallas Public Library, <https://dallaslibrary2.org/dallashistory/murphyandbolanz/Addition2/add2p239-5.php>, <https://dallaslibrary2.org/dallashistory/murphyandbolanz/Addition3/add3p401.php>, <https://dallaslibrary2.org/dallashistory/murphyandbolanz/Addition3/add3p403.php>.
- "Environmental Review Toolkit: Program Comment for Common Post-1945 Concrete and Steel Bridges." FHWA. Accessed 04/13/2023, https://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/env_topics/historic_pres/program_comment.aspx.
- "Fair Park Estates." Southfair CDC. Accessed 04/12/2023, <https://southfaircdc.org/single-family-housing/#fair-park-estates>.

- “Fair Park Estates Neighborhood Association.” Facebook. Accessed 04/12/2023, <https://www.facebook.com/groups/517697064997173/>.
- Fairchild Aerial Surveys, Inc. Aerial photos. 1930. From the Edwin J. Foscue Map Library, Southern Methodist University, <https://digitalcollections.smu.edu/digital/collection/dmp/id/163>.
- “From Pioneer Paths to Superhighways - The Texas Highway Department Blazes Texas Trails 1917-1968.” Texas State Library and Archives Commission. Accessed April 28, 2021, <https://www.tsl.texas.gov/exhibits/highways/greatage/centralexpressway1950s.html>.
- [Gaston, William Henry (original owner of Fair Park and surrounding land), various articles.] Dallas Morning News via genealogy bank.
- “Goals for Dallas.” Prepared for the City of Dallas, 1966, from the Dallas Public Library.
- Glover, Robert W. “Gaston, William Henry.” Handbook of Texas Online, accessed October 31, 2022, <https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/gaston-william-henry>.
- “Goodyear and Goodrich Building.” Dallas Landmark Structures and Sites, City of Dallas Historic Preservation, accessed March 3, 2021, <https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/Pages/Goodyear-Goodrich-Building.aspx>.
- “Grove Hill Memorial Park.” Find-a-Grave Index, <https://www.findagrave.com/cemetery/3970/grove-hill-memorial-park>.
- Grove Hill Oddfellows Association 1912.” Ephemera Collection, Texas/Dallas History and Archives Division, Dallas Public Library, catalog link <https://catalog.dallaslibrary.org/polaris/search/title.aspx?ctx=1.1033.0.0.6&pos=3&cn=2787555>.
- “Gulf Refining Company/Hickory Street Annex.” Dallas Landmark Structures and Sites, City of Dallas Historic Preservation, accessed March 3, 2021, <https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/Pages/Gulf-Refining-Company.aspx>.
- Hardy-Heck-Moore, Inc. “Alcalde Street-Crockett School Historic District.” NRHP Nomination Form. Texas Historical Commission, Austin, 1995. From the THC Atlas, <https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/NR/pdfs/95000330/95000330.pdf>.
- ___. “Historic and Architectural Resources of East and South Dallas, Dallas County, Texas.” NRHP Nomination Form. Texas Historical Commission, Austin, 1995. From the City of Dallas, <https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/HP%20Documents/Resources%20Page/Historic%20and%20Architectural%20Resources%20of%20East%20and%20South%20Dallas%201990.pdf>.

- ___. "Peak's Suburban Addition Historic District." [ca. 1895–1945], NRHP Nomination Form. Texas Historical Commission, Austin, 1995. From THC Atlas, <https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/NR/pdfs/95000328/95000328.pdf>
- Hardy-Heck-Moore, Inc., Blanton & Associates, Martha Doty, Freeman, and Diane E. Williams. A Historic Context of the Bankhead Highway and Other Historic Named Highways. Volume I. Prepared for the Texas Historical Commission, <https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/preserve/survey/highway/Bankhead-history.pdf>, 49–50.
- Harland Bartholomew & Associates. "A Master Plan for Dallas, Texas." Planning report submitted to the City of Dallas, 1944. From the Portal to Texas History, crediting the Dallas Municipal Archives, <https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metaph752541>.
- Harland Bartholomew & Associates. "Your Dallas of Tomorrow." Planning report submitted to the City of Dallas, 1943. From the Portal to Texas History, crediting the Dallas Municipal Archives, <https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metaph610711>.
- Hayes, Brian. *Infrastructure: A Field Guide to the Industrial Landscape*. Norton, 2005.
- HHM & Associates, Inc. (HHM). "Historic Resources Survey of Downtown and Deep Ellum." Volume I. Prepared for City of Dallas, 2022. From the City of Dallas, <https://open-history-data-dallasgis.hub.arcgis.com/>.
- ___. "Deep Ellum Historic District" [Second Draft]. NRHP Nomination Form. Texas Historical Commission, Austin, 2010.
- ___. "Thematic Historic Context Statements." Volume II. (Prepared for City of Dallas, 2022. From the City of Dallas, <https://open-history-data-dallasgis.hub.arcgis.com/>.
- Hazel, Michael V. "Cabell, Earle (1906–1975)." *The Handbook of Texas Online*, <https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/cabell-earle>.
- Hicks Environmental, Inc. "Project Pegasus Historic Resources Survey Report." Prepared for TxDOT, 2004.
- Historic Aerials, <https://historicaerials.com>.
- Humble Oil & Refining Co. *Dallas* [map]. N.p., 1965. From the Dallas Public Library.
- "History." Fair Park, <https://www.fairparkdallas.com/discover/history>.
- "How a Highland Park Church is Trying to Save Jubilee Park, One of the Poorest Areas in Dallas." *D Magazine*, July 23, 2008, <https://www.dmagazine.com/publications/d-magazine/2008/august/how-a-highland-park-church-is-trying-to-save-jubilee-park-one-of-the-poorest-areas-in-dallas/>.
- "IH-30 Canyon Improvements Project Historic Resources Survey Report." Prepared for TxDOT, October 2020.
- "Interstate 30." Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Interstate_30.

- James, Frances. *Dallas County history: from the ground up*. [S.l.]: F. James, 2007-. From the Dallas Public Library, catalog link
<https://catalog.dallaslibrary.org/polaris/search/title.aspx?ctx=1.1033.0.0.6&pos=6&cn=1231556>.
- Jebsen, Jr., Harry, Robert M. Newton, and Patricia R. Hogan. "Centennial History of Dallas Texas Park System: 1876–1976." Prepared for the City of Dallas. Department of Park Administration, Landscape Architecture, and Horticulture, in cooperation with the Department of History, Dallas Technical University, Lubbock, Texas, 1976, pp. 6–8. From the Dallas Public Library,
https://dallascityhall.com/government/citysecretary/archives/DCH%20Documents/Dallas_Park_Rec_Centennial_History.pdf.
- "John F. Worley." *Dallas City Directory* (1918), p. 1203. From the Portal to Texas History crediting the Dallas Public Library,
<https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metaph806922/m1/1199>.
- Jones, W. Dwayne with updates by David W. Moore, Jr. and Shonda Mace. "A Field Guide to Gas Stations in Texas" [Historical Studies Report No. 2003–03]. Prepared for TxDOT, May 2016.
- J-Quad and Associates with Stanland and Associates. "South Dallas/Fair Park Economic Development Plan." Prepared for the City of Dallas, 2001. From the City of Dallas,
<https://dallascityhall.com/departments/pnv/Pages/South-Dallas-Fair-Park-Economic-Development-Corridor.aspx>.
- "Jubilee Park." Accessed 04/12/2023, <https://www.jubileecenter.org/>.
- Kessler, George. "A City Plan for Dallas," 1911, 13–31. From The Portal to Texas History, crediting Dallas Municipal Archives,
<https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metaph129158/>.
- Kovach, Gretel C. "The Very Complicated Legacy of Dr. William Samuell." *D Magazine* online, published August 2009, <https://www.dmagazine.com/publications/d-magazine/2009/august/the-very-complicated-legacy-of-dr-william-samuell/>.
- Krause, Lee A. "The renovation of the older neighborhoods of Dallas, Texas: an independent study." [S.l.] [s.n.]; [1988?] From the Dallas Public Library, catalog link
<https://catalog.dallaslibrary.org/polaris/search/title.aspx?ctx=1.1033.0.0.6&pos=6&cn=2501005>.
- "Landmarks, 1921–1924: 1921, Elevator Fire Causes Loss of \$75,000." *Dallas Daily Times Herald*, October 25, 1921, p. 6, col. 3,
<http://freepages.rootsweb.com/~jwheat/history/landmarks2124.html>.
- Landon, Marie, Stan Klein, and Richard D. Poougher. "Munger Place Historic District." NRHP Nomination Form. Texas Historical Commission, Austin, 1978. From THC Atlas,
<https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/NR/pdfs/78002916/78002916.pdf>.

Legacies: A History Journal for Dallas and North Central Texas. From the Portal to Texas History crediting the Dallas Historical Society,
<https://texashistory.unt.edu/explore/collections/LHJNT/>.

“Leonhardt Lagoon – Fair Park – Dallas, TX.” Living New Deal,
<https://livingnewdeal.org/projects/leonhardt-lagoon-fair-park-dallas-tx/>.

Mason, Alan S. “Interstate Forwarding Company Warehouse.” NRHP Nomination Form. Texas Historical Commission, Austin, 1992. From THC Atlas,
<https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/NR/pdfs/92000021/92000021.pdf>.

“Mount Auburn” [subdivision plats]. *Murphy & Bolanz Addition Books – Dallas County 1880–1920*, Book 3, pp. 314–317. From the Dallas Public Library,
<https://dallaslibrary2.org/dallashistory/murphyandbolanz/Addition3/add3p314.php>,
<https://dallaslibrary2.org/dallashistory/murphyandbolanz/Addition3/add3p315.php>,
<https://dallaslibrary2.org/dallashistory/murphyandbolanz/Addition3/add3p316.php>
[m,](https://dallaslibrary2.org/dallashistory/murphyandbolanz/Addition3/add3p317.php)
<https://dallaslibrary2.org/dallashistory/murphyandbolanz/Addition3/add3p317.php>.

“Mount Auburn Neighborhood Association.” Accessed 04/12/2023,
<https://mountauburnneighborhood.org/about/>.

Murphy & Bolanz Addition Books – Dallas County 1880–1920. From the Dallas Public Library, index link
<https://dallaslibrary2.org/dallashistory/murphyandbolanz/bookindex.php>.

“Museum of Nature and Science – Dallas, TX.” Living New Deal,
<https://livingnewdeal.org/projects/museum-of-nature-and-science-dallas-tx/>.

Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc. (MF&A). “Request for Determination of Eligibility for the Southeast Corridor Light Rail Transit Project.” Prepared for the Federal Transit Administration for Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART), August 2001.

"Map: Explore Jubilee Park." KERA News, <http://stories.kera.org/inside-neighborhood/explore-jubilee-park-poi-map-highlight/>.

McAlester, Virginia Savage. *A Field Guide to American Houses*. Knopf, 2013.

McElhaney, Jackie and Michael Hazel. "Dallas, TX." *Handbook of Texas Online*,
<https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/hdd01>.

“Neighborhood Association Map.” City of Dallas. Accessed 04/12/2023,
https://dallascityhall.com/departments/pnv/DCH%20Documents/NOM%20for%20Web_March2020.pdf.

New Detailed Route Map of Dallas Transit System’s Ultra-Modern Service. Handymap, Inc., 1967. From the Dallas Public Library.

“Oakland-Merlin Overpass – Dallas, TX.” Living New Deal,
<https://livingnewdeal.org/projects/oakland-merlin-overpass-dallas-tx/>.

- “Owenwood Neighborhood Association.” Facebook. Accessed 04/12/2023,
<https://m.facebook.com/groups/owenwood/>.
- Powers-Lawson, Kellie. “The Interstate Forwarding Building/Goodyear Building.” Dallas Landmark Nomination Form. City of Dallas Historic Preservation. June 22, 1990, p. 7. Accessed October 1, 2021,
<https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/HP%20Documents/Landmark%20Structures/Interstate%20Forwarding%20Building%20Landmark%20Nomination.pdf>.
- Reminiscences, a glimpse of old East Dallas*, ed. Gerald D. Saxon. Dallas: Dallas Public Library, 1983. From the Dallas Public Library, catalog link
<https://catalog.dallaslibrary.org/polaris/search/title.aspx?ctx=1.1033.0.0.6&pos=1&cn=309394>.
- Sanborn Maps 1899, 1905, 1921, 1922, 1950. From the Library of Congress at
<https://www.loc.gov/>.
- Sam Street's map of Dallas County, Texas. Dallas, Tex.: Sam Street, 1900), from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2005625344>.
- Schmidt, René and Tracey Cox. “Junius Heights.” Dallas Landmark Commission Nomination Form. City of Dallas, 2005,
<https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/HP%20Documents/Districts%20Page/Junius%20Heights%20Landmark%20Nomination%20Report.pdf>.
- Shelton, Devlin, Jay Firsching, and Emily Smith. “Gulf Oil Distribution Facility.” NRHP Nomination Form. Texas Historical Commission, Austin, 2010. From the THC Atlas,
<https://atlas.thc.state.tx.us/Details/2010000144>.
- Singleton, Kate. “Ford Assembly Plant/Adam Hats Building.” Dallas Landmark Commission Nomination Form. City of Dallas, 1996. From the City of Dallas,
<https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/HP%20Documents/Landmark%20Structures/Adam%20Hats%20Building%20LMC%20Nomination.pdf>.
- Smith, Emily. “Gulf Refining Co. Distribution Plant.” Dallas Landmark Commission Nomination Form. City of Dallas, 2008, 3–16. From the City of Dallas,
<https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/HP%20Documents/Landmark%20Structures/Gulf%20Refining%20Company%20Landmark%20Nomination.pdf>.
- Smith, Lynn C. and Beth Reed. "Non-Archaeological Historic-Age Resources Survey Report: Dallas Horseshoe Project." Prepared for TxDOT, 2012.
- Snyder, Stephen G. and James H. Charleton. “Texas Centennial Exposition Buildings (1936–37).” NRHP Nomination Form. Texas Historical Commission, Austin, 1986. From THC Atlas, https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/NR/pdfs/86003488/86003488_NHL.pdf.

- Solamillo, Stan and Rosa Clipper-Fleming. "Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company & B.F. Goodrich Building." NRHP Nomination Form. Texas Historical Commission, Austin, 2002. From THC Atlas, <https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/NR/pdfs/02000009/02000009.pdf>.
- Squire Haskins Photography, Inc. Collection. UTA Libraries Digital Gallery. Squire Haskins Photography, Inc. Collection. University of Texas at Arlington Libraries. "The industrial area near downtown Dallas, Texas." UTA Libraries Digital Gallery.
- State Highway Commission. Map Proposing System of State Highways, as adopted June 1917. From the Texas State Archives Map Collection, <https://www.tsl.texas.gov/apps/arc/maps/maplookup/06254>.
- Stevens, Michael. "Continental Gin Company, Dallas Plant." City of Dallas Landmark Designation Report. City of Dallas, 1986, 6. From the City of Dallas, <https://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/historicpreservation/HP%20Documents/Districts%20Page/Continental%20Gin%20Landmark%20Designation%20Report.pdf>.
- Strong, J. M. and Murphy & Bolanz. Official map of Dallas County, Texas Dallas: Murphy & Bolanz, 1886. From the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2005625350/>.
- Subdivision and plat records. Recording Division, Dallas County Clerk, <https://www.dallascounty.org/government/county-clerk/recording/>.
- Swindell, J. H. Dallas County [map]. August 14, 1855. From The Portal to Texas History, crediting Texas General Land Office, <https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metaph88480/m1/1>.
- "Tenison Park – Dallas TX." Living New Deal, <https://livingnewdeal.org/projects/tenison-park-dallas-tx/>.
- Terry, Antoinette. *A profile of East Dallas, Texas showing it to be an asset upon annexation to Dallas*. 1975. From the Dallas Public Library, catalog link <https://catalog.dallaslibrary.org/polaris/search/title.aspx?ctx=1.1033.0.0.6&pos=1&cn=302208>.
- Texas Ice House. <http://www.texasicehouse.com/>.
- Texas State Highway Department. General Highway Map, Dallas County, Rockwall County, Texas. 1936. From the Texas State Archives Map Collection, <https://www.tsl.texas.gov/apps/arc/maps/maplookup/04838>.
- "The History of Deep Ellum." Parks for Downtown Dallas, <https://parksfordowntowndallas.org/the-history-of-deep-illum>.
- "The Ulrickson Committee Report, 1927 – 1930." City of Dallas. Municipal Archives. Accessed October 4, 2021,

https://dallascityhall.com/government/citysecretary/archives/Pages/Archives_1995-034.aspx.

TxDOT Historic Bridges Map. TxDOT,
<https://txdot.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=cc9cf3452a324d0bb961a0c8b4edd898>.

TxDOT Historic Districts and Properties of Texas Map. TxDOT,
<https://txdot.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=077104987672487b9b320cc424d588a2>.

University of Texas Arlington Senior Planning Studio. "Neighborhood Study Mt. Auburn/Owenwood/Santa Fe/East Dallas." University of Texas at Arlington, 1978. From the Dallas Public Library, catalog link
<https://catalog.dallaslibrary.org/polaris/search/title.aspx?ctx=1.1033.0.0.6&pos=1&cn=377250>.

[Various locations of properties listed in the NRHP and/or designated as National Historic Landmarks, State Antiquities Landmarks, Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks, Historic Texas Cemeteries, and Official Texas Historical Markers.] THC Historic Sites Atlas, <http://atlas.thc.state.tx.us/>.

[Vertical files, various neighborhoods (including East Dallas, Owenwood, Buckner Terrace, and White Rock).] Dallas Public Library, index at
<https://dallaslibrary2.org/genealogy/docs/verticalfile.pdf>.

Ware, Barbara. "Grove Hill Cemetery Interment Cards - 1911 to 1985." Dallas Genealogical Society, <https://dallasgenealogy.com/dgs/grove-hill-cemetery-interment-cards/>.

Writers' Program of the Work Projects Administration in the City of Dallas. The WPA Dallas Guide and History, 40, University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting UNT Press, accessed March 1, 2021,
<https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc28336/>.

Appendix A: Project Information and ROW Information

The project information on the pages below is generally consistent with analysis conducted in support of this HRSR. As shown below, the estimated acreage of ROW acquisition is approximately 12.0 acres, and GIS analysis showed 12.4431 acres proposed for ROW acquisition.

[Back To List](#)

- [WPD Section I - Project Definition](#)
- [WPD Section II - Tool](#)
- [WPD Section III - Project Work Plan](#)
- [WPD Section IV - Findings](#)



Print this Page

Project Definition

Project Name:

CSJ: - -

Anticipated Environmental Classification:

Is this an FHWA project that normally requires an EIS per 23 CFR 771.115(a)?

Project Association(s)

Manually Associate CSJ:

CSJ	DCIS Funding	DCIS Number	Env Classification	DCIS Classification	Main or Associate	Doc Tracked In	Actions
CSJ:000911251	Federal,State		EA	WF	Associate	Main	

DCIS Project Funding and Location

Funding

DCIS Funding Type:

Federal State Local Private

Location

DCIS Project Number:
 Highway:
 District:
 County:
 Project Limit -- From:
 Project Limit -- To:
 Begin Latitude: + . Begin Longitude: - .
 End Latitude: + . End Longitude: - .

DCIS & P6 Letting Dates

DCIS District: DCIS Approved: DCIS Actual:
 P6 Ready To Let: P6 Proposed Letting:

DCIS Project Description

Type of Work:

Layman's Description:

DCIS Project Classification:

Design Standard:

Roadway Functional Classification:

Jurisdiction

Does the project cross a state boundary, or require a new Presidential Permit or modification of an existing Presidential Permit?

https://www.dot.state.tx.us/ECOS/apps/ecos/project_definition.jsp?proj_id=13593584&pr... 4/19/2023

Who is the lead agency responsible for the approval of the entire project?

FHWA - Assigned to TxDOT TxDOT - No Federal Funding FHWA - Not Assigned to TxDOT

TxDOT

Who is the project sponsor as defined by 43 TAC 2.7?

Yes

Is a local government's or a private developer's own staff or consultant preparing the CE documentation, EA or EIS?

Yes

Does the project require any federal permit, license, or approval?

USACE IBWC USCG NPS IAJR Other

No

Does the project occur, in part or in total, on federal or tribal lands?

Environmental Clearance Project Description

Project Area

Typical Depth of Impacts: (Feet)

Maximum Depth of Impacts: (Feet)

New ROW Required: (Acres)

New Perm. Easement Required: (Acres) New Temp. Easement Required: (Acres)

Project Description

Describe Limits of All Activities:

The Texas Dept. of Transportation (TxDOT), in conjunction with the City of Dallas, proposes reconstructing and widening improvements to the segment of the I-30 East Corridor from I-45 to Ferguson Road in Dallas, Texas, a distance of approximately 5 miles. The project improvements propose to reconstruct and widen eight to ten general purpose lanes and reconstruct four/six discontinuous frontage roads. The project improvements also propose the reconstruction and widen of one reversible High-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane to 2 reversible managed lanes. Location map and schematic (with typical sections) are uploaded to ECOS.

Describe Project Setting:

According to the Dallas and White Rock Lake topographic maps of the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) for the corridor, the elevations in the project study area range from a maximum of approximately 510 feet above mean sea level (msl) to a minimum of approximately 410 feet above msl. The eastern portion of the project study area can be characterized as gently undulating with a local topographic trend sloping toward White Rock Creek, which crosses the corridor. Roughly the western half of the project area slopes southward toward unnamed tributaries of White Rock Creek.

Based on aerial photography, a general land use analysis of the study area reveals that approximately 30 percent of the land is residential (single and multi-family) development. Undeveloped, designated open-space or park land accounts for approximately 10 percent of the study area. The remaining 60 percent of the land in the study area is commercial (mostly highway retail strip development), industrial, and miscellaneous tracts such as schools and hospitals.

The land use along I-30, within the limits from I-45 to Ferguson Road, is primarily a combination of retail/commercial, vacant, and single-family homes. The primary location of single-family homes in this segment is between Haskell Avenue and Jim Miller Road. The Fair Park is located on the south side of the freeway in this segment, and Tenneson Park Golf Course is located north of I-30. Other major land uses include Samuel Grand Park, which is located east of Winslow Avenue, north of I-30 as well as Grove Hill Memorial Park and Cemetery, which is located east of Lawnview Avenue, south of I-30.

Substantial traffic generators, such as I-45, President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT), major employment areas, shopping centers, restaurants, and residential areas, are located within the project limits that are considered contributors to the high traffic volumes on I-30.

It is anticipated for this project to result in the potential displacement of at least 17 buildings (3 residential and 14 commercial, and 4 billboards) within this segment of I-30 East Corridor Project.

As mentioned, one cemetery, Grove Hill Memorial Park and Cemetery, which is located east of Lawnview Avenue, located adjacent south of I-30. In addition, two commercial properties identified in the project area have been determined to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as part of a previous project conducted for the I-30 corridor (included in the I-30 Canyon Historic Resources Survey Report [HRSR]). Of the two, one is anticipated to be displaced as a result of this project; therefore, a Section 4(f) evaluation will be required.

A perennial stream (White Rock Creek) crosses the project area, and the proposed project would reconstruct and widen the I-30 bridge crossing of this creek, necessitating the placement of new bridge support columns. Two unnamed tributaries to White Rock Creek also cross I-30 and highway

Describe Existing Facility:

Within these limits from I-45 to Ferguson Road, the existing I-30 highway facility consists of a nine-lane, controlled-access highway to include eight general purpose lanes and one reversible high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane. Extending eastward from Haskell Avenue the interim HOV system uses a movable barrier to convert one of the general purpose mainlanes (off peak direction) into a HOV lane (peak direction). Once peak hour flow subsides, the barrier is returned to the center median and each freeway direction operates under normal conditions.

The existing I-30 main lanes and HOV lane are on an elevated bridge structure from I-45 to Haskell Avenue with subsequent main lane overpasses from Haskell Avenue to Dolphin Road. Frontage roads vary from two to three lanes in each direction and are discontinuous within these limits. The existing right of way (ROW) typically varies, ranging from approximately 200 feet to 500 feet in width, and the ROW width exceeds 1,000 feet at major intersections.

Describe Proposed Facility:

The proposed improvements would include ten general purpose lanes (five in each direction), two reversible managed lanes, discontinuous two to three lane frontage roads in each direction, and reconstruction of ramps and bridge structures. The proposed I-30 main lanes and managed lanes would be depressed from I-45 to Dolphin Road. Accommodations for bicycle and pedestrian travel along the project corridor are a component of project development. The proposed ROW typically ranges from 308 to 505 feet in width. The proposed improvements would require additional ROW of approximately 12 acres and would also provide opportunities for potential surplus ROW to be sold at fair market value to the City or County or others interested if the City of County chooses not to purchase.

The proposed typical section for the proposed project consists of the following:

- 10 mainlanes (five 12-foot lanes in each direction) with 10-foot inside and outside shoulders;
- two reversible managed lanes (toll) in the center median of I-30 (12-foot lanes) with 10-foot and 4-foot shoulders and a barrier to separate the managed lanes from the mainlanes; and
- one to three-lane discontinuous frontage roads (12-foot lanes) in each direction with curbs; in most instances, a 10-foot-wide shared use path (bicycle and pedestrian) would typically be constructed adjacent to frontage roads.

Would the project add capacity?

Transportation Planning

Is the project within an MPO's boundaries?

Does the project meet the definition for a grouped category for planning and programming purposes?

The project is located in area.

This status applies to:

CO - Carbon Monoxide O3 - Ozone NO2 - Nitrogen Dioxide

PM10 - Particulate PM2.5 - Particulate

Environmental Clearance Information

Environmental Clearance Date: _____ Environmental LOA Date: _____

Closed Date: _____ Archived Date: _____

Approved Environmental Classification: _____

Project Contacts

Created By: Date Created:

Project Sponsor: TXDOT (Or) Local Government

Sponsor Point Of Contact: Sandra Williams - Environmental Program Manager

ENV Core Team Member: Michelle Lueck - Environmental Specialist

District Core Team Member: Sandra Williams - Environmental Program Manager

Other Point of Contact(s):

Last Updated By: Sandra Williams Last Updated Date: 01/25/2022 10:18:22

https://www.dot.state.tx.us/ECOS/apps/ecos/project_definition.jsp?proj_id=13593584&pr... 4/19/2023

This page intentionally left blank.