NPS Form 10-900-b
(March 1992)

OMB No. 1024-0018

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Multiple Property Documentation Form

_x_ New Submission __ Amended Submission

RECEIVED 2280
APR 15 1997
NAT. REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

A. NAME OF MULTIPLE PROPERTY LISTING

Historic and Architectural Resources of Grapevine, Texas

B. ASSOCIATED HISTORIC CONTEXTS

Community Development in Grapevine, Texas: 1888-1955

C. FORM PREPARED BY (with assistance from Bruce Jensen, THC Architectural Historian)

Name/Title: Stan Solamillo (Project Director)
Organization: ArchiTexas
Street & Number: 1907 Marilla
City or town: Dallas
Date: November 1996/March 1997
Telephone: 214-748-4561
State: TX *Zip:* 75201

D. CERTIFICATION

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation. (_See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Curtis Tunnell
Signature and title of certifying official

4-1-97
Date

State Historic Preservation Officer, Texas Historical Commission
State or Federal agency and bureau

I hereby certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

for Edson H. Beall
Signature of the Keeper

5/16/97
Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR WRITTEN NARRATIVE

	PAGE NUMBERS
E. STATEMENT OF HISTORIC CONTEXTS	E-3 THROUGH E-20
F. ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TYPES	F-21 THROUGH F-31
G. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA	G-32
H. SUMMARY OF IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION METHODS	H-33 THROUGH H-34
I. MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES	I-35 THROUGH I-38

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determining eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 120 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503

STATEMENT OF HISTORIC CONTEXT: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN GRAPEVINE, TEXAS, BETWEEN 1888 AND 1955

INTRODUCTION

Grapevine, Texas, was established in the 1840s as a rural farming community. Its township was platted by 1854 and it developed as a regional agricultural center for a number of smaller, surrounding communities. The inhabitants of these smaller communities as well as those in Grapevine proper, shared a cohesive identity and culture. This culture was largely responsible for the establishment of the town and influenced its development through time. It also provided the impetus for the formation of a local economic base which was maintained for almost one hundred years. Although an antebellum planters class never developed in 19th century Grapevine, the township was dominated by a succession of prominent farm families. Its establishment as a regional agricultural center was largely due to their influence, and there appears to have been a conscious effort on the part of such families to establish a town from the onset. There was also a tendency for members of the principal landowning families to intermarry. As a result, many of the largest land owners and prominent businessmen of Grapevine in later years were their descendants. New businesses were often created to support or benefit those that relatives had previously established. These symbiotic economic and social relationships were constantly being maintained and formed to enhance familial as well as agricultural interests (Simmons 1995).

Grapevine farmers were for the most part, self-sufficient cultivators who grew and consumed their own crops. In the 19th century they initiated and maintained a somewhat diversified agricultural system. Even after the development of cash crop economy based upon cotton, they continued to cultivate additional produce. They also practiced dairy and poultry farming which became successful industries later in the 20th century. Grapevine's agriculturally-based economic system at the township level mirrored the economic system at the state level. It had its beginnings in boom and bust subsistence dry-land farming which was maintained through a cash crop economy of cotton and sorghums as well as the land-lease practices of share-cropping and tenant farming.

During the Great Depression, it made the transition to a more diverse and perhaps more stable system of crop cultivation as well as poultry, dairy, livestock and agricultural commodity production. Grapevine's economy included a collection of brokers, bankers and speculators as well as businessmen and a professional class. Their impact on the development of the city as well as on the population at large included the early development of the town's infrastructure and its access to a transportation network of rail and roads. There is a strong oral tradition among both Anglo and African-American informants that is extant to this day. The use of this resource has provided a unique opportunity for comparison with as well as addition to the historical record of the township.

Like many other rural communities in Texas, Grapevine also changed its agricultural-based economy to one dependent on industry, manufacturing and the professions. The change occurred fairly late in its history and was initiated with the construction of the highways, the advent of the automobile, and the effects of state and federally-sponsored projects on the local environment.

With these changes eventually occurred the demise of an entire culture, signaled by the disappearance of some of those very communities which supported Grapevine's economic base during the 19th and early 20th centuries. An eventual population shift of residents from Grapevine to the larger urban centers of Dallas and Fort Worth began in the 1920s. This was followed by an immigration of persons from outside the area in the late 1930s and 1940s who were employed in the service and industrial sectors in those centers. Since the 1940s, there has been a continued immigration of populations from outside the city. This process completed Grapevine's transformation in the mid and late 20th century into a suburban community of Dallas and Fort Worth.

The land to the east and west of Main Street in the 1880s consisted of rather large family holdings. These were gradually subdivided into residential lots for the construction of housing, at first for relatives, then for speculative purposes. In addition to dividing property among heirs at the death of a parent, it was also a fairly common practice to include the latter as part of a bride's dowry, the transfer of which was apportioned from family holdings. This practice appears to have been particularly responsible for some of the early residential development which occurred west of Main Street. Even well into the 20th century, some Grapevine families such as the Jenkins were still building houses for daughters on family-owned lots in town (Simmons 1995).

Although Grapevine's growth as a town included the development of its internal infrastructure, the transportation network beyond the township limits remained a significant problem throughout much of the historic period. Finally in 1884 a commission was appointed in Fort Worth to establish the alignment of four main roads in Tarrant County. One of the results of the commission's planning activities was the construction of the Grapevine Road. Built from Fort Worth to Grapevine, it stopped short of the township by eleven miles, ending abruptly at a place called Anderson's Corner. The terminus was reputed have been the result of high land prices and a general opposition from farmers who prevented the road's construction through their fields. Little improvement of this condition would occur until the early 20th century, when a series of bond elections were approved for the extension of the highway into Grapevine (*Grapevine Sun*, 18 December 1930).

Reliance solely upon the county's roads for transporting produce would have thwarted the development of a cash crop economy in the township during the 19th century. Wagon freight rates were twice as expensive as those offered by the railroads and when combined with the varying conditions of the roadbeds that they traveled, wagons remained an unreliable form of transportation throughout the historic period (Young: 8).

Presumably, Grapevine's businessmen and influential families were aware of these facts and equally aware of the economic impact of railroads on other towns, particularly in Ellis County to the south and in Dallas County to the east with the arrival of the Houston & Texas Central (H&TC). Constructed from 1871-1872, the line extended from Houston to Dallas and northward to Denison. At Denison, it connected with the Missouri, Kansas & Texas (MK&T) Railroad which ran northward to St. Louis. The H&TC railroad was especially important because it provided a regularly scheduled and less expensive means of transporting locally grown produce, specifically cotton, to the ports of Houston and Galveston. In addition, the carrier provided farmers in the areas which it serviced with unprecedented profits from the sale of their raw goods, thereby enhancing the local economies (Moore et al: 15).

At the behest of influential members of Grapevine's business community, the St. Louis, Arkansas & Texas (SLA&T) Railroad built what became known as the Cotton Belt Route through Grapevine in 1887, inaugurating service in 1888. Renamed the St. Louis & Southwestern (SL&S) Railroad in 1891, the line connected Grapevine to Greenville and Texarkana to the northeast as well as Fort Worth to the southwest (Emrich: 8/2). The SL&S supplied consumer goods to the township's residents and its farmers and solidified Grapevine's position as regional trade center. The township became, with the arrival of the railroad, the shipping point for local crops and the produce from hundreds of surrounding farms and a number of small rural communities (Young: 8).

TOWNSHIP EXPANSION, COMMERCIAL AND SUBURBAN DEVELOPMENT: 1888-1927

The impact of the SL&S on the township of Grapevine and its development of a cash crop economy was phenomenal. Although cotton had been cultivated in the area since the previous decade, production of the crop in the surrounding farms increased significantly. Three gins were constructed on the west side of Main Street to process the crop for market. The North Texas Gin Company was built at the corner of College and Boynton Streets. The Farmers Gin Company was located at the intersection of Wall and Scribner Streets and Fort Worth Cotton Oil Mill Company opened in the 200 block of Church Street. By 1900 they were contributing to Tarrant County's production of 11,580 bales (U.S. *Agricultural Schedules*, 1900). Grapevine speculators such as W.D. Turnipseed began to purchase other crops such as corn, wheat, oats and cotton in addition to buying and selling futures. A variety of small businesses sprang up to support companies and their employees that handled those commodities.

Although Grapevine had historical ties with Fort Worth, Dallas began to have an ever increasing effect on the township and its environs during the last decade of the 19th century. Wishing to capitalize on the profits from the transportation of commodities including cotton, a group of Dallas businessmen chartered the Dallas, Pacific & Southeastern (DP&S) Railroad in 1889. Reflecting many

of the speculative ventures of the railroad industry typical of the period, their intent was to create yet another competitive east-west rail line linking Albuquerque, New Mexico with New Orleans. Its route included stops at Grapevine and Dallas. Beginning in Dallas, the road was built westward for 70 miles, crossing the north side of the township and on through Tarrant County. However, its construction was terminated abruptly when the company ran out of money. The roadbed remained abandoned for almost thirty years until it was finally put to use with the construction of Texas Highway No. 114 (Young: 8).

As a consequence of the relative prosperity experienced by their relatives and friends in Texas as well as the advertisements by land speculators carried in newspapers circulated throughout the still impoverished Southern states, settlers arrived in a second postwar wave during the late 1880s and 1890s. Many of the new settlers could not afford to purchase the cheap land and homes advertised by speculators when they arrived and became sometimes unwilling participants, along with local freedmen, in the tenant and sharecropping system of agriculture on farms throughout the area during this period (Moore et al: 16).

Although much of Grapevine's Anglo oral tradition about cotton and the sharecropping system is based upon informants' recollections from the 1920s, it indicates that the practice remained fairly static since its inception in the late 19th century. Consequently, it is useful in illustrating the farming practice as it occurred in Grapevine during that period. The success of tenant farming eventually led many of Grapevine's land-owning farmers to move into the township where they built and lived in residences from which they managed their farms. Their income was typically derived in percentages ranging from 66% to 75% of the crops harvested by their tenants. The oral tradition also indicates that some tenant farmers, like most of the hired hands, were also town residents, who commuted to the farms daily. Crop production was typically divided into thirds or fourths. If a farm had 750 acres, 500-600 acres would be planted in cotton and the balance would be in other cash crops such as winter wheat, oats, hay or corn. Examples of this practice were found on the Stewart, Satterwaite, Lipscomb, and Koonce farms (Simmons 1995).

Harvesting cotton is still referred to in the informants' vernacular as chopping cotton, and it was accomplished by groups of workers who were hired for that task. The work crews included both Anglo and African-American men and women who, accompanied by their children, worked from sunup to sundown. An average person is reputed to have been able to harvest between 300-400 pounds of cotton per day. Some of Grapevine's African-American workers, especially those from the Hill (which was established later in 1923), are still remembered for and associated with their daily quotas of cotton. Informants indicate that Thelma Brewer picked 400 pounds a day; Walter Brewer, 400 pounds; and Jim Jones, between 700-800 pounds (Simmons 1995).

After the harvest, processing the crop provided additional employment for hired hands at the gins from the first of August to the last of December. Ten bushels of cotton seed were typically distributed back to farmers for the next year's crop and the balance was retained as payment for ginning. Additional uses for seed included feed for cattle as cotton seed cake and cotton seed oil, the latter of which was provided by presses which were located in Fort Worth (Simmons 1995).

A cash crop economy meant that income for much of the township coincided with the harvest cycle. During the rest of the year, the dry goods and other stores in Grapevine maintained credit or barter systems. Bills for the year were finally paid in the fall after harvest and during ginning season, when local brokers bid and paid for the crop. Consequently, if cotton production reached a point where the supply exceeded the demand, forcing a sudden downturn in the price of the crop and its by-products, the entire town's economy would be devastated. This occurred first in the 1890s and was a prelude to 20th century cycles of boom and bust. As a result, farmers were strongly advised by county agents in Fort Worth to reduce their reliance on a single crop system of agriculture. Although the warnings prompted a some agricultural diversification, large amounts of acreage remained dedicated to the crop, making the farms around Grapevine part of the largest cotton producing region in the world (U.S. *Agricultural Schedules*, 1890-1940).

Grapevine's participation in the cash crop economy and its subsequent late 19th century growth precipitated the establishment of local banks. The Grapevine Home Bank opened in 1900 with Bob Morrow, a local businessman and insurance agent, as president. Three years later, Farmers National Bank, founded by two other local businessmen, John Estill and E.J. Lipscomb, also began operations. Of the two lenders, Grapevine Home Bank's president was by far the most colorful. Over the course of some 33 years as a banker, Morrow gained a reputation for high interest rates and speculative lending. The Anglo oral tradition indicates that he would lend money when other bankers wouldn't, but he would also foreclose on anyone, including family members (Simmons 1995).

The bankers, some of whom were members of Grapevine's most prominent families, built houses east of Main Street. They were joined by physicians, dentists, pharmacists and businessmen who purchased property and built expensive residences. This precipitated the development of East College Street as a rather exclusive area in the township. Over a 20 year period beginning in the 1880s, land speculation increased and the area was further subdivided into residential lots. Grapevine College and its dormitory had been constructed on East College Street twenty years earlier, and the institution provided advanced education opportunities for many of the area's students (Lucas: n.p.). Some development occurred on West College Street during this same period, but it was sporadic by comparison. With its gins and other industrial uses, the west side apparently failed to attract the population which began to congregate on the east side of Main Street. Consequently, the area exhibited a sparse settlement pattern well into the 20th century.

Grapevine's development as a town also required a local press, but the various weekly newspapers published over the course of the town's history were plagued with failures. With some press runs lasting less than a year, they included the *Grapevine Globe* (c.1882), the *Grapevine News* (1882-1883), the *Grapevine Advocate* (c.1893) and the *Grapevine Sun* (1895-present). Founded by B.R. Wall and partner, C.W. Ridout, the *Grapevine Sun* was the only newspaper to successfully maintain a strong and continuous readership. It accomplished this by providing local news along with agricultural data and advice, and to a lesser degree international news, interspersed with sections on fashion, advertisements and even house and barn plans (Young 1979:57). Its role as a social instrument would become especially evident during the 1930s. Local demand for the Fort Worth paper which had been strongest during the 19th century began to wane in favor of Dallas publishers in the 20th century. Newspapers such as the *Dallas Morning News,* first published in 1898, were delivered with increasing frequency to the residents of Grapevine.

In 1902 two local businessmen, Dick Wall and Zeb Jenkins, joined four others in establishing a flour mill south of Main Street's business district. Like Turnipseed, they also became heavily involved in speculation on the futures market (Simmons 1995). Their pursuit of this venture at the south end of town accompanied the commercial development of Grapevine's Main Street as it continued northward, displacing the few remaining houses. This new growth was assisted by the town's incorporation in 1907, a move that was strongly supported by its business community.

In the same year, seven Dallas cotton merchants founded the Dallas Cotton Exchange in an attempt to control the market for the crop which had become Texas' most vital commodity. Eventually acquiring cotton samples from all over the world including China and South America, it allowed local merchants to grade and set the price of Texas cotton. The exchange was connected by teletype to the futures markets in Chicago and New York. Grapevine brokers such as Bill Weatherly, also a partner with E.J. Lipscomb, began taking advantage of Dallas' increasing position as a spot cotton market by becoming more involved in speculation.

Due in large part to the efforts of its merchants, businessmen, bankers and politicians, Grapevine's increasing prosperity was reflected in infrastructure improvements that were made during the early 1900s. Gas and water service were established throughout the township in 1909. Within a year, its residents also received electricity and telephone service. By 1910 the population of Grapevine reached 681 persons. The town's leadership also continued to focus on transportation opportunities for its residents. In 1911, for example, businessman Dick Wall formed a group of local investors to develop an interurban line connecting the community to existing lines linking Fort Worth, Denton and McKinney with Dallas. Editorials in the *Grapevine Sun* strongly supported the establishment of the line to provide residents with easier access to the cities of Fort Worth and Dallas (Emrich: 8/3). Despite the efforts of Wall and other individuals, however, the dream of an interurban line was never realized.

As a result, Grapevine remained somewhat isolated and the roads outside the town limits were still in need of much improvement. Finally in 1912, after years of relative neglect and perhaps due to the failure of Wall's interurban proposal, a bond issue was submitted and approved by the voters for an extension of the Grapevine Road. Another bond issue was successfully proposed six years later to straighten the road, which remained unimproved because funding proved insufficient to complete the work. It took the strong leadership of Commissioner S.A. Wall to facilitate the Grapevine Road's designation as State Highway No. 121 in 1926. Consequently, county funds were matched with state funds for grading and drainage improvements. A northern route to Dallas from Grapevine was later proposed and approved in the same year along with the rebuilding of the Fort Worth-Dallas Pike (*Grapevine Sun,* 18 September 1930).

The Dallas-Fort Worth Turnpike, known among Grapevine residents as the Fort Worth Pike (Simmons 1995), was originally constructed in 1913. Formed by a combination of U.S. Highway No. 80 and Texas Highway No. 1, it became a major artery for east-west commercial traffic (Gousha: 17). As a result of its construction early in the decade, the residents of nearby Grand Prairie and Arlington were commuting to and from work in Dallas and Fort Worth for years before Grapevine's roads were finally constructed. This provided Grapevine leaders with a strong incentive to improve the transportation network leading to and from the town (Simmons 1995). Through the 1920s and 1930s, the turnpike was the most heavily trafficked road in the state (Solamillo: 5).

Grapevine's agriculturally based economy remained stable until World War I. With the outbreak of hostilities, however, the cotton market suddenly collapsed. Exports of Texas cotton to European markets, specifically the textile factories in England, ceased. State economists in Austin would later write about this event as the beginning of the end for an old agricultural system, despite the rebounding of that market following the war (*Texas Business Review* 27 December). Whether this second collapse of the cotton market spurred Grapevine farmers' interest in and development of what they referred to as truck farming is unclear. The market had already experienced a disastrous downturn a decade previously, well within the realm of recent memory. The increased usage of the automobile following the war had a more direct correlation with the rise of truck farming. Along with a vast array of newly mechanized farm machinery, advances in automotive technology spurred the diversification of the local agricultural system. Finally achieving prominence during the 1920s, Grapevine's truck farming industry began to assume a position in the local economy that would remain strong well after the cotton industry waned.

With its roots in the late 19th century, truck farming was developed in Grapevine by local farmers who cultivated acreage that was located primarily on the sandy soils found west of town. Known in other parts of the country as market gardening or market farming, the term was used to describe this type of agricultural production by local farmers as well as state officials during this period. (McCallum1995). During the late 19th century, Grapevine farmers began raising peanuts for

transport by wagon to local consumer markets (Simmons 1995). Farmers gradually cultivated larger amounts of peanuts as well as other crops and transported them for sale to Grapevine brokers. In the period following World War I, local brokers became increasingly involved in the futures markets and took advantage of easy capital provided through banks in Grapevine and Dallas.

Grapevine's dairy farming industry also began to take shape during this period following development of the copper-lined tanker truck in 1903. Independent dairy producers, often using the same land-lease practices as tenant farmers, maintained herds as large as 800 head. Milk in ten gallon cans and cream in five gallon cans were delivered to Dallas dairies such as Borden's and Cabell's, as well as Vandevort's and Tennessee Dairies in Fort Worth. The success of the system in Grapevine and neighboring towns resulted in the establishment of numerous independent creamery, butter, ice cream, milk and cheese factories throughout north central Texas. By the late 1930s, despite forced herd reductions earlier in the decade, there were in excess of 42 such establishments in Fort Worth and 34 in Dallas (*Texas Business Revie,* 27 December 1937).

Dairy farming remained popular in Grapevine, with independent producers entering into contracts with larger dairies and factories. By the middle of the 20th century, however, the large companies formed a dairy association to consolidate milk production efforts. This effort eventually drove the independent producers out of the business. As a result, large dairies such as Borden's began delivering milk that was not locally produced for sale in the Grapevine's markets for the first time in the history of the community (Simmons 1995).

While the first automobile arrived in Grapevine in 1909, a decade passed before substantial numbers were owned by town residents. This process took even longer for many local farmers (Young: 83). The arrival of the automobile brought about the construction of service stations and garages that accompanied Grapevine's major road expansions during the 1920s. Andrew W. Willhoite and Bart H. Starr opened Willhoite's Garage on Main Street in 1921. Other garages were established on Main Street, but by 1930 the majority of new service stations were built along the highways to take advantage of increased motor traffic.

The development of the Texas oil industry also affected Grapevine during this period (*Texas Business Review,* 27 December 1937). The discovery of new oil fields west of Fort Worth during the 1910s fanned the speculative interests of many new independents, including five local businessmen. In 1919 they formed the Grapevine Producing Company to operate a 10,000 acre oil and gas lease west of Grapevine. Its officers included J.E. Yates, E.E. Lowe, O.O. Hollingsworth, J.S. Estill and R.L. Lucas. Selling shares to interested buyers throughout the city, the company's attempt at entering the oil and gas business proved unsuccessful. It was disbanded shortly after a heavily advertised well which failed to produce a gusher on a specified date (Young: 83).

Despite the activities of some of Grapevine's most celebrated entrepreneurs who could afford to make serious gambles with their own and others' money, the majority of the city's inhabitants remained relatively poor. The 1920 census indicated that Grapevine's population reached 821. Within a year, agents of the Sanborn Insurance Company were hired to survey and prepare the first maps of the city. Their documents indicate that much of Main Street and the residential areas located east and west of the thoroughfare were fairly well developed. However, the character of the town's residential areas, despite the construction of spacious and well-appointed houses for Grapevine's more prominent citizens along East College Street especially, still maintained a rather rural character. Lots were still very large and small dwellings and outbuildings were located in the rear yards. The Sanborn maps also indicate that by 1921 the railroad depot, several cotton gins, and the Wm. Cameron & Company Lumber Yard had continued the development of the south end of Main Street, initiated 18 years earlier by Wall and Jenkins.

The Wm. Cameron & Company Lumber Yard expanded throughout the state during the latter part of the 19th century and the early part of the 20th century. It stocked building material as well as finished wood millwork and casework which it brought into Grapevine on the SL&S Railroad. It began to run advertisements for cabinets, casework, roofing and roof vents in the *Grapevine Sun* during the early 1920s. By the end of the decade and throughout the 1930s, Cameron ran full page ads of house plans and elevations in the newspaper. As a result, much of Grapevine's housing stock which dates from that period appears either to be based on Cameron house plans or produced directly by the company.

The Anglo oral tradition indicates that town dwellers during this period maintained household practices rooted in the subsistence patterns of the 19th century, often regardless of their economic status. A standard residential property accommodated a large vegetable garden, as well as a small number of livestock and poultry. These typically included at least one cow, between six and twelve chickens and a pig (Simmons 1995). Cows were almost always milked late at night or early morning, with the milk pasteurized domestically. Similarly, poultry products such as eggs were home raised, with surpluses often made available to neighbors. Most residents are reputed to also have owned at least one horse (Simmons 1995). The practice of keeping livestock in rear yards remained common throughout the 1930s and well into the 1940s. In addition to gardens and livestock, substantial rear yards typically accommodated at least one outbuilding such as a smokehouse. This rural character was especially prevalent in the residential areas west of Main Street. While this building type is fairly rare today in Grapevine, it is present in great frequency on the Sanborn Insurance maps of the period. Many such outbuildings were converted into or demolished to make way for automobile garages.

To process this livestock population, the Wall family established a slaughter pen on a foot path off Franklin Street west of Main Street about 1900. Hogs especially were taken to this location for processing. The oral tradition maintains that the Walls killed the hogs, removed the entrails, scalded

them to remove body hair, and then cut them up. The pork was then taken back to the household, packed in salt for three or four weeks, or smoked or preserved in vinegar. Every part of the animal was used (Simmons 1995). Despite the fact that the owner of the slaughter pen processed and prepared livestock, he was not regarded by Grapevine residents as a butcher in the traditional sense, and that occupation is firmly denied by informants. As at many other businesses in Grapevine, a barter system often covered these services in lieu of cash (Simmons 1995).

The agriculturally based economy of Grapevine attracted a steady influx of seasonal workers, including many African Americans. Capitalizing on this steady stream of workers, Edward T. Simmons purchased two acres outside the town limits from Martha Cluck in 1923. He erected housing for four families who commuted regularly to Grapevine to work as field hands on local farms. These families included the Brewers, Wrights, Redmonds and Chivers. The Simmons development was known locally as the Hill (Love Chapel 1995). Many of the early dwellings currently present at the Hill appear to have been moved to the area. This practice was not restricted to this part of the city, nor was it specific to dwellings housing African-American laborers. The reuse of older buildings was common among land owners in Grapevine, regardless of the owners' economic status. A whole collection of wood buildings, including small rent houses, large farmhouses, outbuildings, industrial buildings and even schools were moved throughout the city. The practice continues to occur today.

America's experimentation with enforced temperance during Prohibition illustrates to some degree the continued independence of Grapevine's populace. Many became involved in a vast underground industry of locally operated stills and speakeasies for the production, distribution and sale of alcohol, especially in the nearby urban centers of Dallas and Fort Worth. Many people achieved wealth through this practice, although informants are still reluctant to identify those individuals or their families (Simmons 1995).

During the same period, the growth of Dallas' economy and its unprecedented population increase of 100,000 persons between 1900 and 1920 required ever increasing quantities of land and water. While land could be easily acquired through annexation, the city's water needs forced planners to begin looking for new reservoir sites in the region. As early as 1923, proposals called for a dam in the watershed of Denton Creek to provide water for new residential developments such as the exclusive Park Cities subdivisions in north Dallas. This source would be realized some 20 years later with the construction of Lake Grapevine.

CITY AND SUBURBAN DEVELOPMENT: 1927-1955

The Great Depression exerted a tremendous impact on the town, its inhabitants and local farmers. Although the collapse of the New York Stock Exchange in October 1929 is generally recognized as the onset of the Great Depression, in Grapevine the failure of Farmers National Bank in

1927 spawned economic troubles in the community. Little is known about the details of the bank failure, as neither this failure nor the stock market crash received coverage in the *Grapevine Sun*. Defaults on farm loans may have provided the impetus for this local downturn, however.

While no local response to the closing of the Farmers National Bank entered the written record, the failure prompted a now long-held sentiment against involvement with lending institutions. The local Anglo oral tradition inveighs against "buy[ing] bank stocks. . .[because] banks may pay back depositors, [but] they will never pay back stockholders" (Simmons 1995). Perhaps aware of this kind of public opinion upon closing his bank in 1933, ostensibly because of the imposition of new Federal banking regulations, Bob Morrow made sure that the *Grapevine Sun* published an account of his bank's 33 year record. It stated that "Mr. Morrow has never missed paying his stockholders a dividend in any year. . .since [the bank's] organization, [and] he has paid them $345,500 in dividends" (*Grapevine Sun*, 1 January 1933).

The first written record of the Great Depression appeared in the *Grapevine Sun* on 1 January 1930. Notices were published by local businesses, most of which were family owned such as Wall Feed Store, indicating that as of that date there would be no more credit and that they would be operating strictly on a cash basis to everyone *(Grapevine Sun,* 1 January 1930). The effect on poorer farmers, especially tenants and sharecroppers, which resulted from this change from a credit to a cash-based system was severe.

Grapevine banks, in response to a sudden drop in the price of farm commodities, especially cotton, had taken action two years earlier. Tarrant County National began running ads in the *Grapevine Sun* imploring farmers to drastically reduce their production of cotton. One such ad read:

> the one crop idea of farming is economically unsound . . . [and] means failure to the tenant and landowner . . . for the mutual good of the entire citizenship of this Community, we urge and insist [that] every farmer diversif[y] in some manner . . . Raise hogs, cows, sheep, [and] chickens. Plant different kinds of feed, barley, corn, oats, maize and hay crops. If you will adopt this plan . . . you will not need a bank for anything except to deposit your money (*Grapevine Sun* 3 May 1928).

Those farmers who had not heeded the calls for diversification following the collapse of the cotton market the decade before appear now to have begun to respond to the content of the bank's ads and if not that, to at least start to bow to peer pressure. As a consequence of the drastic acreage reductions advised by Grapevine banks and the *Grapevine Sun* prior to 1930, the cotton yield of that year was only 53 percent of normal (De Moss: 117). Speaking about agricultural practices of this period, informants indicated flatly that if you relied only on cotton, you were a fool (Simmons 1995).

Over the next two years Grapevine's banks continued to emphasize the importance of agricultural diversification. The Tarrant County National Bank published an ad in the fall of 1929 announcing that:

> for the advancement and betterment of this community, [we] will finance dairying, farming, stock raising, industries, merchandising, [as well as] truck farming. . . [and we recognize that] Grapevine is deriving great benefits from the diversification of our farmers *(Grapevine Sun,* 23 July 1929).

In the same issue, the Grapevine Home Bank indicated that it had plenty of money to lend to dairymen to increase their herds and expand their dairy operations *(Grapevine Sun,* 23 July1929). However, not wishing to abandon their economic mainstay of almost 30 years, both banks also continued to advertise their willingness to "cash any local buyers cotton ticket or cotton check [as well as] cotton and cotton seed checks on local and out of town banks" (*Grapevine Sun*, 26 September 1929).

The growth of Grapevine's truck farming industry had continued to steadily increase in the previous decade. In response the SL&S rail company announced its plans in the harvest season of 1927 to "establish a shipping and packing shed for the truck growers" in Grapevine (*Grapevine Sun,* 1 September 1927). Conducting a survey of non-cotton crop production earlier in that year, the carrier had found that there were in excess of 500 acres of sweet potatoes and 1,500 acres of peanuts produced on local farms. Estimating that even with low yields this would bring between 50 and 60 carloads of sweet potatoes and 70 carloads of peanuts (valued at $60,000) in addition to other vegetable crops produced in the area, the SL&S moved to capitalize on what was becoming a successful industry. The railroad also offered its horticultural agent to further assist growers by bringing in buyers and providing crating and culling service for produce at the lowest price possible (*Grapevine Sun,* 1 September 1927).

The newspaper functioned as a social instrument during this period by urging Grapevine's farming community, despite its development of truck farming, dairies and a subsequent poultry raising industry, to return to some of the subsistence patterns practiced during the 19th century.

> Every cotton farmer could use enough of his cotton land to grow an ample supply of vegetables. . .needed by a family of five or six. . .[In addition], a vegetable garden is an important factor in the production of net income for the cotton farmer. [Plant] vegetables that can be worked along with cotton [as well as] other crops such as lettuce, spinach, snap beans, beets, carrots and radishes. . .[Also plant] tomatoes, sweet corn or field corn. . .white potatoes, sweet potatoes, summer squashes, watermelons, mushmelons,. . .cucumbers, onions,. . .collards, Brussels sprouts, and Italian or sprouting broccoli. (*Grapevine Sun,* 27 March 1930).

The *Grapevine Sun* would continue its important role by later explaining and rallying the public to support and participate in the government programs which were enacted as part of Roosevelt's New Deal. The legislation which directly impacted Grapevine as well as many other Texas cities during the years that followed included the Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA), the Works Progress Administration (WPA) and the National Recovery Act (NRA). Through these and other programs implemented under Roosevelt's New Deal, Grapevine farmers were assisted with vouchers for livestock feed, seed and fertilizer.

The most intrusive of these programs to assist the American farmer was the AAA, which brought state and county agents to Grapevine to enforce a series of actions mandated by Congress. In developing the content of the AAA, Congress relied upon the U.S. Department of Agriculture's conclusion that agricultural supply and demand dedicated too much acreage to cotton. To reduce this reliance on single crops, the legislation called for cuts in production of crops and dairy herds throughout the nation. Consequently, between 1932 and 1933 hundreds of acres in the Grapevine region were plowed under and hundreds of local dairy cattle were sacrificed. Although local farmers were paid for their losses by the acre or by the head, the effect of the action was nonetheless devastating (Simmons 1995). Again, for some reason, like the closing of Farmers' National and the Stock Market crash, the reduction of local dairy herds was never reported in the *Grapevine Sun*.

Whether the mandated destruction of hundreds of acres of Grapevine cotton and hundreds of local dairy cattle forced tenant farmers to begin leaving their farms fallow and to seek other sources of income is unknown. However, there was a significant increase in the number of unemployed persons, which included both tenant farmers and their hired hands.

Beginning in August 1933, full-page advertisements featuring the blue eagle of the National Recovery Act (NRA) listed Grapevine's participating businesses in the *Grapevine Sun*. Within a year and a half however, the NRA and its system of uniform wages and working hours was ended with a decision by the U.S. Supreme Court, and the ads ceased (Thurman: 202).

Under the Works Progress Administration, a canning factory was opened in 1932 and operated in Grapevine until its sale to a private firm at the end of World War II. Grapevine farmers brought in produce such as tomatoes and green beans. The government provided tin cans and a percentage of the processed produce was kept and distributed to the needy or to employees (Simmons 1995). Informants indicated that payment for work was also often made in food in lieu of wages:

> [New] workers [were] paid a minimum wage [or] with canned goods. [You could be] paid with dry beans [or a] sack of flour, [or maybe] cured meats such as bacon. Payment was issued every Friday. After two months [of steady] employment, [you could be] paid [with a check] (Simmons 1995).

Following its privatization in 1945, the cannery processed chili until its relocation to a site in East Texas (Simmons 1995). The barter system employed at the cannery during the 1930s was described by one informant as providing the tools to make it on one's own (Simmons 1995).

While Grapevine and other rural communities in north central Texas were struggling for their survival, agents of the Sanborn Insurance Company returned to town to update its maps. Their documents indicate that little change in the built environment had occurred since the previous decade. Speaking about Grapevine during this period, one informant indicated that "Nobody had anything, so you didn't know the difference" (Simmons 1995).

The outbreak of World War I late in 1941 brought about the advent of a war industry in the Fort Worth region. The sudden influx of workers to the region during this decade created unprecedented growth in Grapevine's population. As a result, the town incurred a massive building boom in housing, and it began a transition from a relatively independent agricultural community to a suburban one. The last major building boom during the historic period occurred during the 1940s. A Works Progress Administration (WPA) grant of $101,000, matched with local bond funds, provided for the construction of a new high school in 1940. The facades of the E.L. Jordan Building and Willhoite Garage on Main Street were renovated in the same year, and the New Palace Theater and the First National Bank buildings were erected on Main Street in 1940 and 1942, respectively. Post-war housing starts resulted in a continuation of Grapevine's residential development within the city limits east of Main Street and north of Northwest Highway. There also was a slight resurgence of commercial development at the south end of Main Street along the railroad right-of-way.

The nomenclature popularized by the local press and advertisers of the building trade about anything new, from facade renovations and new buildings constructed on Main Street to home improvements, often included the words modern, modernistic, or modernization during this period. Grapevine's limited commercial development during this period represent vernacular interpretations of modernism. Constructed as the last additions to Main Street during the historic period, they represent both stylistic interpretations and building techniques associated with the late 1930s, as Art Moderne (or Art Deco) commercial edifices supplanted the brick one or two part commercial buildings built earlier in the century. The essentially utilitarian nature of these new buildings is demonstrated by the use of concrete block covered with stucco (Palace Theater) or the application of stucco to earlier brick facades (Willhoite Garage). The E.L. Jordan facade renovation was described as "a modernistic front of Egyptian Art Plaster with Vitrolite, finished in black glass on a background of white" (*Grapevine Sun* 21 March 1940). The Willhoite Garage renovation was reported as "changed to give [the building] a modernistic appearance with [exterior] wall surfaces finished in white stucco trimmed with red . . .which gives Grapevine one of its most modernistic appearing service stations and garages (*Grapevine Sun,* 27 June 1940). The New Palace Theater was built adjacent to J.K. Buckner's store on the north at a cost of $25,000. Described in as a structure that:

> would fit well in any large city, the theater's front facade was white stucco with maroon tile extending for a height of seven feet along the front. Poster frames [were] built into the tile and [were] covered with glass. The attraction board [served] as a border for [a] V shaped marquee that [could] accommodate two lines of lettering 16 feet long, with two tubes of white fluorescent neon behind each line of letters *(Grapevine Sun,* 21 November 1940).

The First National Bank was completed in March 1942 on the former site of the old Palace Theater and Earl Yates Dry Goods. It was also described as

> a modernistic structure, built of Leuders limestone with [an] entrance of Minnesota Ruby Red Granite. [Presenting] a most cosmopolitan appearance, [it had] 16 inch fluorescent letters which announc[ed] the name of the bank, glass tile [fenestration], which [had] a special screen between its layers of glass [and. . .] a new feature which [was] being offered in the more modern banks--a curb service window *(Grapevine Sun*, 24 March 1942).

The Wm. Cameron & Company Lumber Yard ran advertisements between 1940 and 1942 to entice prospective home buyers with FHA financing for its line of new homes and remodeling services. The company apparently constructed a large number of new houses in Grapevine during this period, particularly in the College Heights neighborhood. In August 1941 the company completed construction of its Texan model home on Dooley Street. Described in the *Grapevine Sun* as "a home that [one] can build for less than a dollar a day," the model featured a roof of top quality red cedar shingles, oak floors, Ideal Brand all weather window units and screens, as well as Ideal Brand built-in woodwork, medicine cabinets, ironing boards and mantels. Finishes included "U.S. Gypsum wall board, Masonite Temprtile [sic] wainscotings in the kitchen and bathroom, Minnesota Brand paints, and Cameron's own 1941 Smash Hits wallpaper" *(Grapevine Sun* 15 May 1941). The company began operating its Grapevine store under the Cameron Store name in late 1941. It initiated a New Farm and Ranch Plan Book and Survey Service to "scientifically determine whether Grapevine property owners needed any building, remodeling or repairing, thereby making area homes, Farm [and] Ranch Factor[ies] lower operating cost one[s]," adding to the company's existing services including plans, materials, supervision, financing, labor and estimates *(Grapevine Sun,* 15 May1941). "Home modernization. . .[by] Cameron men [who] are trained modernization specialists. . .is easy the Cameron way" and "you can pay on low monthly terms" were phrases that accompanied a half-page ad in 1941. It featured illustrations of turn of the century houses, fashions and automobiles presented alongside models from 1941 so that the reader might compare and contrast them, captioned with the questions "Which do you want? This or This?" *(Grapevine Sun*, 15 May 1941). The success of Cameron's modernization services in Grapevine is unknown. However, it proved the *Grapevine Sun's* most prolific advertiser during the period, despite the country's entry into World War II.

On 9 April 1942 the *Grapevine Sun* announced that all new construction was to be halted under orders from the War Production Board (WPB). The following week, Grapevine's Cameron Store responded with an advertisement entitled, "What You Can Build Under The New Government Building Order." Citing "no restrictions on repairs and maintenance," the company divided new construction into separate categories that included "Farmers and Ranchers, Home Owners--City and Rural, and Business" concerns. The Federal regulations were clearly explained to the public. Each category concluded with "but remember, repair and maintenance are unlimited." For homeowners, this included paint, wall paper and roof replacement *(Grapevine Sun,* 16 April). However, Cameron's weekly ad campaign in the *Grapevine Sun*, which was at its height in early 1942, was scaled back dramatically by the war. From 1942 to 1945, company ads appeared only once a month and were limited to featuring Minnesota Brand paints and Cameron's wall paper line. Despite the downturn in business and advertising, the company was always included in a listing of Grapevine businesses who regularly contributed to the city's quota for War Loans.

The deleterious effect that the war economy had on Cameron's business was further impacted when Western Auto also began advertising Kem-Tone paint products and wallpaper in the *Grapevine Sun* in 1945. This led Cameron to run the following ad:

> Lumber available! Contrary to the general assumption, we can still sell lumber in many instances. Our supply is limited to be sure, but if you really need lumber to build or to repair, please come in to see us. Perhaps we can yet take care of you, as allowed by the War Production Board. . .the farmer especially, is well taken care of under the new restrictive order *(Grapevine Sun,* 12 April 1945).

In contrast, W.D. Deacon's feed business expanded dramatically during the war years. Operating during this period as Grapevine Milling Company, the company profited from the annual increase in farm production quotas issued by the federal government between 1942 and 1945. It ran advertisements in the *Grapevine Sun* for various products. The tone of the ads were changed early in 1942 to reflect the war's arrival. One such ad read:

> Sea Power in Manamar--Supplies the hard-to-get essentials--fish proteins, food minerals and vitamins, including entire Vitamin B Complex. These are the factors which furnish Strength-Stamina Power for maximum wartime production of livestock and poultry *(Grapevine Sun*, 17 April 1943).

To address the growing demand for the company's feed mixes which had become popular among Grapevine area poultry growers and livestock producers, the Grapevine Milling Company facility was gradually expanded over the next decade. Steel grain storage tanks were added to the complex in 1945. Following its incorporation as B&D Mills in 1956, a manufacturing tower was

added in that same year, a separate office building was erected adjacent to the east warehouse and a feed store was constructed for the retail trade in 1959. The last major additions to the facility were made in 1969 and 1970 when 12 soft stock ingredient bins and bulk load out bins for rail distribution were installed (Deacon: 2).

There was a general transition by Grapevine area farmers from cotton to grain production after 1945. B&D Mills was the principal buyer of local production for use in its line of complete feeds (Deacon: 3). By 1954 B&D Mills had become one of the leading pioneers in the use of feed mill technology. The Deacons were extremely innovative in the mixing and distribution of poultry feeds and became the first company in Texas to provide bulk feed products to the trade (Deacon: 4). From the 1940s through the 1960s, B&D Mills was Grapevine's largest employer. The company's business from outside the Grapevine area provided a strong contribution to the city's commerce (Deacon: 2) and B&D Mills' products were sold within a territory bounded by Nacogdoches on the east, Wichita Falls on the west, Shawnee, Oklahoma on the north and Falfurrias, Texas on the south (McCallum 1996). At its height of production in the early 1970s, the manufacturing facility processed some 52,000 tons of feed.

In addition, the company expanded into the production of turkeys in the mid-1950s. A turkey breeder flock and hatchery were in operation by 1958 and the company grew to become one of Texas' largest contract turkey producers, producing between 500,000 and 900,000 birds annually. These were supplied primarily to the Fort Worth Poultry and Egg firm, a subsidiary of Armour & Company. Also initiated during the same decade was the company's entry into experimental research in feed formulations for the production of eggs, broilers and turkeys. Conducting a variety of contract research programs for companies such as Phizer, Monsanto and A.E. Staley, B&D Mills successfully concluded studies on turkey breeder antibiotic levels, synthetic levels of the amino acid Methionine, and the effect of caloric content on Fatty Liver Syndrome.

B&D Mills eventually eliminated the grain portion in its complete feeds in favor of concentrates and became the industry leader in lowering the cost of feed to poultry men. This also reduced the company's manufacturing tonnage which was necessary because of an increase in freight costs for shipment by rail. Marketed under the trade name of Master Made Feeds, B&D Mills' super concentrate feed products transferred much of the protein source of feed supplements to on-farm mixing (Deacon 1995: 4).

The construction of the Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport in the 1970s increased the pace of development in Grapevine. The abandonment of the Cotton Belt line during this same period precipitated the sale of the B&D Mills in 1973, marking irrevocable changes to the character of the community's historic development patterns. Increasingly, suburban development linked Dallas and Fort Worth into a unified metropolitan region. Despite these changes, however, the community of

Grapevine retained much of its historic fabric. With the establishment of the Grapevine Heritage Foundation, citizens united to preserve much of the surviving historic character through rehabilitation efforts in the commercial district and investment in the historic housing of the community's neighborhoods. The foundation in particular spearheaded many of these efforts, restoring the historic depot, encouraging rehabilitation of historic commercial and residential properties, and undertaking compatible new construction based on historic models lost to the community. With their sponsorship of this documentation project, the foundation has provided the community with an enduring preservation tool ensuring that these efforts will continue to preserve Grapevine's cultural heritage for future generations.

ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TYPES

The architecture surveyed and recorded in the project area was found to fall roughly into two classifications: urban and rural. As a result, there is a diversity in architectural styles and periods of construction which is associated with short building booms that occurred periodically during the city's history. These two architectural classifications are also closely connected with two different development patterns that are exhibited in the city. Grapevine's urban architecture is mostly associated with the use of increasingly smaller lots with uniform building setbacks. Conversely, its rural examples are sited on relatively large lots with varying setbacks. These two architectural classifications, their associated building types and patterns of development are strongly suggested when comparing the neighborhoods east and west of Main Street. Dense growth and the use of reductive lot sizes are found on the east side, while a sparse or rural pattern is found to have remained in use on the west side until at least the 1940s.

Initially, the original Grapevine township was divided into large family-held parcels which were eventually sub-divided as needed or developed at later dates. The east side incurred the township's first major development and by the turn of the century was a fashionable subdivision, while the west side remained sparsely settled. This established an essentially rural character that was maintained on the west side of city by the land-owning families. In addition, there appears to have been a large amount of building movement and reuse throughout the township, especially on the west side and to the north of Northwest Highway, which often resulted in much older buildings appearing in blockfaces that were often undergoing more recent development. Consequently, a disparity of periods and architectural styles is existent and appears to be the direct result of this practice. Building movement and reuse has continued to be utilized by many Grapevine property owners well into the 20th century, especially for the creation of tenant housing.

The original Anglo-American settlers of Grapevine and its environs came from the Upland South (southern states including Tennessee, Kentucky, Georgia, North and South Carolina, Missouri, and Arkansas) during the middle and late 19th centuries. Their building practices were integral to a culture born out of an Upland Southern heritage. This legacy can be seen in the historic built environment, especially in the building types that were constructed during the last quarter of the 19th century through the first quarter of the 20th century. It may also be inferred that this local agrarian culture was an important underlying factor responsible for how much of Grapevine's development was actually implemented. Consequently, the development patterns of the community, its rural character and its growth through time may be viewed as a materialization of this culture. Even the establishment of the only significant African-American enclave, the Hill, may also be viewed as having been created as a result of this agrarian culture. The development pattern and the architectural styles found there are primarily the result of building reuse for tenant housing.

The historic cultural resources found within the city limits of Grapevine include a broad range of building types and subtypes. They include vernacular commercial (1890-1948), industrial (1902-1959), transportation (1911-1928), agricultural (1920-1945), institutional (1920-45), vernacular and popular house types (1870-1945) and high style residences (1890-1930).

COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS

The commercial buildings constructed along Grapevine's Main Street were predominantly examples of vernacular commercial architecture dating from the fourth quarter of the 19th century through the second quarter of the 20th century. As such they constitute intact examples of Grapevine's commercial architecture. Constructed of masonry, they are one to two stories in height and typically three bays wide. Most are simply detailed with brick cornices that include sign bands framed by brick piers. Their storefronts exhibit varying degrees of integrity with some examples still retaining their cast iron pilasters. Most originally featured transoms. Some remain hidden beneath more recently applied awnings, while others are visible above the awnings. The rear for the most part remain intact. Fenestration on the rear facades of these buildings frequently consists of arched windows. Based upon facade organization, the majority of Grapevine's commercial buildings conform with Longstreth's typologies for 1- and 2-part commercial blocks (Longstreth: 24, 54). Detailing reveals the minimal influences of the design idioms of the Italianate, Classical Revival and Art Moderne styles.

The scale, detailing and composition of the contributing buildings on Main Street provide a streetscape that is representative of the periods in which they were constructed. Grapevine's commercial buildings are eligible under Criteria A and C. Commercial buildings eligible under Criterion A must have strong historical associations, including direct links to important trends and events in Grapevine's past. In order to be eligible under Criterion C, commercial buildings must retain their original form, materials and details and must be closely associated with Grapevine's development as an commercial center.

INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS

The Farmers & Merchants Milling Company, later known as B&D Mills (G72) is a mill and grain elevator complex constructed during the first quarter of the 20th century and gradually expanded to its present form in subsequent decades. A principal landmark for Grapevine, the complex is adjacent to the north side of the former Cotton Belt Railroad right of way. It includes an elevator, constructed of standing seam metal over a steel frame, concrete silos, several utilitarian buildings covered in standing seam and corrugated metal, and two early, riveted steel plate storage topped by

decorative metal finials. There is also a collection of small warehouses and machine shops (G76, G209, G211 and G212) in proximity to the railroad right of way. Erected shortly after World War II, they are covered in standing seam or corrugated metal. The 1- and 1 ½-story vernacular buildings feature gable roofs and fenestration of steel casement sash. They comprise an intact collection of simple, utilitarian buildings closely associated with Grapevine's postwar growth.

The remnants of a gin complex and later, basket factory, William Giddens & Sons Cotton Gin/Wright Basket factory (G131), is the only extant collection of buildings associated with part of Grapevine's ginning industry. The complex includes two gabled roof, board and batten covered barns with shed additions. They are not fenestrated except for loading doors and vents. An early 20th century T-plan house also occupies the property. Reputed in the oral tradition to have been the ginner's residence, it is a 1-story frame building finished with wood clapboards. It has been remodeled with the application of Colonial Revival details.

To be eligible under Criterion C, these industrial buildings must retain most of their original forms, materials and details. They also must be closely associated with Grapevine's development as an agricultural center. Eligibility under Criteria A requires strong historical associations, including direct links with important trends in Grapevine's history.

TRANSPORTATION RELATED FEATURES

The Cotton Belt Railroad Depot (G213) was built in 1901 and the Section House (G214) was constructed in 1888. Erected on foundations of wood piers, both buildings are of frame construction covered with wood siding. They feature wood shingle roofs. Both buildings were relocated to their current site for their preservation and have undergone complete restoration. However, their proximity to the original right of way has been maintained. The scale, detailing and composition of these buildings are representative of the period in which they were constructed. They are simple, popular plan types designed by often anonymous railroad company architects. They represent buildings commonly produced by the railroads for passengers as well as employees during their expansion in early 20th century Texas. Both buildings are among the best preserved examples of wood frame railroad architecture in northern Tarrant County. Railroad buildings are eligible under Criteria A and C. In order to be eligible under Criterion A for their association with the transportation industry, railroad buildings must retain their original design, construction material and details as well as their proximity to the original right of way. Such properties may also be eligible under Criterion C for their engineering significance. They may be relocated from an original location as long as they continue to occupy an appropriate setting and their important features remain intact.

The railroad bridge (G73) is another rail related resource constructed in 1928. It is a through plate girder span which carries a single track. A single span that is constructed of riveted steel plates, the bridge's underside is strengthened with steel X-bracing. Its track alignment, with its approach into and out of Grapevine, is supported by reinforced concrete piers of sufficient height to provide an underpass for vehicular traffic. The date 1928 has been cast into the northeast corner of the eastern pier, while the western pier is unmarked. While under construction, the bridge's rather unique, angled design was thought by many Grapevine residents to not be viable and would result ultimately in the structure's failure. Railroad bridges are eligible under Criteria A and C. To be eligible under Criterion A, such properties must have played a significant role in the development of Grapevine's agricultural economy. To be eligible under Criterion C in the area of engineering, railroad bridges must be examples of designs that advanced the railroad's ability to carry increased freight loads.

Agricultural Properties

There are few barns and even fewer outbuildings that remain within the city limits of Grapevine. Examples appear to have been constructed in the first and second quarters of the 20th century. Located primarily on what remains of Grapevine's historic farmsteads, the most notable examples include barn plans associated with the Upland South. Barns include variations of transverse crib plans while outbuildings include both single crib and double crib varieties. Some of the best preserved examples of Grapevine's remaining historic barns and outbuildings are contained in a few extant farmsteads such as G140. Such complexes are eligible under both Criteria A and C. To be eligible under Criterion A or C, the buildings found in these complexes must retain their original forms, materials and details and must be closely associated with Grapevine's development as an agricultural center.

Institutional Properties

Institutional buildings are represented by a religious complex that includes both a church and a school. The church (G174) appears to have been constructed in the 1940s. The school (G175) is reputed by the oral tradition to have been built during the 1930s and its architectural form supports this inference. In addition, it was purchased by the church congregation and relocated from its original site to its present location in the 1960s. Both of these examples are simple vernacular buildings which although retaining their original metal casement windows, have facades which have been covered in asbestos shingles. The complex in its current condition, although retaining original building forms, has its original details and materials obscured by the application of the asbestos. As such, it is ineligible for nomination to the NRHP. To be eligible under Criterion C, these buildings must retain their original forms, materials and details.

VERNACULAR HOUSES

Vernacular house types were initiated when immigrant populations introduced such types through permanent settlement. Later vernacular building types were primarily the result of the dissemination of popular plans and high styles which because of fashion, were initially introduced into Grapevine's urban core, and later appeared in the surrounding rural environs. This practice was furthered in the late 19th and early 20th centuries with the overwhelming proliferation of published popular designs.

Typologically based upon the expansion of a one-room or single-pen house, the double-pen house consists of two rooms or *pens*, separated by a common wall with chimneys located on either one or both gable ends. The house type demonstrated a typically southern additive pattern which resulted in a house being enlarged laterally instead of vertically, thereby serving as the basis for several other plan types including the *saddlebag* and *dogtrot*. It is a house type associated with Upland Southern origins and was a common dwelling form constructed by settlers who migrated from that region.

Double-pen houses are one-room in depth and occur with two rooms of either square or rectangular plan. The roughly square configuration of the pen as the basic unit of construction is an English derivative which originated in Tidewater Virginia and Maryland while the rectangular shape is of Scotch-Irish origins. A double-pen with a separate entrance into each pen is defined as a *Cumberland*, while a single entry to one pen with access provided through the interior partition retains the double-pen identification (Jurney and Moir: 7). A double-pen with a central chimney is a *Saddlebag*. The double-pen was transported with the migration of settlers from the Chesapeake Tidewater westward through Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas and into Missouri and southward into Georgia and Alabama where it spread across the Lower South into Louisiana and Texas (Jordan 1978:111). Shed or hipped porches are commonly added to this house type and additions are often added which create T- and L-Plans. The double-pen (G177) and the Saddlebag (G256) are rather rare examples of this house type to have survived into the late 20th century in Grapevine. The house type and all its related forms are often collectively referred to as being of the *Hall-and-Parlor* family (McAlester: 94).

The result of separating two pens with a hall or *trot* and enclosing it forms the prototypical center passage plan (Glassie: 98). However, not all central passage plans are typologically related to this illustration because the center hall was borrowed for use in other house types, including some variations of the bungalow. It is a common house type associated with Upland Southern origins and was constructed from the mid-19th through early 20th centuries. When the plan is of single room depth with two symmetrical rooms flanking a center hall and incorporating exterior chimneys at the gable ends, the plan type is referred to as *Quarter Georgian* (Swaim: 41). When appearing as two

rooms deep with interior chimneys, the plan is described as *Georgian*. The inclusion of a proportionately reduced rear room, either as 1/3 or 2/3 the standard room depth is a common variation of of the prototypical plan type. Shed or hipped porches are commonly added to this house type and additions are often added which create T-plans and L-plans. The center passage houses in Grapevine range from two well preserved, ornate examples (G119 and G310) constructed in 1869 and 1870 to more simple examples that were constructed in the late 19th century (G18). The house type and all its related forms are often collectively referred to as being of the *Hall-and-Parlor* family (McAlester: 92).

The I-house was first identified by Kniffen as occurring throughout the mid-Atlantic states as far north as the Ohio River. Originating in the Upland South and typologically related to the *double-pen, saddlebag, dogtrot* and *Georgian* plan types, the floor plan has been found to be somewhat variable. Features such as chimneys and stairs may be located at the ends or in the middle of the building and the I-house often includes lateral and rear additions, front as well as rear or galleried porches, and equally varied stylistic treatments. However, despite the regional variations, I-houses are typically single-room depth, at least two rooms in length and one-and-a-half to two stories in height (Kniffen: 53). The I-house accompanied the westward migration of settlers along identical routes as the double-pen. Shed or hipped porches are commonly added to this house type and additions are often added which create T- and L-plans. Stylistic elements often include Gothic Revival details overlaid onto earlier Greek Revival elements. The I-houses in Grapevine (G140 and G129) include both well preserved examples of the house type as well as those that have been heavily altered through time.

The L-plan, sometimes referred to as a gable-front-and-wing, (McAlester: 93) was often an elaboration of traditional vernacular house plans such as the central passage plan, I-house, and Hall-and-Parlor. It eventually became a house type that became more increasingly elaborate with influences from the Greek Revival and Queen Anne styles that differentiate it from its vernacular antecedents. With the coming of the railroads and the ensuing abundance of lumber and mass produced architectural millwork, the house form spread rapidly throughout the continental United States. The L-plan of the late 19th and early 20th centuries commonly found in Grapevine is typically 1- to 1 ½-stories in height with an added gable-front wing of equal height. Shed or hipped porches are commonly added to this house type. The L-plan continued to be developed and constructed well into the 1940s with reduced roof slopes more minimal treatments that reflected the stylistic influences from the Minimal Traditional and Early Ranch styles of the period (McAlester: 93). It is a house type that appears in Grapevine with great frequency in earlier vernacular (G5) and later popular variations.

The modified L-plan was built as a turn-of-the-century elaboration of the L-plan house type. The L-plan was a popularization of a traditional house type, whose diffusion across the continental United States was associated with emerging industry. It was built as worker housing in the mill towns

of the southeast, as inexpensive farmhouses from the rural southeast into the Midwest, and as company-provided and suburban housing in the urban areas of the Midwest, south and southwest. The modified L-plan is characterized by an enlarged central section, covered by a steeply pitched hipped roof, with secondary cross gables. It often displays Queen Anne ornamentation such as scroll-sawn wood trim at the gable ends and on porches (Moore et al: 90). The modified L-plans which occur in Grapevine (G48) are simple examples of this house type.

Taking its name from the shape of its building footprint, the cruciform plan is cross-shaped and is formed from the intersection of its four gabled roofs. It often includes a cut-away bay in the front-gabled wing that features sawn, decorative fretwork and the gable above is also commonly finished with sawn decorative shingles. Associated primarily with Queen Anne style details, the house type typically was constructed during the last quarter of the 19th century. The cruciform plans (G27, G37, and G127) in Grapevine are rare surviving examples of a house type historically associated with materials made available by railroad service in the community.

Characterized by and named after its pyramidal-shaped roof and incorporating a four-room plan, this house type was first described by Kniffen in 1936. A popular plan type, the pyramidal house was built with a central chimney which served as many as four different flues for wood burning stoves. The expansion of the lumber industry and the railroads, which provided the availability of milled building materials as well as house plans and a transportation network to move mass-produced items, assisted in the diffusion of this house type. It was often built as tenant and worker housing throughout the rural areas of the Lower Mississippi Valley in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The house type appears in Grapevine (G107) with far less frequency than would be expected.

Stylistic Influences

Originally popularized by a group of 19th century English architects, the Queen Anne style was reinvented by American architects to include a number of vernacular and popular house types that were constructed primarily during the last two decades of that century. The dissemination of the style was principally the result of pattern books and architectural magazines. Later examples continued to be built in North Central Texas at least until 1910. The majority of the region's Queen Anne house types are divided into two stylistic categories: *Spindlework* and *Free Classic*. Spindlework examples have delicate turned porch columns, spindlework and scroll-sawn fretwork as the predominant form of detailing. This most frequently occurs in porch balustrades and suspended porch friezes (McAlester: 264). Free Classic examples substitute classical columns for turned ones and incorporate classical details as replacements for spindlework and scroll-sawn fretwork. Grapevine's examples of the style are primarily of the Spindlework category. They are represented in Grapevine as both vernacular and high style examples. At a minimum the house type appears as a 1-story vernacular

dwelling that has been overlaid with details such as decorative brackets, fretwork and sawn diamond or fish scale shingles. Examples include L-plan and T-plan forms. Equally simple but popular house types associated with the Queen Anne style include modified L-plans and cruciform plans. As a high style dwelling form, it often appears as a 2 ½-story residence with towers, fish scale shingles, turned and scroll-sawn brackets and fretwork, multiple cross-gables and porches and decorative window hoods. Constructed during the last quarter of the 19th century, the best surviving example of this house type in Grapevine is the Dorris House (G2).

One of the most common, popular house types built throughout the continental United States in the early 20th century was the bungalow. Popularized through literature, magazines and even songs between 1910 and 1930, this house type was built in both urban and rural areas. It is a simple design, typically three rooms deep with a gabled roof. Porches are usually offset or centered, featuring gabled roofs, square or battered wood columns and knee braces at the eaves. Exposed rafter tails, sawn to receive an integrated gutter system are also common. This is the most common house type in Grapevine and appears with both modest Craftsman (G10) and even high style details. The most impressive of Grapevine's bungalows is the Morrow House (G8). Built in 1927, it is constructed of red brick, accentuated with cast stone sills, balusters and railings and has a roof of glazed green ceramic tile.

The Colonial Revival style was popular for houses built primarily from the mid-1910s through the 1940s in Grapevine. Earlier versions of the style, constructed prior to 1935, were closely modeled after the Colonial examples on the eastern seaboard. These were popularized by the published architectural literature of the period such as the 1915 *White Pine Series of Architectural Monographs*. Examples built after 1935 were often of the side-gabled type, with simple stylized door and window surrounds and other colonial details (McAlester: 326). Erected in Grapevine primarily after 1935, the house type is not very common. One of the best examples was produced by the Wm. Cameron & Company Lumber Yard. in 1941 at 513 S. Dooley (G220). Other examples of the style appear to have been remodeled older house types. In many of its advertisements printed in the *Grapevine Sun* during the period, the practice was clearly a viable option in the community. One such application of Colonial Revival details involved a T-plan house (G131) transformed with new trim.

Houses built in the Tudor Revival style appeared primarily during the 1920s and 1930s. These dwellings are relatively uncommon in Grapevine and appear as modest examples of the style, with superimposed steep gables applied to otherwise symmetrical facades, and covered in brick or stucco (McAlester: 358). Also promoted by Cameron in many of its advertisements, the most notable examples of the style are simple 1-story houses at 222 E. Franklin (G11) and 311 Smith (G21). Cameron houses are known to have been produced by local contractors hired by the Wm. Cameron & Company Lumber Yard through the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s. They included examples of all these popular styles, with Tudor Revival, Colonial Revival and even variations of the Craftsman Bungalow

examples dating to the 1920s and 1930s. In the 1940s the company produced small houses influenced by the hallmarks of the early Ranch style. Advertised often in the *Grapevine Sun* as the "House of the Month," these dwellings were constructed in 1-story asymmetrical forms featuring both gabled and hipped roofs, boxed eaves, entry porches. They were covered in molded or plain wood clapboard. At least six Cameron houses were identified during the research investigations, including 329 E. Texas (G52), 518 E. Estill (N/A), 703 E. Wall (N/A), 514 E. Worth (G39), 415 S. Dooley (N/A) and 513 S. Dooley (G220). One noteworthy example is the Texan, built at 513 S. Dooley Street (G220) in 1941. In addition, the company also advertised its remodeling services during this period. Further research should be conducted to ascertain the company's impact on local residential development.

Dwellings constructed during the period of significance demonstrate both historical and architectural significance and therefore, can be eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criteria A, B or C. Those determined eligible under Criterion A must be associated with important events or patterns in local history, while those associated with individuals who made noteworthy contributions to the development of Grapevine as an agricultural center may be eligible under Criterion B. Although Criterion A is somewhat broad and abstract, many of Grapevine's historic dwellings are associated with definable periods of demonstrated economic growth and prosperity as well as collapse. Falling into four general periods in Grapevine's history, they indicate clearly that residences built in a certain era may be reflective of the period during which they were constructed. Consequently, they may also be indicative of patterns in local history. Associations with important individuals who were important to the development of Grapevine are also factors that are demonstrable of historical significance. Eligibility in this case is determined by a dwelling's having been the home of a person or persons who achieved importance while residing in a particular building. In addition, the dwelling should be especially representative of that person's career. Grapevine has a large number of such domestic buildings and the history of their occupants has been well documented through both oral and written histories. The majority of Grapevine's domestic architecture, however, should be nominated under Criterion C as notable examples of architectural types or styles.

Domestic buildings may be also determined to be architecturally significant when grouped together and designated as components of a historic district. When nominated within the boundaries of a historic district, they may provide a more complete cross-section of the local history and assist in determining broader themes that contributed to Grapevine's overall growth and development. Groupings of historic buildings are the best means of demonstrating development patterns in Grapevine. An analysis of the architectural styles within specific districts are indicative of periodic growth and suburbanization as well as how local preference for specific architectural styles compared with the popular styles of specific periods. Historic districts provide a material manifestation of Grapevine's local history and as such are the best tangible links to the city's past. The inclusion of multiple properties in particular better conveys a sense of history than that capable by an individual building.

REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS

Individual domestic properties may be considered for nomination if they are at least 50 years of age and retain a significant degree of architectural integrity. They should be recognizable in building form and materials as being representative of a period of significance which in most cases is the date of construction. To be listed, a residential building must meet at least one of the four Criteria for Evaluation.

Many historic dwellings in Grapevine are likely candidates for listing under Criterion C as noteworthy examples of an architectural type, style or method of construction. However, for an individual property to be listed under this criterion, its physical integrity must undergo thorough scrutiny. A building's exterior should appear almost exactly as it did during its period of significance (generally as originally constructed, but sometimes as altered). While it is inevitable that architectural fabric deteriorates over time, restoration, rehabilitation and reconstruction efforts should be sensitive to a dwelling's historic character and should utilize shapes, forms and materials that are compatible with the original design. The installation of historically inappropriate elements detract from a building's integrity and therefore, can compromise a building's eligibility for listing. Typical inappropriate elements include the replacement of wood window sash with metal, wood porch columns with wrought iron, and wood siding with asbestos, vinyl or aluminum. The removal of significant architectural details may also compromise a building's historic integrity.

Properties nominated under Criteria A or B are those that have strong historical associations and links to important trends and events in local history (Criterion A) and associations with individuals (Criterion B) who are historically significant. It is important, however, to establish the relative importance of the events, trends and/or individuals within a defined historic context. A strong argument must be made to describe the accomplishments of individuals and then relate those contributions to local history. In addition, properties must have been used by such persons when significance was achieved and/or must be closely associated with those individuals.

A concentration of dwellings can be grouped and nominated as a historic district. To be eligible for listing, a historic district must be a well-defined area that contains a significant number of historic buildings that retain their architectural integrity. At least 50 percent of the total number of buildings in a district should be classified as Contributing, a designation requiring that individual properties still possess enough of their original fabric to be recognizable to their periods of significance, i.e., dates of construction or of historic remodeling. The buildings do not necessarily have to be unaltered, but they should retain a majority of their historic architectural materials and details.

Alterations to historic dwellings that can affect their classification include changes or additions to exterior cladding (such as the application of asbestos, vinyl, aluminum or any synthetic siding), porch trim and materials, porch floor materials and replacement, and installation of inappropriate replacement windows.

Noncontributing properties are those that detract from a district's historic character and should comprise less than 50 percent of the total number of buildings in a district. This category includes historic buildings that lost their integrity through significant and multiple exterior alterations (including additions) that post-date the period of significance. (Some material additions, particularly application of rigid asbestos-shingle siding, actually occurred during the period of significance and relate to the marketing of specific products by Cameron Homes, itself a major historic business and influence in the mid-century development of Grapevine. These historic alterations are considered appropriate and do not cause a property to be classified as Noncontributing. Modern buildings (those built after the period of significance) are also classified as Noncontributing. A residential historic district, like all historic districts, must have boundaries that are logically determined and defensible on aesthetic and/or historical grounds.

The residential historic district in Grapevine can be eligible for listing under three of the four Criteria for Evaluation. Under Criterion A, the historic district can be viewed as representative of the early suburban development in Grapevine. It also can be eligible under Criterion B because of the historically significant individuals who resided in the area and whose contributions are recognized locally. While properties in the district may possess individual architectural significance, they typically have greater significance when grouped as a whole.

GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

The geographical area encompasses the 1994 corporate limits of the City of Grapevine, Tarrant County, Texas.

SUMMARY OF IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION METHODS

Between May and June 1994 an ArchiTexas/Solamillo project team conducted a comprehensive survey of cultural resources in Grapevine, Texas. In determining which properties were potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NR), this effort identified all historic properties within the city limits. Despite intense development during the past two decades, a surprisingly large number of such properties survive. These range from high style and vernacular dwellings to vernacular commercial, industrial, agricultural and transportation related buildings.

The project team surveyed all pre-1950 properties and sites including commercial, residential and institutional properties of historic and/or cultural significance. The project team photographed all identified resources using T-Max ASA 400 black and white film and Ektachrome ASA 100 color slide film, recording each image on photo index sheets. Additionally, all surveyed properties were recorded using standard Texas Historical Commission survey instruments. Upon completing the field work, the survey team entered this information into a database for easy storage and retrieval by City of Grapevine and Grapevine Heritage Foundation staff. The City of Grapevine provided information from their Geographic Information System (GIS) data base for the compilation of survey maps showing current building footprints and road alignments. Site numbers were assigned to historic properties, with diagonal hatching reflecting preservation priorities. The maps prepared as part of this study are a compilation of the data resulting from the survey and were subject to final field checks during the nomination preparation.

Previous survey efforts in Grapevine included a 1981 effort sponsored by the Tarrant County Council for Historic Preservation and a subsequent study conducted by Greiner & Associates for the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The initial survey identified approximately 66 historically and culturally significant properties. The FAA survey identified 70 properties (G01-G70) determined potentially eligible for NR listing. The ArchiTexas/Solamillo team recorded 241 additional properties (G71-G311), with four concentrations of these historic properties potentially eligible as historic districts. These concentrations include an extension to the Main Street Historic District, the Grapevine Railroad and Industrial District, the Hill and the College Heights Residential Historic District. Additional individual historic properties throughout the city were divided into three categories (high, medium and low priority) based primarily upon levels of architectural integrity. Field records from the earlier surveys helped identify historic properties lost through demolition during the past decade.

The survey team then made recommendations on potential historic districts in the community in preparation for a multiple property nomination of Grapevine's historic resources. Subsequent tours with Texas Historical Commission (THC) staff and representatives of the State Board of Review

(SBR) in November 1994 and a follow-up review by members of the Grapevine Historical Commission (GHC) in April 1995 prompted changes to the research design for this effort. The resultant inclusion and reevaluation of properties identified by the Griener survey redefined boundaries of the College Heights Historic District. In addition, a proposed historic district along West College Street was eliminated from this nomination effort due to losses of historic fabric. All comments and recommendations offered by the THC, the SBR and the GHC were incorporated into the final nomination document.

A research design developed with the assistance of THC staff, SBR members and the GHC guided the creation of a historic context with which to analyze Grapevine's built environment. The ArchiTexas/Solamillo team examined a variety of primary and secondary sources to gather information necessary for developing this historic context. Plat maps, tax records, Sanborn fire insurance maps, issues of the *Grapevine Sun* and oral and written histories provided insight for this effort. Supplementary oral history projects coordinated by the Grapevine Independent School District focused on members of the African-American congregation of Mt. Horhum Baptist Church and residents of the African-American community known as the Hill. In addition, the project team conducted oral history interviews with informants from the Anglo-American community. Topics and questionnaire instruments were coordinated between these oral history projects.

The project team prepared a formal outline of the research for submission to the THC and the Grapevine Heritage Foundation in 1994. Suggested revisions resulted in submission of the historic context to both organizations in August 1995 and to the oral history informants in October 1995 for their comments. Revisions were made by January 1996 for an initial review by the SBR, with subsequent revisions presented to the SBR in November 1996.

MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Brewer, John Mason. *A Historical Outline of the Negro in Travis County*. Austin: Samuel Houston College, 1940.

Conner, Stephen. *The Peters Colony of Texas: a history and biographical sketches of the early settlers*. Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 1979.

Deacon, William. "History of B&D Mills." TMs, 1995. Grapevine Heritage Foundation, Grapevine, Texas.

DeMoss, Dorothy. "Resourcefulness in the Financial Capital." In *Texas Cities and the Great Depression,* edited by Willena Adams. Austin: Texas Memorial Museum, 1973.

Ellis, L. Tuffly. *Cultural and Historical Maps of Texas*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1977.

Emrich, Ron and ArchiTexas. "Grapevine Commercial Historic District National Register Nomination." TMs, 1992. Texas Historical Commission, Austin, Texas.

Glassie, Henry. *Pattern in the Material Folk Culture of the Eastern United States*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968.

Gousha, H.M. *Gulf Refining Company Official Road Map No. 17.* Chicago: Gulf Refining Company, 1930.

Grapevine Sun. Various dates (1890-1955). Grapevine Public Library, Grapevine, Texas.

Jones, Dwayne. Oral history interview by Stan Solamillo. 6 March 1995. Grapevine Heritage Foundation, Grapevine, Texas.

Jordan, Terry. *Texas Log Buildings: a folk architecture*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978.

Jordan, Terry and Matti Kaups. *The American Backwoods Frontier: an ethnic and ecological interpretation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.

Jurney, David and Randall Moir. *Archaeological and Historical Investigations of the Francis Asbury Brown Farmstead.* Dallas: Archaeological Research Program, Southern Methodist University, 1990.

Kerr, Homer. "Migration Into Texas, 1860-1880." Southwestern Historical Quarterly. Vol. 70, 1966.

Kniffen, Fred. "Folk Housing: Key to Diffusion." *Geoscience and Man.* Vol. 27, 1990.

Lathrop, Barner. *Migration Into East Texas.* Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 1949.

Longstreth, Richard. The Buildings of Main Street. Washington: the Preservation Press, 1987.

Love Chapel Oral History Project. Oral history interviews of Floyd Deacon, Katherine Redmond, Mary Virginia Simmons and Louise Watts. Interviews conducted by Susan Pittman, Susan Bauer, Karey Bauer, Laura Blanchard, Carroll Bright, William Browning Jr., Amy Carlini, Shannon Cook, Becky Dawson, Jennifer Dity, Ashlee Garrett, Tiffany Hamburger, Melissa Huddleston, Shannon Kennedy, Christy Morrison, Tiffany Neal, Amanda Rivers, Gina Sciarrillo, Kelley Stanberry and Kathy Thompson. March-May 1995. Grapevine High School, Grapevine, Texas.

Lucas, Dorothy. "Grapevine History." TMs, n.d. Grapevine Public Library, Grapevine, Texas.

McAlester, Virginia and A. Lee McAlester. *A Field Guide to American Houses.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984.

McCallum, P.W. Oral history interviews by Stan Solamillo. 20 August and 11 November 1996. Grapevine Heritage Foundation, Grapevine, Texas.

McDonald, William. *Dallas Rediscovered.* Dallas: Dallas Historical Society, 1978.

McKnight, Mamie. "Freedman's Cemetery Dallas Landmark Nomination." TMs, 1991. Black Dallas Remembered, Dallas, Texas.

Moore, David et al. "HABS Mitigation of Architectural Sites for the Superconducting Super Collider, Ellis County, Texas." TMs, 1992. Texas Historical Commission, Austin, Texas.

Mount Horuhm Missionary Baptist Church Oral History Project. Oral history interviews of Ludie Barnett, Luevetra Brown, Reverend Lorenzo Dunford, Bennie Henderson, Florence Jones, Henry Jones, Clarice Magrue, Robert Uzzel and Louis Brewer Watts. Interviews conducted by Susan Pittman, Heather Anderson, Betsy Cates, Dena Cook, Winston Denny, Jenny Dodson, Tameen Husain, Kyle King, Amanda Knight, Jackie Middleton, Amanda Owen, Carolyn Stewart, Myrna Trent, Brian Treyor, Laurie Troup and Brent Troy. March-May 1994. Grapevine High School, Grapevine, Texas.

Mullen, Andrea Kirsten. "In Search of a Historiography of Black Texas Settlements." *Perspective: the Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians/Texas Chapter.* Vol. 9, 1980.

O'Donnell, Pearl Foster. *Trek to Texas (1770-1870).* Fort Worth: Branch-Smith, 1966.

Page, Anderson and Turnbull. "Tarrant County Historic Resources Survey: Grapevine." TMs, 1990. Historic Preservation Council for Tarrant County, Fort Worth, Texas.

Pickens, Suzanne and Richard L. Mattson. "Historic Architectural Survey of Runway 16/34 East and Runway 16/34 West, Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport, Tarrant and Dallas Counties, Texas." TMs, 1991. Greiner & Associates, Fort Worth, Texas.

Prince, Robert. *A History of Dallas From A Different Perspective.* Dallas: Nortex Press, 1993.

Rabinowitz, Howard. *Race Relations in the Urban South, 1860-1890.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1980.

Roark, Carol, ed. *Tarrant County Historical Resources Survey.* Fort Worth: Historic Preservation Council for Tarrant County, 1990.

Sanborn Map Company. *Fire Insurance Maps of Grapevine, Texas.* Various dates. Center for American History, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

Simmons, Mary Virginia (Wall). Oral history interviews by Stan Solamillo. 16 and 23 January 1995. Grapevine Heritage Foundation, Grapevine, Texas.

Solamillo, Stan. "History of Short North Dallas." TMs, 1994. The Research & Media Group, Allen, Texas.

Spencer, H.A. *Spencer's Street Guide and Index of Dallas, Texas: containing a list of all the streets in Dallas, Highland Park and suburban additions, with maps showing street car and bus lines.* Dallas: by the author, 1934.

Strong, Julie. "Historic and Architectural Resources of Burton, Texas, National Register Multiple Property Nomination." TMs, 1991. Texas Historical Commission, Austin, Texas.

Swaim, Doug. *Carolina Dwelling.* Raleigh: North Carolina State University Press, 1978.

Tarrant County, Texas. *Plat books*. Office of the County Clerk, Tarrant County Courthouse, Fort Worth, Texas.

Tarrant County, Texas. *Tax Abstracts of Lands*. Office of the County Tax Assessor/Collector, Tarrant County Courthouse, Fort Worth, Texas.

Terrill, Catherine. Oral history interviews by Stan Solamillo. 16 and 23 January 1995. Grapevine Heritage Foundation, Grapevine, Texas.

Texas Business Review. Various dates (1927-1937). Bureau of Business Research, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

Thurman, Judith Jenkins. "Austin and the New Deal." In *Texas Cities and the Great Depression,* edited by Willena Adams. Austin: Texas Memorial Museum, 1973.

Tyler, Ron, ed. *The New Handbook of Texas*. Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 1996.

U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. *Agricultural Schedules*, 1850-1940.

Webb, Walter Prescott, ed. *The Handbook of Texas*. Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 1952.

Willhoite, W.D. Oral history interviews by Stan Solamillo. 16 and 23 January 1995. Grapevine Heritage Foundation, Grapevine, Texas.

Willhoite, W.D. Oral history interview by Sallie Andrews. 12 December 1996. Grapevine Heritage Foundation, Grapevine, Texas.

Young, Charles, ed. *Grapevine Area History*. Dallas: Taylor Publishing Company, 1979.