

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey Plan, Historic Resources Survey, and Historic Preservation Plan

Volume I - Historic Context

Prepared for the

Jefferson County Historical Commission





Prepared by HHM & Associates, Inc.

March 2024

Photos courtesy of University of North Texas Libraries and the Texas Historical Commission.

VOLUME I TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume I Historic Context I-1

Chapter 1 | Introduction I-1

Chapter 2 | Geographic Sketch I-2

General Description I-2

Geography and Topography I-4

Topography I-4

Waterways I-5

Soils and Vegetation I-8

Climate I-10

Chapter 3 | Pre-1861: Exploration and Early Settlement I-12

Prehistoric Inhabitants I-12

European Colonial Exploration and Trade (1528–1821) I-12

Spanish Cattle Grazing and Drives I-14

Early Non-Native American Settlement and Land-Use Patterns (1821–1860) I-14

Settlement Under Mexican Rule (1821–1835) I-14

The Republic of Texas Settlement (1836–1845) I-16

Early Texas Statehood Settlement (1845–1860) I-19

Early Industry I-26

Early Agriculture I-27

Farming I-27

Cattle I-27

Transportation I-29

Trails I-29

Port Development and Activity I-30

Early Railroad Efforts I-30

Chapter 4 | The Late Nineteenth Century: 1861–1899 ..... I-37

The Civil War: 1861–1865 ..... I-37

Reconstruction and Post-Reconstruction: 1866–1899 ..... I-39

Population Demographics I-39

Agriculture I-40

Lumber and Sawmilling Industry I-46

Transportation Networks I-46

Land-Use Patterns and Community Development I-51

Chapter 5 | The Early Twentieth Century: 1900–1940 ..... I-59
Population Demographics I-59
Agriculture I-60
Truck and Fruit Farming I-61
Rice I-63
Livestock and Dairy I-68
Industry I-72
Lumber I-72
Oil I-73
The Depression's Impact on Industry I-76
Transportation I-78
Railroads and Interurban I-78
Highway and Bridge Building I-79
Waterways I-85
Land-Use Patterns and Community Development Trends I-86
Eastern Jefferson County I-86
Central, Southern, Northern, and Western Jefferson County I-98
Parks and Open Space I-108
Chapter 6 | World War II: 1941–1945 ..... I-123
Impact on Industry I-123
Rubber I-123
Shipbuilding I-125
Social Impacts of Expanded Industry I-128
Population Growth: Influx of Laborers and Impacts I-128
Agriculture and Prisoners of War I-131
Defense of the Homefront I-131
Sabine Pass Harbor Entrance Control Post I-131
Civilian Contributions I-132
Chapter 7 | Postwar Era: 1946–1978 ..... I-138
Population Demographics I-138
Agriculture I-140
Shift to Large-Scale Commercial Farming and Ranching I-140
Cattle and Rice I-143
Industry I-146
Oil and Petrochemicals I-147

Shipbuilding I-150
Transportation I-150
Land-Use Patterns and Community Development Trends I-157
Eastern Jefferson County Land-Use Patterns I-157
Rural Jefferson County Land-Use Patterns I-159
Community Development I-163
Parks and Open Space I-174
Conclusion **I-177**

INTRODUCTION

This project is funded in part by a grant from the National Park Service's Emergency Supplemental Historic Preservation Fund and managed and administered by the Texas Historical Commission (THC). Through the grant, the THC aims to fund projects that promote preservation planning and the documentation and rehabilitation of historic resources in areas affected by Hurricane Harvey. As part of this effort, the THC awarded the Jefferson County Historical Commission a grant to prepare a historic resources survey plan, historic resources survey, and a historic preservation plan.

Jefferson County has a long history of damage from hurricanes and floods, including Hurricane Harvey in 2017 and Hurricanes Ike (2008) and Rita (2005). Hurricane Harvey alone caused an estimated $2.2 billion of damage, flooding over 15,000 homes and wiping out critical infrastructure across Jefferson County. Future climate projections anticipate more frequent, stronger storms and floods in coming decades. Though hurricane damage in 2017 was widespread across the county, this project focuses on the areas outside of Beaumont and Port Arthur, where historic preservation efforts have been limited. Historically, much of the preservation work in the county has focused on Beaumont and Port Arthur, both designated Certified Local Governments. As a result, historic resources in the county's smaller cities and unincorporated and rural areas have largely gone undocumented, leaving them in danger of being lost. The goals of this project are to document as many above-ground historic-age properties in these areas of Jefferson County as possible, to assess the damage of past storms, and to integrate this information into a preservation plan that will help Jefferson County respond to future storms' impact on historic resources.

HISTORIC CONTEXT OF JEFFERSON COUNTY

The goal of this historic context is to create a framework for evaluating the significance of historic-age resources for their associations with broad historic themes and trends. The context within is structured chronologically by era. Within each era, selected significant contextual themes are discussed. This historic context will be used to evaluate the potential significance of the resources surveyed during the historic resources survey phase of this project. Because the survey area does not include Beaumont and Port Arthur, this historic context does not delve deeply into development within these cities. Instead, the historic context focuses only on broad trends associated with these cities, concentrating on the historic context and development of small towns and unincorporated areas in Jefferson County. The contextual themes selected represent the trends most commonly associated with historic resources in Jefferson County based on research to date, although future research may bring additional significant trends to light.

GEOGRAPHIC SKETCH

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Jefferson County lies in southeast Texas in the Coastal Plains (Figure 1). The Gulf of Mexico forms the county's southern border, Pine Island Bayou its northern border with Hardin County, and the Neches River, Sabine Lake, and Sabine Pass separate the county from Orange County and Louisiana to the east. Only Jefferson County's western border, with Liberty and Chambers counties, is a solid landmass (Figure 2). Jefferson County encompasses approximately 937 square miles.[1] As of 2021, the county had a population of around 251,000.[1] More than half of the population lives in the county's two largest cities: Beaumont and Port Arthur. Both cities are in the eastern section of the county; Beaumont is on the Neches River in the northeast portion of the county, and Port Arthur on Sabine Lake is in the southeastern portion. Smaller cities and areas of development occupy the area between Beaumont and Port Arthur, while the rest of the county is rural, characterized by unincorporated areas and small cities with populations fewer than 2,500 people. The southern section of the county is the least populated and is generally defined by parks and wildlife refuges including Sea Rim State Park, McFaddin National Wildlife Refuge, Texas Point National Wildlife Refuge, Candy Cain Abshier Wildlife Management Area, Big Hill Bayou Wildlife Management Area, and J. D. Murphee State Wildlife Management Area. Interstate Highway 10 traverses the northern section of the county northeast-southwest, US Highways 90 and 96 run through the northern section of the county, and State Highway 73 serves the central part of Jefferson County. In eastern Jefferson County, the main thoroughfares include State Highway 347, US Highway 69, and State Highway 87. A network of county and local roads service the southern third of the county.

[1] Historical records provide larger numbers, including 1,000, 956, and 945 square miles. The decrease in size may be due to measuring errors or differences, or possibly a loss of land due to rising waters over the years.



Figure 1. Map of Texas with Jefferson County highlighted in red. Source: Wikimedia Commons contributors, September 8, 2020, https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?title=File:Map_of_Texas_highlighting_Jefferson_County.svg&oldid=451943304.



Figure 2. Map of Jefferson County showing its primary cities, roadways, and waterways. Source: Robert Plocheck, Texas Almanac, accessed November 2, 2021, https://www.texasalmanac.com/places/jefferson-county.

GEOGRAPHY AND TOPOGRAPHY

Topography

Jefferson County falls within the Coastal Plains region of Texas. Land is relatively flat, and the elevation ranges from sea level along the coast to around 50 feet above sea level in the northern part of the county.[2] Though generally flat, abrupt elevation increases up to around 15 feet are produced by protruding salt domes at and near Spindletop and Big Hill. Salt domes are mounds seeped with sulfur and natural gas. Other areas of slight elevation include bluffs and sloping banks found along the county's myriad waterways.

Waterways

The principal waterways in Jefferson County are the Neches River and Sabine Lake, both on the eastern border and emptying into the Gulf of Mexico. The Neches River starts approximately 416 miles northwest of Jefferson County in Van Zandt County. Before feeding into Sabine Lake, the river in Jefferson County cuts through flat terrain. The river is between 20 and 40 feet deep and has gentle banks, lined with trees in some areas. Both the Neches River and the Sabine River (flowing from the northeast) feed into Sabine Lake near Port Arthur. Sabine Lake lies half in Texas and half in Louisiana. The lake is approximately 14 miles long and 7 miles wide. Land along the lake is a mixture of sandy and marshy.[3] Sabine Pass connects the lake with the Gulf of Mexico. Together, the Neches River, Sabine River, Sabine Lake, and Sabine Pass are known as the Sabine-Neches Waterway (Figure 3). The waterway—a network of interconnected manmade canals, channels, and turning basins protected by jetties in places—is the result of interventions dating from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The efforts created over 40 miles of navigable waterways up both the Neches and Sabine rivers and supported port development in both Jefferson and Orange counties in Texas.[4]



Figure 3. The confluence of the Sabine-Neches Canal and the Neches River with the Rainbow Bridge in the top left. Taken some time after 1936. Source: J. C. Watkins Photography, University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting the Port Arthur Library, accessed December 23, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth79112/.

Feeding into the principal waterways are a myriad of tributaries, both streams and bayous, that historically ran snake-like through the county. One of the principal tributaries emptying into Sabine Lake is Taylor Bayou, which begins at a fresh-water marsh in the western part of the county and flows east

into the lake. Despite its freshwater source, the bayou has tide water that flows upstream to a point near the center of the county. Tributaries of Taylor Bayou include North Fork and South Fork. Hillebrandt Bayou also drains into Sabine Lake, rising northwest of Beaumont and flowing through the city before converging with Taylor Bayou (Figure 8). The northern course of Hillebrandt Bayou is less wild, having been dredged and channeled to improve drainage in Beaumont.[5] Pine Island Bayou is another primary bayou. Forming the northern border of the county, the bayou flows east through flat to rolling terrain before entering the Neches River approximately six miles north of Beaumont.[6] Hardwood trees and conifers line the bayou's banks. Pine Island Bayou flows through the region dubbed the Big Thicket, a historically heavily forested section of southeast Texas. In 1974, the National Park Service established the Big Thicket National Preserve, protecting discontiguous areas in Jefferson, Liberty, Hardin, Polk, Tyler, Jasper, and Orange counties that largely follow the bayous and streams. In Jefferson County, Pine Island Bayou and a small area in Beaumont fall within the preserve (Figures 4-5). Over the years, many of Jefferson County's waterways have been dredged and/or channelized. In addition to improving drainage, farmers used the waterways for irrigation, channelizing them and building pump stations along their banks.

A series of small marsh lakes are found in the southern half of the county, near the Gulf of Mexico. Among the lakes connected via the Salt Bayou include Little Lake, Clam Lake, Keith Lake, and Salt Lake. The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, the manmade channel completed through Jefferson County in the 1930s, separated these marsh lakes from the mainland and cut off the fresh water supply to the marshes, allowing saltwater to invade. To provide fresh water to the lakes, rice crops, and cattle to the north, some property owners built levees, dams, and pumping stations south of the channel. Further inland, small, river-like lakes include Lovell Lake and Boyt Lake. At Lovell Lake, rice farmers built pumping stations and embankments for irrigation.[7]

The vast canal system in the county is also used for transporting municipal water. Pumped through the canals, water from the Neches River and two reservoirs north of the county (Lake B. A. Steinhagen and Sam Rayburn Reservoir) provide raw water to municipalities, industrial businesses, and farms.



Figure 4. Map of the Big Thicket National Preserve. Note the green shading, indicating sections within the preserve, along Pine Island Bayou and parts of Beaumont within Jefferson County. Source: Big Thicket National Preserve, Texas, National Park Service, accessed December 2, 2021, https://www.nps.gov/bith/planyourvisit/maps.htm.



Figure 5. Picnic area at Edgewater Park on Pine Island Bayou in the Big Thicket National Preserve. Source: Schott Sharaga, NPS Photo, accessed December 2, 2021, https://www.nps.gov/thingstodo/picnic-by-the-bayou.htm.

Soils and Vegetation

The county can roughly be broken into three distinct geographical zones: the marshy southern section, the middle coastal prairie, and the northern timbered section. Different soils are found throughout each section, though a heavy clay—Beaumont Clay—underlies the entire county (Figure 6).

The marshy lands in the south are covered in salt and wire grasses and dotted with salty marshes rimmed by cheniers (beach terraces). The soil is largely alluvium clay, except along the beaches, where sandy loam and fine sand are found. The area is covered in salt-tolerant vegetation and is hospitable to a variety of wildlife and waterfowl. In the 1970s and 1980s, much of this land was purchased by the state and federal governments and turned into protected park and refuge land (Figure 7).

Jefferson County has an abundance of underground natural resources. Among them include fresh water, natural gas, oil, sulfur, and ceramic clays.[8] The middle and largest section of the county is open prairie with patches of trees. The soil is dark and sandy loam over heavy clay and is generally difficult to till and naturally poorly draining. This area, due to the nature of the soil and the abundant prairie grasses, is best adapted for livestock and flood-tolerant crops like rice.

The northern section, particularly the northwest corner and along Pine Island Bayou, has sandy soils and is the most heavily timbered of the sections. Patches of dense trees and brush are also found west of Fannett in an area known as the Gilbert Woods and south of Beaumont along Hillebrandt Bayou (Figure 8). Pine trees dominate, though water oak, live oak, post oak, cypress, and palmetto are among the other tree species found in the county.



Figure 6. Map from 1915 showing the different soil types found in the county. Map also shows the various waterways, cities, and railroads that existed in 1915. Source: United States Bureau of Soils, Jefferson County, 1915, University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting UNT Libraries Government Documents Department, accessed December 2, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth19707.



Figure 7. Marshlands at Sea Rim State Park in southern Jefferson County. Source: John Perry, 2016, Flickr, https://flic.kr/p/GGebLd.



Figure 8. Hillebrandt Bayou in Jefferson County. Source: Gosdin, 2017, Flickr, https://flic.kr/p/U8jGGQ.

Climate

Jefferson County has a subtropical climate with hot summers and mild winters. Average high temperatures range from the low 90s in July and August and the low 60s in December, January, and February. Average low temperatures fall to the low 70s in summer and mid-40s in winter.[9] Moisture from the Gulf of Mexico contributes to high humidity in summer, while the Gulf's warm waters keep winters mild. The county receives, on average, 59 inches of precipitation. Though rain generally falls evenly throughout the year, the month of May is the wettest and April the driest.[10]

Due to its location on the Gulf of Mexico, Jefferson County is susceptible to hurricanes during hurricane season – roughly July through November. More than 10 hurricanes and tropical storms have hit Jefferson County since the mid-nineteenth century. Among the most devastating hurricanes to strike the county include Hurricane Audrey (1957), Hurricane Carla (1961), Hurricane Bonnie (1986), Hurricane Rita (2005), Hurricane Ike (2008), and Hurricane Harvey (2017), each causing significant property damage.

ENDNOTES

[1] "Quick Facts, Jefferson County, Texas," United States Census Bureau, accessed November 4, 2021, https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/jeffersoncountytexas.

[2] W. T. Block, "A History of Jefferson County, Texas," accessed November 3, 2021, http://www.wtblock.com/wtblockjr/History%20of%20Jefferson%20County/Chapter%201.htm.

[3] *1880 Decennial Census: Volumes 5 and 6, Cotton Production: Texas*, U. S. Census Bureau, (1880): 99-100, https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/decennial/1880/vol-05-06-cotton/1880v5-09.pdf.

[4] Meredith Temple, "Sabine-Neches Waterway Channel Improvement Project, Southeast Texas and Southwest Louisiana," Department of the Army, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, July 2011, usace.contentdm.oclc.org.

[5] Anonymous, "Hillebrandt Bayou," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed November 10, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/hillebrandt-bayou.

[6] Anonymous, "Pine Island Bayou," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed November 10, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/pine-island-bayou.

[7] Anonymous, "Lovells Lake," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed November 10, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/lovells-lake.

[8] Diana J. Kleiner, "Jefferson County," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed November 11, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/jefferson-county.

[9] "Climate in Jefferson County, Texas, Bestplaces.net, accessed November 10, 2021, https://www.bestplaces.net/climate/county/texas/jefferson.

[10] "Climate in Jefferson County, Texas, Bestplaces.net, accessed November 10, 2021, https://www.bestplaces.net/climate/county/texas/jefferson.

PRE-1861: EXPLORATION AND EARLY SETTLEMENT

PREHISTORIC INHABITANTS

Inhabitation of present-day Jefferson County dates back to the Paleo Indians, who traversed and occupied the area over 13,000 years ago.[1] Spearheads and ceramics are among the artifacts found belonging to these inhabitants, who hunted giant sloth, mammoth, and saber-toothed tigers that lived in the coastal plains, as evidenced by fossilized teeth and bones found at McFaddin Beach in Port Arthur.[2] Archaeologists have also discovered artifacts dating to the Archaic Period (c. 10,000 – 2,000 years ago). Ceramics, human and animal bones, shells, and spears are among the artifacts found at Black Hill Mound south of Beaumont.[3] Originally believed to be a natural mound, more recent studies suggest the area was used for ceremonial purposes by Native inhabitants.[4] Around 2,000 years ago, the Atakapa tribe inhabited the area. Ethnohistoric records indicate the tribe had two villages near present-day Beaumont on the Neches River and one at Sabine Pass.[5] Archaeologists have also found shell middens (piles of shells) and pottery shards believed to be left by the Atakapa.[6] The Atakapa occupied the area as late as the early nineteenth century, during which time they traded with the Europeans in the area. Diseases brought by Europeans greatly diminished the Atakapa and, by 1908, only nine descendants were known to occupy the area.[7]

EUROPEAN COLONIAL EXPLORATION AND TRADE (1528–1821)

For a portion of the three centuries spanning the mid-sixteenth to mid-nineteenth centuries, the Spanish and French vied for control over a larger region that encompassed present-day Southeast Texas. Throughout the period, the two disputed ownership over the region, and while they both maintained a level of presence, neither succeeded in colonizing nor settling the area.

The Spanish first laid claim to the region after Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca led an expedition along the Gulf Coast in 1528. Sent by the King of Spain to colonize the area between Florida and the Rio Grande River, de Vaca and several Spaniards spent around six years trading and living among the region's Native Americas (presumably the Atakapa tribe) before departing for Mexico. During this period, disease took a number of de Vaca's men as well as Native Americans.[8] Throughout the sixteenth century, the Spanish monarchy further strengthened its claim to this region of the New World, authorizing subsequent expeditions, including ones led by Hernando de Soto and Luis de Moscoso Alvardo.[9]

For over a century, Spain mostly ignored its claim to this territory, known as the El Atascosita District—an area encompassing present-day Chambers, Hardin, Jasper, Jefferson, Liberty, Newton, Orange, Polk, San Jacinto, and Tyler counties—focusing instead on its more mineral-rich territories. Spanish interest in the region grew, however, when the French arrived in the territory in the late seventeenth century. Sent with over 100 colonists, French explorer Sieur de La Salle landed at Matagorda Bay in present-day Victoria County in 1685. La Salle's settlement, Fort St. Louis, lasted approximately two years before the remaining colonists deserted and killed La Salle. Despite the settlement's failure, La Salle and the French successfully established trade with some of the region's tribes, igniting further tensions with the Spanish. In return, Spain established San Francisco de los Tejas Mission on the upper Neches River in present-day Houston County in 1690.[10]

Throughout the eighteenth century, the French and Spanish sent more men to Southeast Texas to strengthen trade with Native Americans and take control of the area. While much of the Spanish and French interests focused further inland, the Spanish maintained a post just west of present-day Jefferson County, and the French continued trading with tribes in the region. At least one Frenchman, with enslaved men, operated "rancherias" on the east side of the Sabine River in the mid-eighteenth century.[11] As the French continued expanding their reach in the region, in 1756 Spain established two

missions, Nuestra Senora de la Luz and San Agustin de Ahumada Presidio, in neighboring present-day Chambers County (Figure 9). Disease, a hurricane, lack of food and supplies, and a general failure to convert Native tribes plagued both missions, which were essentially abandoned following France's cession of its Louisiana territory to Spain in 1763.[12]



Figure 9. Map showing the original boundaries of Jefferson County after its organization in 1838. At the time, it included all of present-day Orange County (independently organized in 1852), most of present-day Hardin County (independently organized in 1858), and part of Chambers County (independently organized in 1858). Source: HHM.

Despite Spain's control of the region in the late eighteenth century, the French continued their trade, and by the 1770s, the English even manned a ship on Sabine Lake, where they traded goods with the Atakapa.[13] During this period the region became a haven for smuggling. Beginning in the 1810s, pirates, including the notorious Frenchman Jean Lafitte, preyed on ships in the Gulf of Mexico and used the region's waterways, including Sabine Lake and the Neches and Sabine rivers, to move enslaved people and contraband between Point Bolivar on Galveston Bay into Louisiana. After Lafitte died in 1821, these activities reportedly experienced a lull until 1836, when social upheaval in the wake of the Texas Revolution and Texas's independence from Mexico renewed the need for smuggling enslaved peoples; though slavery was legal in the Republic of Texas, the importation of enslaved people from Mexico was illegal. By this time, the majority of smugglers were Americans, though the usage of the waterways remained the same, with Sabine Pass and Brig Landing serving as popular docking sites for ships.[14]

Spanish Cattle Grazing and Drives

In 1821, the Treaty of Cordova transferred ownership of the region from Spain to Mexico, beginning the era of permanent Anglo settlement in the region. Despite Spain and France's failure at colonizing Southeast Texas, this period of European exploration significantly impacted the future of Jefferson County. In the early 1700s, wild horses and cattle grazed the land, thanks to earlier Spanish expeditions. Throughout the eighteenth century, the number of cattle grew, as the Spanish drove cattle from Mexico into the region for their missions. In addition to cattle, the Spanish also raised sheep, goats, horses, and chickens at their missions in present-day Texas.[15] As the number of cattle in present-day Texas multiplied, the Spanish began driving cattle into their Louisiana territory in the 1770s. Driving cattle from the region, the Spanish used old mission trails, including the Atascosita Trail, which traveled from the Brazos River to the southwest through Southeast Texas and onto the Opelousas Road (later named the Beef Trail) and then into Louisiana (see Transportation discussion).[16] Though the Spanish cattle drives were short-lived, continuing only into the 1780s, the cattle-raising traditions established at the missions and subsequent drives laid the foundation for the forthcoming development of Jefferson County's stock-raising industry and renewed cattle drives.

EARLY NON-NATIVE AMERICAN SETTLEMENT AND LAND-USE PATTERNS (1821–1860)

Early non-Native American settlement in Jefferson County can be broken into three different periods of rule: Mexican rule, Texas rule, and American statehood. Land grants offered by all three countries encouraged settlement and resulted in the emergence of early industries and agriculture. The formation of county government, communities, and expanded transportation also attracted residents. Despite this early growth, by 1860, Jefferson County remained sparsely populated, with just shy of 2,000 residents.

Settlement Under Mexican Rule (1821–1835)

Permanent settlement in the region began in earnest under Mexican control in the mid-nineteenth century. To encourage settlement, the Republic of Mexico offered individual homestead land grants for approximately 4,428 acres (a league), as well as larger "empresario" grants to entities colonizing at least 200 families, who in turn received between 177 acres (a labor) and 4,605 acres (a league and a labor), depending on the usage of the land.[17] Despite the empresario grant system, for the first decade under Mexican rule, the region, far removed from any major city, was largely self-governed and settled haphazardly, with little government oversight or legal worries on behalf of the settlers.[18] During this period, settlers "squatted" on land along the Neches and Sabine rivers, raising livestock and subsistence farming. In 1826, settlers in the Municipality of Atascosita (roughly the same as the Spanish-controlled El Atascosita District) voted to merge with Stephen F. Austin's nearby San Felipe Colony. Though the merger never occurred, the vote revealed that Anglo Americans made up the majority of residents in the district: 331 "free" [White] citizens and 26 enslaved people.[19] Among the early settlers in present-

day Jefferson County were Noah and Nancy Tevis and their five children. The family settled at Tevis Bluff on the Neches River (present-day Beaumont) in 1824.

Settlement increased slightly after 1829 when Lorenzo de Zavala was awarded an empresario grant for the settlement of 500 families (Figure 10). Lorenzo de Zavala, along with empresarios of neighboring grants, Joseph Vehlein and David G. Burnet, transferred interests in their grants to the Galveston Bay and Texas Land Company, assigning them with colonizing the land.[20] The Galveston Bay and Texas Land Company, a real estate promotion firm founded in New York, helped settlers obtain land titles within the three grants upon completing Mexican colonization law requirements.[21] Between 1830 and the Texas Revolution (1835-1836), settlers—a mix of merchants, farmers, and other entrepreneurs—continued trickling into the region. Settlers came from all over, including the Midwest and South. Many migrated from Louisiana, St. Landry Parish in particular, and the period saw small numbers of Cajuns, or Acadians, begin entering Texas.[22] Despite the abolition of slavery in Mexican territories in the late 1820s, the law was largely ineffective at preventing settlers from migrating with enslaved peoples. The ban also indirectly encouraged the smuggling of enslaved peoples along the coast and in Jefferson County.[23] Though the majority of African Americans arriving in this period were enslaved, at least four free Black men—the Ashworth brothers—arrived between 1831 and 1835 (see sidebar for more information).



Figure 10. Map showing the land acquired by the Galveston Bay and Texas Land Company around 1830, including the Lorenzo de Zavala empresario grant that encompasses present-day Jefferson County. Source: Barry Lawrence Ruderman, Antique Maps Inc., accessed December 12, 2021, https://www.raremaps.com/gallery/detail/50971/map-of-the-southern-part-of-texas-mesier.

Ashworths in Jefferson and Orange Counties

Between 1831 and 1835, the biracial Ashworth brothers—William, Aaron, Abner, and Moses—arrived in present-day Jefferson County from South Carolina via Louisiana.[24] Three of them had obtained land grants from the Mexican government, though before claiming their land, war broke out. Despite opposition to the immigration of free Black people into present-day Jefferson County, William acquired a franchise from the county in 1838 to operate a ferry across Sabine Like and up the Neches River to Beaumont.[25] In 1840, the Texas Congress ordered all free Black people to leave Texas or be sold into slavery. White residents, including some prominent officials in Jefferson County, petitioned Congress for an exemption for the Ashworths, leading to the passage of the Ashworth Act later in 1840.[26] The bill exempted the Ashworths and other free Black residents who had been in Texas prior to the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence from leaving the Republic.[27] The 1850 census lists 63 free Black residents (presumably all biracial) in Jefferson County (presumably within present-day Orange County), 38 with the name Ashworth.[28] Both Aaron and William Ashworth are listed as farmers and property owners, as well as owners of enslaved people.

Settlers generally claimed land along the waterways for the fertile soil and abundant timber, and they used trails, rivers, and bayous for transportation.[29] Taylor Bayou was popular among settlers, and small population nodes also developed at Santa Anna on the Neches River (present-day Beaumont) and Grigsby's Bluff (present-day Port Neches). By 1834, more settlers had arrived at Tevis Bluff, including two brothers from Michigan, Henry and Dr. D. J. Otho Millard, who opened a store in the small community.[30] A year later, John Jay French, a merchant from New York, also opened a store in the settlement. Also in 1835, Henry Millard, along with partners Joseph Pulsifer and Thomas B. Huling, purchased land from Nancy Tevis in Tevis Bluff and in nearby Santa Anna. They laid out a townsite—the first in present-day Jefferson County—and named it Beaumont.[31]

The Republic of Texas Settlement (1836–1845)

Jefferson County and Texas War for Independence (October 1835 – April 1836)

Though no battles occurred in the county during the War for Independence, Jefferson County played a role in the formation of the Republic of Texas. Residents generally favored independence from Mexico leading up to and during the war, and residents supported the cause militarily and politically. At least one military company under Captain B. J. Harper formed in Beaumont. The company, made up of around 28 men, was called to the Alamo for relief but arrived after its fall. Though they missed the fight, several other men from Beaumont were among the "old 300" who helped take San Antonio from the Mexicans.[32] Politically, several residents of Jefferson County served as representatives at the Convention of 1836 that established the Republic of Texas, and several men served on the General Council, the provisional governing body of the Republic of Texas in early 1836.[33] Lastly, residents and property were not left unscathed during the war. After Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna and Mexico took the Alamo and Texas troops led by Sam Houston retreated toward the Sabine River, residents between the Rio Grande and the Brazos River fled east toward Galveston and Louisiana in what is known as the "Runaway Scrape."[34] In Jefferson County, some refugees reportedly stole from residents, while some likely fled into Louisiana via Sabine Lake and the Neches River.[35]

At the end of the War for Independence, the area that would encompass Jefferson County had approximately 250 free residents.[36] By 1845, the population topped 1,000. The Republic's continued land grant policy, as well as the organization of the county, contributed to growth during the decade.

In December 1837, the Republic of Texas's First Congress established the county system, and Jefferson County was among the first counties organized. At the time of organization, Jefferson County encompassed an area larger than its present-day boundaries and included all of present-day Orange County (independently organized in 1852), most of present-day Hardin County (independently organized in 1858), and part of Chambers County (independently organized in 1858) (see Figure 9). In 1838, Beaumont was named county seat.[37] That same year, the county erected its first building (not extant) – a jail and offices in Beaumont (the first courthouse was not built until 1854).

LAND GRANTS AND SETTLEMENT PATTERNS

Similar to the Mexican system, the Republic of Texas offered land grants to promote settlement. It initially offered "headright grants" worth 1,476.1 acres for existing settlers, though the size of grants decreased gradually between 1837 and 1842, ranging from 320 to 1,240 acres. The Republic of Texas also gave land grants to veterans of the Texas War for Independence.[38] One veteran, Charles Cronea of Sabine Pass, was awarded 1,280 acres for his service.[39] Whereas merchants and traders made up a good portion of the earlier settlers, this period saw more homesteaders and ranchers arrive. The makeup of

arrivals generally mirrored that from the previous period, with most migrating from the lower South, including some Cajuns and French Acadians. Enslaved peoples also arrived in Texas legally, as the constitution of the Republic of Texas permitted slavery.

Settlers claimed land grants primarily along the county's waterways in the northern and eastern sections of the county, along Pine Island Bayou, the Neches River, Taylor and Hillebrandt Bayous, and Sabine Lake (Figure 11). Beaumont, as county seat and a commercial center, experienced modest growth. John Jay French, who had arrived earlier in the 1830s, purchased 300 acres just north of Beaumont and, in 1845, built one of the oldest extant buildings in the county, a two-story wood building that functioned as both a house and a trading post (present-day 3025 French Road, within the Beaumont city limits, Figure 12).[40] Grisby's Bluff (present-day Port Neches) also saw modest development after its original settler, Joseph Grigsby, acquired over 3,000 acres in the area in 1837. Grigsby, a Kentucky native, acquired the land from Thomas F. McKinney, a keelboat operator who had surveyed the land earlier for a townsite. Upon acquiring the land, Grigsby built a plantation and a boat landing for early port activities (not extant, see Figure 11 for location of Grigsby's property).

> ***Learn More!*** *Read the National Register Nomination for the French Home Trading Post: https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/NR/pdfs/70000752/70000752.pdf*

Outside of Beaumont and Grigsby's Bluff, other small nodes of settlements developed along Sabine Lake, as land speculators acquired property during this period for the purpose of townsite building. Despite some modest growth, for the most part, town planning failed during this period. Among the failed townsites are Aurora and Sparks (located in present-day Port Arthur, both abandoned before Port Arthur developed in 1895), and City of the Pass (located on the mouth of the Sabine River in the general location of Sabine Pass Battleground State Park). Developed By Dr. Stephen H. Everett, John Bevil, and Bevil's son John R. of Jasper County and laid out in April 1839, City of the Pass proved unsuccessful with few of the 2,500 lots sold. One of the developers built a two-story house at the townsite (not extant), but the town failed to materialize.[41] Sabine City (present-day Sabine Pass and part of present-day Port Arthur) on the other hand experienced more success. Founded by Sam Houston's Sabine City Company in 1839, Sabine City was meant to rival Galveston as a major port.[42] At least 2,060 platted lots sold for residential and commercial purposes, and by 1844, the town had around 10 "wooden shacks" and around 150 residents - a third of them sailors, a third of them businessmen, and a third of them stockmen and farmers (see the Port Development discussion).[43] The town name first changed to Augusta upon an 1856 citizen petition to incorporate and again changed in 1860 to Sabine Pass. Outside of eastern Jefferson County, no significant nodes of settlement occurred. Some landowners, however, did establish post offices, which operated on and off over the period in various locations. One such location was Pine Island. In 1839, landowner Thomas D. Yocum secured a post office at Pine Island, approximately two miles north of present-day Pine Island in what is called Westbury. The post office closed shortly after 1839 and reopened again for several decades in 1849.[44]



Figure 11. Map of Jefferson County in 1840. Note that much of the land outside of eastern Jefferson County and away from the waterways remained unclaimed. Also note the early development of a road network running through Beaumont. Also, Grigsby's property, where a plantation and mill were located in present-day Port Neches, is roughly outlined in red. Source: Texas General Land Office, General Map Collection, accessed December 2, 2021, https://historictexasmaps.com/collection/search-results/3726-map-of-jefferson-county-general-map-collection.



Figure 12. John Jay French's house in Beaumont - one of the oldest in the county. Built in 1845, the building served as both a house and trading post and helped establish Beaumont as a commercial center early on in the mid-nineteenth century. Source: Wayne Bell, "French Home Trading Post," National Register of Historic Places Inventory Nomination Form, Texas Historical Commission, Austin, Texas, September 1970, https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/NR/pdfs/70000752/70000752.pdf.

Early Texas Statehood Settlement (1845–1860)

In December 1845, the United States annexed the Republic of Texas. The annexation occurred during a period when Americans embraced the doctrine of Manifest Destiny. Guided by the belief that American expansion was a duty, the government purchased lands, engaged in wars over territorial expansion, granted free land, and allowed slavery in some territories. Though the United States went to war with Mexico over parts of Texas, Jefferson County, in the far eastern part of the new state, was outside the disputed area and encountered no fighting on its soil during the Mexican-American War between 1846 and 1848. Entering statehood, Texas was by and large still sparsely populated, with around 150,000 residents in 1850.[45] To encourage settlement, the state continued the land grant policy after annexation, offering up to 320 acres to homesteaders between 1845 and 1853, and up to 160 acres between 1854 and 1898.[46] Slavery remained legal in Texas, and the state's enslaved population grew more than 300 percent between 1850 and 1860.[47] State leaders also encouraged immigration from Europe to help populate Texas, even creating a Department of Immigration in 1871 to promote the state and its agricultural and economic strengths.[48] Public land—around 20 percent of the state—was also granted to private entities charged with public infrastructure improvements including building railroads, irrigation canals, highways, and schools.[49] By 1860, these policies helped grow Texas's population by nearly 42 percent over the ten years since 1850 and drastically impacted development of land across the state.[50]

In Jefferson County, these policies resulted in modest population growth between 1850 and 1860 (Table 1).[1] The majority of residents in antebellum Jefferson County were White and native born, born in the American South, particularly Louisiana and Texas.[51] Cajuns from Louisiana continued settling in Jefferson County and Southeast Texas, and "most of the thousand or so ethnic French in Texas by 1850 lived in the far southeastern counties [Galveston, Harris, Jefferson, and Liberty] and bore typically Cajun surnames" (as discussed in the sidebar on the French Cajuns).[52] The foreign-born population grew from around 3 percent to around 10 percent over the decade, with Europeans from Germany, England, and Ireland accounting for the bulk of this sector of the population.[53] Enslaved African Americans accounted for around 15 percent of the county's population throughout the decade (see the sidebar on the Enslaved Peoples of Jefferson County).

Table 1. U. S. Census statistics for Jefferson County showing population growth and demographic breakdowns between 1850 and 1860. Note that census statistics are subject to error, and census methodologies for recording race and ethnicity were inconsistent from decade to decade.

Year	Total	Growth Rate	White		Black						Foreign Born	
					"Free Colored"		"Enslaved"		All Black			
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1850	1,836	-	1,504	81.9	63	3.4	269	14.7	332	18.1	64	3.5
1860	1,995	8.7%	1,684	84.4	-	-	-	-	311	15.6	136	6.8

Learn More! *Explore the interactive online exhibit "What Census Calls Us" from the Pew Research Center to better understand how census methodologies changed over time: https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2015/06/ST_15.06.11_MultiRacial-Timeline.pdf.*

French Cajuns in Jefferson County

The French Cajuns from Louisiana began moving into the region in the 1830s and 1840s, and an ebb and flow of migration continued throughout the nineteenth and into the twentieth centuries. Throughout the late nineteenth century, Cajuns left Louisiana, where economic conditions suffered after the Civil War, and moved to Southeast Texas and Jefferson County to work on the railroad and in the rice fields. Among the first Cajun settlers in Jefferson County was the Hebert family who settled and farmed on Taylor Bayou in 1842. By the late nineteenth century, a Cajun middle class emerged in Jefferson County, and Cajuns played important roles in the county's economic development. One Cajun migrant, Joseph Broussard, established the Beaumont Rice Mills in 1892 and also helped organize the Beaumont Irrigation Company. The early twentieth century, however, saw the largest migration of Cajuns into Jefferson County after the discovery of oil at Spindletop in 1901. Throughout the twentieth century, during periods of increased labor demand—in rice fields, the industrial expansion during World War II, and shrimping in the postwar period—Cajuns came to Southeast Texas to meet the demands. By this time, so many Cajuns had migrated to southeast Texas that the region was dubbed "Cajun Lapland."

The integration of Cajuns into Jefferson County impacted the culture in a variety of ways: the food, music, and architecture. A former example of the Cajun influence on the architecture of Jefferson County was the Dugat-Hamshire House in Fannett. Built by Alcad Dugat in phases between 1876 and 1888, the house incorporates Acadian plantation architecture with Victorian-era architectural details (Figure 13). Dugat migrated with his parents from Louisiana around 1854. On the land he acquired from his parents, he raised sheep, farmed, and made furniture. This house was demolished around 2010.

[1] The exact population growth in Jefferson County between 1850 and 1860 is hard to determine due to differences in county size between the two years. In 1850, Jefferson County was a much larger county that included present-day Orange County, Hardin County, and Chambers County, but by 1860 they had formed their own counties, leaving Jefferson County with its present-day boundaries.



Figure 13. The Dugat-Hamshire House in Fannett was built between 1876 and 1888. Representative of early settlement outside of Beaumont and the Cajun heritage of early settlers, the house was a Jefferson County landmark. The house was demolished around 2010. Source: "Dugat-Hamshire House," Jefferson County Historical Commission, marker application, accessed November 20, 2021, https://co.jefferson.tx.us/historical_commission/pdfjs/web/viewer.html?file=files/markers/10510.pdf?Marker%20No.=10510.

The Enslaved Peoples of Jefferson County

In 1860, 311 African Americans lived in Jefferson County (Figures 14-15). Some had moved with their enslavers to Jefferson County, while others had been born into slavery to African Americans brought into the county in an earlier period. Many White Jefferson County residents owned enslaved people, and some only owned one. The largest number of enslaved peoples belonged to two men: John Stamps, a railroad contractor, had 26, and David Wingate, a steam mill operator, had 13.[54] One of the enslaved men was Henry Lewis. Born in 1835 at Pine Island (approximate location of the Thomas D. Yocum grant and present-day Westbury, north of US 90), Lewis participated in the Federal Writers' Project "Born in Slavery: Slave Narratives" in the 1930s, where he recalled his time in Jefferson County. His enslaver was Robert Cade, who Allen recalls as an Irishman who owned a plantation in Louisiana, where Allen's father was born.[55] In Pine Island, Allen recalled working in the woods and the fields with "100 slaves" and building Cade's house out of hand-sawed planks.[56] Allen shared a log cabin with a dirt floor, a mud-cat chimney (a chimney constructed from sticks and mud rather than bricks or stone), and mattresses made out of sacks. Allen remembered the slave traders who traveled through the county with a group of enslaved peoples who were forced up onto blocks to be sold. After Juneteenth 1865, Allen moved to neighboring Chambers County before returning to Beaumont, where he died at the age of 107 in 1943.[57] Allen was buried at Blanchette Cemetery, a historically all-Black cemetery in Beaumont.



Figure 14. One of the county's former enslaved residents, Betty Simmons, in the 1930s at age 100. Simmons, like many freed men and women in the county, moved to Beaumont after the Civil War. Source: The Library of Congress, accessed December 4, 2021, https://www.loc.gov/item/mesnp164019b/.



Figure 15. Abe Livingston, another former enslaved person, in the 1930s at age 83. Livingston was born in Jasper County but moved to Beaumont like other freedmen to work on the railroad after gaining his freedom. Source: The Library of Congress, accessed December 3, 2021, https://www.loc.gov/item/mesnp163024/.

Earlier established settlement patterns continued leading up to the Civil War. Much of the southern half of the county remained unclaimed, while the Texas and New Orleans Railroad and the state owned a majority of parcels in western Jefferson County. The construction of the Texas and New Orleans Railroad laid the foundation for future townsite development of several new communities, including China and Nome, though development of these communities would not occur until after the Civil War (see the Transportation section below for discussion of the railroad).

The middle, western, and northern sections of the county remained rural and sparsely populated. Their settlers, mostly ranchers and subsistence farmers, spread out on large parcels on the most fertile lands on and near the county's waterways (Figure 16). Among the early settlers who made this part of the county home in this period was the Broussard family. Migrating from Louisiana in the 1840s, the family built several (extant) houses—Hamshire House (10954 East Hamshire Road), Arceneaux House (end of Wilber Road, State Highway 73), and Boudreaux House (originally on Broussard Cemetery Road but moved to 10714 East Clubb Road in Fannett in 2010)—near Taylor Bayou in the late 1850s (Figure 17).[58] In addition to these houses, several small cemeteries across the county remain as some of the only resources associated with these early families and settlers.

> ***Learn more!*** *Read about the Broussard family and their houses: https://co.jefferson.tx.us/historical_commission/Jeffco_History_Markers.aspx.*

Meanwhile, in eastern Jefferson County, the towns of Beaumont, Grigsby's Bluff, and Sabine Pass emerged as the leading commercial and industrial centers, home to the county's mills, ports, gins, hotels, stores, and post office. Beaumont and Sabine Pass also had their own newspapers. As such, these communities attracted the most settlers, including merchants, engineers, doctors, and lawyers. Beaumont also benefited from its role as county seat, boasting a courthouse in addition to the county jail and offices (Figure 18). Beaumont emerged as the social and cultural center of the county. Because residents had limited time outside of work and the county's crude transportation network restricted the development of a robust cultural and social scene, entertainment options were limited. Entertainment was generally confined to private celebrations and the occasional ball and dance. Excursion cruises were also offered on Lake Sabine.[59] Despite the limited spaces for entertainment, by the end of the period, Beaumont had a dance school and a dance instructor, who placed advertisements in the *Beaumont Banner* as a "teacher of fashionable dances."[60]



Figure 16. Map of land grants and ownership in Jefferson County in 1862. Note the location of some of the largest cattle ranchers in the county: Burrell (red) and Hillebrandt (blue). Source: Texas General Land Office, General Map Collection, https://historictexasmaps.com/collection/search-results/3727-map-of-jefferson-county-general-map-collection.



Figure 17. Photos of one of the three houses built by the Broussard family in the late 1850s (the photos are not identified): the Hamshire House, the Boudreaux House, and the Arceneaux House. The houses, Jefferson County landmarks, are some of the oldest in the county and represent early settlement patterns in rural Jefferson County. Source: "Boudreaux Place," Jefferson County Historical Commission, marker text, accessed November 20, 2021, https://co.jefferson.tx.us/historical_commission/pdfjs/web/viewer.html?file=files/markers/14513.pdf?Marker%20No.=14513.



Figure 18. The first Jefferson County courthouse, built in 1854 in Beaumont. Source: Jefferson County Historical Commission archives, accessed December 23, 2021, https://co.jefferson.tx.us/Historical_Commission/pdfjs/web/viewer.html?file=files/Jefferson%20County%20Courthouse%201854.pdf.

During this period, religious congregations, including Methodist, Catholic, and Baptist congregations, formed in Jefferson County. Prior to building churches, traveling missionaries, pastors, and ministers served these congregations. Sent from cities including Galveston and Nacogdoches, preachers traveled to Jefferson County as part of the "Alligator Circuit," which included Southeast Texas and neighboring parts of Louisiana. Services occurred in private homes, stores, and other buildings, and often were attended by followers of various sects. Though several attempts were made at building a church in Beaumont during the period, the only known building "devoted solely to religious services" was a Methodist church in Sabine Pass.[61]

Similarly, the county's education system was in its nascency. Early on and throughout the period, private instruction occurred across the county, in houses and even in several schoolhouses (in Sabine Pass and Green's Bluff in present-day Orange County, not extant).[62] Not long after the formation of Jefferson County, in 1854, the county court established school districts with appointed trustees.[63] By 1860, nearly 230 children in the county attended publicly funded schools in Beaumont and Sabine Pass, where school buildings had been built (none extant from this era).[64]

EARLY INDUSTRY

Very little industry emerged during this period in Jefferson County, and what did develop centered around timber. The county's abundance of timber and its location on major waterways downstream from timber-rich counties contributed to the development of a robust logging and milling industry. The industry first emerged in the late 1830s, when Jefferson County exported its first shipment of handmade cypress shingles.[65] Using cypress from trees located along the Neches River and pine from the Gilbert Woods near Fannett and along Pine Island Bayou, settlers and shingle makers in Jefferson County contributed to the more than six million shingles shipped through Sabine Pass in 1850.[66] A large number of the shingles, though, were likely made at county sawmills from timber floated down the Neches River. The practice of floating timber downstream into Jefferson County began in the 1840s when hand-

powered shingle and sash mills opened along the Neches River. The county's first steam-powered sawmill opened in 1846 in Sabine Pass, and by 1860 several others operated in Grigsby's Bluff (not extant) and Beaumont. In addition to shingles, Jefferson County's mills also produced milled lumber, fence pickets, lathes, spokes, and staves.[67] Early shipbuilding was also closely associated with the county's sawmills, with shipyards opening in Beaumont and Sabine Pass on the water prior to the Civil War. At the shipyards, shipbuilders earned some of the highest wages in the county building and repairing steamships for merchants.[68]

EARLY AGRICULTURE

Around half the heads of households in Jefferson County reported themselves as a farmer or rancher in the 1850 and 1860 censuses. Many residents participated in some form of agriculture during this period, often combining subsistence farming with other occupations. Outside of subsistence farming, early agriculture in Jefferson County was primarily dominated by cattle ranchers who also grew crops.

Farming

Prior to the mechanization of farming, farmers in this period relied on human and animal labor to plant and harvest crops. Factored with the lack of irrigation, readily available information on new planting techniques and seeds, and reliable transportation, crops in this period were still largely grown on small plots and consumed at home and locally.[69] Among the crops grown in the county include corn, sweet potatoes, hay, sugar cane, rice, and cotton.

Crops, including corn, hay, and sweet potatoes, were typically grown by ranchers for cattle feed. During his travels through Southeast Texas in the 1850s, Frederick Law Olmstead recorded the "herdmen cultivating no other crop than corn, and of that, not enough to supply their own bread demand."[70] Sweet potatoes were also "characteristically wormy and inedible, suitable only as animal feed."[71] Sugar cane, while one of the crops with the largest harvests in weight in 1850, was, according to historian W. T. Block, only grown in significant amounts by one farmer, Stephen L. Smith.[72] On his 325-acre farm in present-day Port Arthur, Smith had livestock and grew corn, sweet potatoes, potatoes, and peas in addition to producing 25,000 pounds of sugar and cane sugar in 1849.[73] After Smith's murder in 1852, the county had no grower of any significant amounts of sugar, as is reflected in the zero pounds of cane sugar reported in the 1860 agricultural census. Prior to its emergence as a commercially viable crop in the late nineteenth century, rice was grown in fluctuating numbers prior to the Civil War. Producing 18,900 pounds of rice in 1850, the second most in the state in 1850, the census reported 0 pounds for Jefferson County in 1860.[74] The decline in rice, perhaps a recording error, may also be attributed to higher cotton prices or crop failure. Rice from this period, dubbed "Providence Rice," depended on good weather and rain for its survival.[75]

Lastly, some cotton was grown in Jefferson County during this period, but unlike much of the Lower South, the county's agricultural economy was not based on cotton.[76] While some cotton was grown, the county was comparatively poor in cotton production, only producing 2 bales of ginned cotton in 1850 and 84 bales in 1860 (by comparison Harrison County produced 4,581 bales in 1850).[77] Though Jefferson County did not have a large cotton and plantation-based agricultural system, Joseph Grigsby maintained a large cotton plantation on the Neches River in present-day Port Neches. One of the earliest settlers, Grigsby came from Virginia, via Kentucky, where he had owned a 1,000-acre cotton plantation.[78] In Jefferson County, Grigsby, who built and operated his plantation with enslaved labor, opened the first horse-driven cotton gin in the area (see Figure 11 for location of Grigsby's property).[79]

Cattle

When settlers arrived in Jefferson County, some wild cattle from the Spanish remained. Settlers also migrated with their own herds of cattle from Louisiana and elsewhere, letting them roam freely on the

range. Without fencing, herds of cattle could double in three years, even with the threat of predatory animals and theft.[80] As such, over the period of early settlement, the number of cattle in the county grew, reaching a high of 55,639 head in 1859, among the top counties in Texas.[81] Some individual ranchers in particular contributed to the growth of the cattle industry in the county. In 1839, 10 ranchers owned nearly 60 percent of the county's 6,846 cattle.[82] Danish immigrant Christian Hillebrandt, who settled near the bayou that now bears his name, owned 775 head of cattle on 21,000 acres, the most in the county.[83] By 1858, Hillebrandt, who migrated from Alabama with a herd of cattle, had landholdings stretching into Liberty and Orange counties and a herd of 9,000 cattle worth $60,000.[84] Other early ranchers, who settled along the county's interior waterways, included David Burrell, William and Aaron Ashworth, and James and William McFaddin, who founded what would become one of the county's largest ranches in the twentieth century, the McFaddin Ranch (see Figure 16 with property owners highlighted) (see Chapter 5: 1900-1940 for more information on the McFaddin Ranch).

Every year, ranchers rounded up their herds for transport to market in New Orleans. Throughout the period, the cattle drives followed the Opelousas Trail. In Beaumont, the herds swam across the Neches River at Collier's Ferry into Orange County. From there, the herds crossed the Sabine, Calcasieu, and Mississippi rivers down to New Orleans. In the early 1850s, around 40,000 cattle crossed the Neches River each year during the drive.[85] By the late 1840s, some ranchers adopted an alternative overseas route to New Orleans. While some ranchers drove their herds to Galveston or Indianola for shipping, Sabine Pass reported growing numbers of exported cattle in the 1850s: 4,531 in 1857 and 5,669 in 1859.[86] While resources associated with these cattle drives are no longer extant, Official Historic Texas Markers commemorate the ferry crossing at Collier's Ferry Park in Beaumont and the Opelousas Trail in China (Figure 19).

> ***Learn More!*** *Read about Collier's Ferry: https://co.jefferson.tx.us/Historical_Commission/pdfjs/web/viewer.html?file=files/markers/10502.pdf?Marker%20No.=10502*

During this period, cattle ranchers not only earned money selling cattle to market for meat, but they also made money off cattle hides and tallow. As a result, a robust leather industry, second only to lumber, developed in Jefferson County. Beaumont emerged as the center of the leather industry, with a slaughterhouse and several tanneries opening in the 1840s.[87] In the 1850s, a saddlery and shoe shops followed. By 1859, Jefferson County exported over 6,000 hides through Sabine Pass.[88]



Figure 19. Image of Collier's Ferry Park in Beaumont. Collier's Ferry was an important ferry crossing on the Neches River. Following historic Native American traces and trails used by early explorers and settlers, the crossing was part of the Opelousas Trail—the historic cattle drive trail—in the nineteenth century. Source: HHM, 2022.

TRANSPORTATION

Trails

Throughout this period, overland trails provided the primary means of transportation into and through Jefferson County. Native Americans, European explorers and traders, and early settlers all relied on these trails for travel in Southeast Texas. Forged first by the Native Americans, these trails later connected missions, trading and military posts, settlements, postal stops, and cattle markets. Developed over time, the series of trails established in this period became the foundation for the emerging road network that began at the end of this period.

In Jefferson County, a small network of dirt roads had developed by 1840 (Figure 11). Due to the marshes in the south, the primary routes to and through the county were further inland where the landscape was less of an impediment to travel. All roads intersected in the county's largest settlement, Beaumont. From Beaumont, roads ran north to Woodville in Tyler County and south to Grigsby's Bluff and Sabine Pass. The road running east-west was part of the larger road through Southeast Texas and Louisiana known as the Opelousas Trail, a route named for the Atakapan-speaking tribes who forged the trail between villages. County "reviewers of roads" oversaw the roads, but citizens were largely responsible for maintenance.[89] Due to the number of waterways in the county, ferries, and later bridges, became widely used. One of the primary ferries in the county crossed the Neches River in present-day Beaumont. Along the Opelousas Trail, Collier's Ferry operated between 1831 and 1950. The county also

oversaw the construction of some early bridges in this period, including ones over Cow Bayou, Adams Bayou, and Ashworth Bayou.[90]

Port Development and Activity

Sabine Pass developed as the primary port in Jefferson County during this period. Dating back to the period of European exploration and trade, Sabine Lake served as a primary entrance to the interior and therefore became an important place of trade (see discussion on smuggling activities during the period of European settlement and occupation). Acknowledging the importance of the waterway, Mexico designated the mouth of the Sabine River at Sabine Lake a port in 1835. When the Republic of Texas obtained power from Mexico, they established a customs house on the lake in 1837, collecting duties and tonnage tax to help pay off their war debts and finance their new government (Figure 20).[91] In dispute over jurisdiction over the waterway, the U. S. government built a customs house on the opposite shore in Louisiana a year later. Tensions grew between the two governments, reaching a peak when U. S. merchant ships anchored off the Texas shoreline and sold goods onboard duty-free. The waterway was also increasingly used by people smuggling enslaved men into Texas and the United States. In response, President Sam Houston sent patrols to Sabine Lake and cannons to the Texas customs house, ordering warning shots be fired at vessels attempting to bypass the customs house.[92] Violence was ultimately averted once the United States annexed Texas and the customs house fell under the jurisdiction of the federal government. Several years later, in 1856, the Sabine Pass Lighthouse was erected by the U. S. government on the Louisiana shore of Sabine Lake (listed in the National Register of Historic Places).

Throughout the period, under Mexican, Texan, and American rule, the trade through Sabine Pass increased, despite the lack of improvements to the waterways and with minimal aid from any government. Beginning in the 1830s and continuing throughout the period, private individuals and companies operated the ships and wharves. They oversaw the arrival of manufactured goods and the departure of agricultural goods and products, livestock, and lumber. Imports arrived from New Orleans and New York, while exports typically went to New Orleans and Galveston. Steamboats came and left from Sabine Lake, while smaller keelboats and flatboats traversed the Neches River, as its fluctuating depth was too risky for larger ships. Despite lack of government aid, the early traders established a flourishing industry at Sabine Pass.

Cotton was among the first products shipped through Sabine Pass. Predominantly grown in cotton-producing counties upriver of Jefferson County, the number of bales shipped through the port between 1838 and 1859 grew from 84 to more than 18,000.[93] Other products grown out of county, including tobacco, were also shipped through the port. The increase in livestock and manufactured products from Jefferson County also contributed to the growing port economy. By the end of the period, Sabine Pass supported a robust shipping industry, exporting 5,669 cattle, 6,096 hides, 15 bales of deer skins, 12,000,000 shingles, 700 hoop poles, 97,000 barrel staves, and 1,099,000 board feet of lumber.[94] That same year, between 90,000 and 100,000 barrels of merchandise were imported through the port.[95]

Early Railroad Efforts

Prior to the Civil War, several railroad companies began building in Jefferson County. Though the outbreak of war ultimately halted further development, these early efforts brought in more people to the county, boosted the economy with the shipment of materials to the county, and laid the foundations for future townsite development.

Though the government granted several charters to railroad companies in the early 1850s, only two completed tracks during the period. The first, the Eastern Texas Railroad, was completed with enslaved labor between Sabine Pass and Beaumont in 1859. High freight rates, the lack of integration into a larger rail network, and the removal of rails and crossties for construction during the war ultimately rendered

the railroad bankrupt in the early 1860s.[96] The second railroad, the Texas and New Orleans Railroad, completed 41 miles of track through northern Jefferson County from Beaumont to Liberty.[97] In 1861, the line was completed from Beaumont to Orange. The railroad built several water stops in Jefferson County, including sites that would later become China and Nome. Though the outbreak of war ended service for all but the Confederacy during the war, the Texas and New Orleans Railroad rebuilt and reestablished service in the late 1870s.



Figure 20. Map of Sabine Pass from 1840. Note the location of "City of Sabine" and the customs house (circled in red) located to the south. Source: Thomas Jefferson Lee, the Library of Congress, accessed November 3, 2021, https://www.loc.gov/item/86694262/.

ENDNOTES

[1] Timothy K. Perttula, Thomas R. Hester, Stephen L. Black, Carolyn E. Boyd, Michael B. Collins, Myles R. Miller, J. Michael Quigg, Wilson W. Crook III, Bryon Schroeder, Ellen Sue Turner, Drew Sitters, Nancy Velchoff, Richard A. Weinstein, and Thomas J. Williams, "Prehistory," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed November 08, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/prehistory.

[2] Howard C. Williams, "Gateway to Texas: The History of Orange and Orange County," (Orange, TX, 1988), 16, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth39146/m1/33/?q=indian.

[3] "Black Hill Mound," Texas Beyond History, accessed November 8, 2021, https://www.texasbeyondhistory.net/coast/images/ap5.html.

[4] "Black Hill Mound," Texas Beyond History.

[5] "Test Excavations at Gaulding Site (41Jf27), Jefferson County, Texas," 6, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth1013860/m2/1/high_res_d/Special_Publication_No._4_Late_Holocene_Settlement_in_the_Taylor_Bayou_Drainage_Basin.pdf.

[6] Williams, "Gateway to Texas: The History of Orange and Orange County," 1.

[7] Dorothy Couser, "Atakapa Indians," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed November 08, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/atakapa-indians.

[8] Williams, "Gateway to Texas: The History of Orange and Orange County," 21.

[9] Williams, "Gateway to Texas: The History of Orange and Orange County," 21.

[10] Anonymous, "Nuestro Padre San Francisco de los Tejas Mission," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed November 08, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/nuestro-padre-san-francisco-de-los-tejas-mission.

[11] Williams, "Gateway to Texas: The History of Orange and Orange County," 23.

[12] Robert Wooster, "Nuestra Señora de la Luz Mission," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed November 08, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/nuestra-senora-de-la-luz-mission.

[13] Williams, "Gateway to Texas: The History of Orange and Orange County," 23.

[14] Williams, "Gateway to Texas: The History of Orange and Orange County," 73.

[15] Frank J. Dobie, "The First Cattle in Texas and the Southwest Progenitors of the Longhorns," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 42, no. 3 (1939): 176, http://jstor.org/stable/30235835.

[16] "A History of Jefferson County, Texas," Jefferson County Historical Commission (JCHC), 2, accessed November 3, 2021, https://co.jefferson.tx.us/historical_commission/pdfjs/web/viewer.html?file=files/History/Jefferson_County_History_2015-12-03.pdf.

[17] Eugene C. Barker, "Mexican Colonization Laws," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed November 08, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/mexican-colonization-laws.

[18] W. T. Block, "Mexico and the Anglo-American Pioneers," *A History of Jefferson County, Texas*, accessed December 1, 2021, http://www.wtblock.com/wtblockjr/History%20of%20Jefferson%20County/chapter%205.htm.

[19] Block, "Mexico and the Anglo-American Pioneers."

[20] Block, "Mexico and the Anglo-American Pioneers."

[21] Andreas V. Reichstein, "Galveston Bay and Texas Land Company," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed November 09, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/galveston-bay-and-texas-land-company.

[22] Terry G. Jordan, "A Century and a Half of Ethnic Change in Texas: 1836-1986," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 89, no. 4 (1986): 405, https://www.jstor.org/stable/30239930.

[23] "Hard Road to Texas: Texas Annexation 1836-1845," Texas State Library and Archives Commission, accessed November 11, 2021, https://www.tsl.texas.gov/exhibits/annexation/part2/question2.html.

[24] Williams, "Gateway to Texas: The History of Orange and Orange County," 76.

[25] Williams, "Gateway to Texas: The History of Orange and Orange County," 76.

[26] Nolan Thompson, "Ashworth Act," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed November 11, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/ashworth-act.

[27] Nolan Thompson, "Ashworth, Aaron," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed November 11, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/ashworth-aaron.

[28] Nolan Thompson, "Ashworth, William," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed November 11, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/ashworth-william.

[29] W. T. Block, "Early Religion, Education, and Social Interaction," *A History of Jefferson County, Texas*, accessed December 1, 2021, http://www.wtblock.com/wtblockjr/History%20of%20Jefferson%20County/Chapter%2012.htm.

[30] Block, "Early Religion, Education, and Social Interaction."

[31] "A History of Jefferson County," JCHC, 4.

[32] "A History of Jefferson County," JCHC, 4.

[33] "A History of Jefferson County," JCHC, 4.

[34] Carolyn Callaway Covington, "Runaway Scrape," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed November 11, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/runaway-scrape.

[35] Williams, "Gateway to Texas: The History of Orange and Orange County," 76.

[36] Block, "Early Religion, Education, and Social Interaction."

[37] Dr. Archie P. McDonald, *Water, Rails & Oil: Historic Mid & South Jefferson County*, (San Antonio, Texas: Historical Publishing Network, 2008), 9.

[38] Aldon S. Lang and Christopher Long, "Land Grants," *Handbook of Texas Online,* accessed February 4, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/land-grants.

[39] Block, "Mexico and the Anglo-American Pioneers."

[40] Wayne Bell, "French Home Trading Post," National Register of Historic Places Inventory Nomination Form, Texas Historical Commission, Austin, Texas, September 1970, 3, https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/NR/pdfs/70000752/70000752.pdf.

[41] W. T. Block, "Early Town-Building and Government," *A History of Jefferson County, Texas*, accessed November 5, 2021, http://www.wtblock.com/wtblockjr/History%20of%20Jefferson%20County/Chapter%206.htm.

[42] McDonald, *Water, Rails & Oil*, 10.

[43] Block, "Early Town-Building and Government." m

[44] Robert Wooster, "Pine Island, TX (Jefferson County)," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed January 07, 2022, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/pine-island-tx-jefferson-county.

[45] "175 years of Texas statehood, by the numbers," *Austin American Statesman*, December 28, 2020, https://www.statesman.com/story/news/local/2020/12/28/175-years-texas-statehood-numbers/4037773001/.

[46] Lang and Long, "Land Grants."; Texas General Land Office, accessed March 30, 2021, https://www.glo.texas.gov/history/archives/forms/files/categories-of-land-grants.pdf.

[47] David W. Moore, Jr., Martha Freeman, and Maryellen Russo, "Agricultural Theme Study for Central Texas," submitted to the Texas Department of Transportation, Environmental Affairs Division, Historical Studies Branch, 2013.

[48] Moore, Freeman, and Russo, "Agricultural Theme Study for Central Texas."

[49] Lang and Long, "Land Grants."

[50] "175 years of Texas statehood, by the numbers," *Austin American Statesman*, December 28, 2020, https://www.statesman.com/story/news/local/2020/12/28/175-years-texas-statehood-numbers/4037773001/.

[51] Arthur M. Z. Norman, "Migration to Southeast Texas: People and Words," *The Southwestern Social Science Quarterly* 37, no. 2 (1956): 150.

[52] Jordan, "A Century and a Half of Ethnic Change in Texas," 405.; Terry G. Jordan, "Population Origins in Texas, 1850," *Geographic Review* 59, no. 1 (1969): 99, https://www.jstor.org/stable/213083.

[53] Norman, "Migration to Southeast Texas: People and Words," 150.

[54] "A History of Jefferson County," JCHC, 8.

[55] "Henry Lewis," *Federal Writers' Project: Slave Narrative Project, Vo. 16, Texas, Part 3, Lewis-Ryles*, 1936, manuscript/mixed material, https://www.loc.gov/item/mesn163/.

[56] "Henry Lewis," *Federal Writers' Project: Slave Narrative Project.*

[57] "Henry Lewis," Find a Grave, accessed November 12, 2021, https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/51789776/henry-lewis.

[58] "Boudreaux Place," Jefferson County Historical Commission, marker text, accessed November 20, 2021, https://co.jefferson.tx.us/historical_commission/pdfjs/web/viewer.html?file=files/markers/14513.pdf?Marker%20No.=14513.; Heather Nolan, "History takes to the road as house goes home," *Beaumont Enterprise*, May 25, 2010, https://www.beaumontenterprise.com/business/article/History-takes-to-the-road-as-house-goes-home-730922.php.

[59] Block, "Early Religion, Education, and Social Interaction."

[60] Block, "Early Religion, Education, and Social Interaction."

[61] Block, "Early Religion, Education, and Social Interaction."

[62] Block, "Early Religion, Education, and Social Interaction."

[63] Block, "Early Religion, Education, and Social Interaction."

[64] Block, "Early Religion, Education, and Social Interaction."

[65] "A History of Jefferson County," JCHC, 53.

[66] "A History of Jefferson County," JCHC, 53.

[67] W. T. Block, "Early Industry and Businesses," *A History of Jefferson County, Texas*, accessed November 3, 2021, http://www.wtblock.com/wtblockjr/History%20of%20Jefferson%20County/chapter%209.htm.

[68] Block, "Early Industry and Businesses."

[69] "A History of Jefferson County," JCHC, 57.

[70] W. T. Block, "Early Agriculture," *A History of Jefferson County, Texas*, accessed November 1, 2021, http://www.wtblock.com/wtblockjr/History%20of%20Jefferson%20County/Chapter%2010.htm.

[71] Block, "Early Agriculture."

[72] Block, "Early Agriculture."

[73] Block, "Early Agriculture."

[74] "A History of Jefferson County," JCHC, 57.

[75] Denise Gomez, "First Providence, Then Prosperity: A Brief History of Beaumont's Rice Culture," Houston History Magazine, July 2016, https://houstonhistorymagazine.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Beaumont-.pdf.

[76] Robert J. Robertson, "Slavery and the Coming of the Civil War, as seen in the Beaumont Banner," *East Texas Historical Journal* 34, no 1 (1996): 15, https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/ethj/vol34/iss1/7.

[77] 1850 Decennial, Statistics of Texas, 517, https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/decennial/1850/1850a/1850a-36.pdf.

[78] Camellia T. Denys, "Grigsby, Joseph," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 16, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/grigsby-joseph.

[79] Denys, "Grigsby, Joseph."

[80] "Opelousas Trail," Jefferson County Historical Commission, marker text, accessed November 2, 2021, 9, https://co.jefferson.tx.us/historical_commission/pdfjs/web/viewer.html?file=files/markers/10549.pdf?Marker%20No.=10549.

[81] *The Texas Almanac for 1860 with Statistics, Historical and Biographical Sketches*, from the University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting the Texas State Historical Association, 205, accessed November 10, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth123766/.

[82] W. T. Block, "Early Livestock Industry," *A History of Jefferson County, Texas*, accessed September 2, 2021, http://www.wtblock.com/wtblockjr/History%20of%20Jefferson%20County/Chapter%2011.htm.

[83] Block, "Early Livestock Industry."

[84] Block, "Early Livestock Industry."

[85] David G. Surdam, "Antebellum Texas Cattle Trade Across the Gulf of Mexico," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 100, no. 4 (1997): 478, https://www.jstor.org/stable/30241546.

[86] Block, "Early Livestock Industry."

[87] W. T. Block, "Early Industry and Business," *A History of Jefferson County, Texas*, accessed October 3, 2021, http://www.wtblock.com/wtblockjr/History%20of%20Jefferson%20County/chapter%209.htm.

[88] Block, "Early Livestock Industry."

[89] W. T. Block, "Early Transportation and Commerce," *A History of Jefferson County, Texas*, accessed December 1, 2021, http://www.wtblock.com/wtblockjr/History%20of%20Jefferson%20County/chapter%207.htm.

[90] Block, "Early Transportation and Commerce."

[91] W. T. Block, "Sabine Pass in the Civil War," *East Texas Historical Journal* 9, issue 2 (1971): 129.

[92] Steven W. Hooper, "Dashiell, William Collier Vauness," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 17, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/dashiell-william-collier-vauness

[93] W. T. Block, "Sabine Pass in the Civil War," *East Texas Historical Journal* 9, issue 2 (1971): 129.

[94] "A History of Jefferson County," JCHC, 64.

[95] *The Texas Almanac for 1861*, from the University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting the Texas State Historical Association, 237, accessed December 12, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth123767.

[96] Block, "Early Transportation and Commerce."

[97] Block, "Early Transportation and Commerce."

THE LATE NINETEENTH CENTURY: 1861–1899

Over the relatively short period of time from the start of the Civil War to the turn of the twentieth century, Jefferson County underwent dramatic changes in population, agriculture, industry, and transportation. After the war, most economic, agricultural, and population gains were erased, and the county was largely left in disarray as it entered into a period of rebuilding. Over the next three decades, however, the county's population, industries, and agriculture rebounded, surpassing previous highs. Taking advantage of improved shipping and the frenzied post-war statewide railroad construction, Jefferson County built a prosperous economy around the region's natural resources: waterways, timber, and fertile soils.

THE CIVIL WAR: 1861–1865

In 1860, Jefferson County's population was just shy of 2,000. Comprised mostly of subsistence farmers and ranchers, with a mixture of lumbermen, merchants, and tradesmen in the cities, the population was 84 percent White and 16 percent Black enslaved people. Though its economy was unlike the cotton plantation system—which was heavily reliant on enslaved labor—found through much of the South, anti-Republican sentiment, fueled by the election of Abraham Lincoln as President in 1860, permeated much of Texas, including Jefferson County. Following the secession of six states from the Union, the Texas legislature voted 166 to 7 in favor of leaving the Union in early 1861.[1] In a follow-up popular referendum, three-quarters of Texans voted in favor of joining the newly formed Confederacy. In Jefferson County, the vote was 256 for secession and 15 against.[2]

Immediately after seceding from the Union, men from Jefferson County joined and formed militia companies. In 1861, three companies, comprised of 29 to 55 men, formed in Jefferson County: Sabine Pass Guards, Jefferson County Mounted Rangers, and Ben McCullogh Coast Guards.[3] Members of these militias, as well as individuals, joined with the Texas Volunteers and other county militias, fighting in various battles in the South. By the end of the war, half of the families in Jefferson County had at least one Confederate soldier.[4] All sectors of the county's economy felt this loss in labor. On farms and ranches, work fell to the county's comparably small, enslaved population and remaining family members, many of them children. As a consequence, fields were left untended, and farms produced smaller crop yields. Similarly, the county's sawmills and gristmills manufactured and produced fewer products as a result of the shrinking population. The Union blockade compounded the loss of labor by cutting off imported dry goods, hardware, and foodstuffs. As a result, some residents resorted to making their own soap, carved utensils, and coffee from ground corn.[5] Some farmers in Sabine Pass even grew indigo and made their own ink. Though families with soldiers received weekly food rations, the focus of many families during the war was simply survival. The blockade also meant that cattle and many of the products made in the county, including corn meal, went to the Confederate war effort via Sabine Pass.

The Union blockade also contributed to several Civil War battles in Jefferson County. In June 1861, the Union Navy established its blockade of the Confederate coast with the aim of excluding "all commercial intercourse from the ports of the insurgent states."[6] Though the Navy's primary focus was on the Confederacy's principal ports—New Orleans, Mobile, and Galveston—Sabine Pass was also subject to the blockade and Union interest, as an exporter of cotton and entry point into Texas. Aware of its critical location, the Confederacy built four earthen defensive forts along the Neches River, Sabine Lake, and Gulf between 1861 and 1863: Fort Sabine (1861), Fort Grigsby (1862), Fort Griffin (1863), and Fort Manhassett (1863) (none extant).[7] Built by locals and enslaved men, Fort Sabine and Fort Griffin became sites of several Civil War incidents.[8]

In September 1862, Fort Sabine came under Union fire. Unable to effectively return fire and hit the attacking vessels, Confederate forces abandoned the badly damaged fort and Sabine Pass surrendered

to Union forces. Despite capturing the port, Union forces occupied the city for only a brief period of time. Faced with growing cases of yellow fever in the area and reports of a Confederate counter-attack, Union forces withdrew from Sabine Pass after several months.[9] Just one year later, though, in need of cotton and hoping to secure Sabine Pass and entry into Texas, the Union sent 4,000 soldiers on four gunboats from New Orleans to Jefferson County in September 1863.[10] In what became known as the Second Battle of Sabine Pass, Lieutenant Richard Dowling and 46 men disabled the attacking Union ships with the fort's cannons (Figure 21). The men captured 300 Union prisoners and two gunboats, and another ship retreated to New Orleans.[11] Afterward, the Confederacy reinforced the fort in anticipation of another attack. The fort, and Jefferson County, did not see any other skirmishes during the war, and troops abandoned Fort Griffin in May 1865.[12] Though the site saw no more battles in its history, subsequent wars highlighted Sabine Pass's strategic location in the defense of the coast (see sidebar on Spanish-American War).



Figure 21. Depiction of the Second Battle of Sabine Pass in 1863. The right-hand side is Louisiana, and the left-hand side shows Sabine Pass. Source: Image available in accordance with Title 17 U. S. C. Section 107 from *The Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed January 11, 2022, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/sabine-pass-battle-of.

Sabine Pass and the Spanish-American War

In the late 1890s, as tensions grew between the United States and Spain, the War Department included Sabine Pass in its defense plans. In May 1898, one month after the start of the Spanish-American War, construction began on two forts in Jefferson County on land granted by Augustus F. Kountze.[13] Locals and the government engineer completed the emplacements at Sabine Pass shortly after, though they never saw any military action. In December 1898, the U. S. and Spain signed the Treaty of Paris, ending the months-long war. In 1901, the U. S. abandoned plans for a permanent military installation at the site. Subsequent hurricanes have severely damaged the fortifications, and little evidence of them remains.

RECONSTRUCTION AND POST-RECONSTRUCTION: 1866–1899

Between 1865 and 1867, the state government of Texas struggled to come to terms with the concessions required for reentry into the union of the United States – nullifying secession and ratifying the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments to the U. S. Constitution. During this period, lawlessness prevailed across the state, and an estimated 379 murders of Black individuals by White individuals went largely unprosecuted. The First Reconstruction Act led the federal government to replace over 400 elected officials across the State of Texas with new officials who did not maintain secessionist views.[14] State representatives in Texas approved a new constitution that complied with federal requirements for readmission in November 1869.[15] The U. S. Congress officially readmitted the State of Texas on March 30, 1870.[16] Black male Texans then gained the right to vote and hold office (a right still denied to women of all races). When given the right to vote, Black men formed a political coalition with anti-secession White men (largely Republican at the time). This coalition elected 52 African-American men to serve in the Texas Legislature or as delegates at Texas Constitutional Conventions; none were elected from Jefferson County.[17] Despite these gains, by the late nineteenth century, the state's White majority adopted a series of discriminatory state and local laws that reversed Reconstruction policies that helped the freed Black population. As such, the economic successes of the period were not shared equally and benefited only the White population.

In Jefferson County, the Civil War reversed the county's population and economic gains from the 1840s and 1850s. Recording 94 fewer people in 1870 than in 1860, Jefferson County's loss of men and labor during the war had rippling effects on the county's agriculture and commerce. With population, crop yields, and manufacturing and commerce down immediately after the war, recovery was somewhat slow. Over the subsequent two decades though, the county's population and economy rebounded. Defined by prosperity in the lumber and milling industry, railroad building, and improvements to agriculture, by the end of the nineteenth century, Jefferson County boasted a robust economy, a growing population, and burgeoning cities and new towns.

Population Demographics

After the drop in population between 1860 and 1870, Jefferson County steadily added residents in the 1870s and 1880s as it recovered from the war. The 1890s saw a dramatic increase in population, due in part to the railroad and lumber industry. Increasing more than 143 percent, the population of the county topped 10,000 for the first time (see Table 2). Across the state and in Jefferson County, the population grew more urban, with a majority of the county's residents settling in eastern Jefferson County. In 1890, 3,705 residents (63 percent of the county's total) lived in the county's two largest cities: Beaumont and Sabine Pass. By 1900, 10,690 (75 percent of the county's total) people lived in the county's three largest cities: Beaumont, Port Arthur, and Sabine Pass.[18]

Table 2. U. S. Census statistics for Jefferson County showing population growth and demographic breakdowns between 1860 and 1900. Note that census statistics are subject to error, and census methodologies for recording race and ethnicity were inconsistent from decade to decade.

Year	Total	Growth Rate	White		Black		Foreign Born		Hispanic Origin	
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1860	1,995	8.6%	1,684	84.4	311	15.6	136	6.8	-	-
1870	1,906	-4.5%	1,408	73.9	498	26.1	80	4.2	-	-
1880	3,353	75.9%	2,290	68.3	1,199	35.8	186	5.5	-	-
1890	5,857	74.7%	3,638	62.1	2,218	37.9	-		-	-
1900	14,289	144%	10,290	72.0	3,942	27.6	947	6.6	-	-

Learn More! *Explore the interactive online exhibit, "What Census Calls Us" from the Pew Research Center to better understand how census methodologies changed over time: https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2015/06/ST_15.06.11_MultiRacial-Timeline.pdf.*

While White men and women accounted for a majority of Jefferson County's population throughout the period, the newly freed African American population grew at a faster pace. While some African Americans stayed close to their former enslavers, working as farmers and sharecroppers, many others in the county sought new jobs working on the railroad and in industries like lumber. These jobs also brought in African Americans from outside the county. As a result, while the total African American population in Texas declined after the Civil War, Jefferson County's increased.[19] Because a majority of African Americans worked at the sawmills and freight facilities in Beaumont, by 1880 the city's population was 45 percent African American.[20]

Migrants from the South continued settling in the county, coming to farm and for jobs in the growing industrial sector and in newly developing cities. Migrants from Louisiana, including French Cajuns, continued to account for a large portion of the county's population growth. Because land was cheaper than in Louisiana, a number of rice farmers left the state, purchased land, and started rice farms in Jefferson County.[21] In what was dubbed a "grand march to the rice fields," farmers from Crowley came in droves beginning in 1892.[22]

A smaller number of European immigrants contributed to the county's growth in the late nineteenth century. While Galveston experienced rapid European immigration through its port, Jefferson County had fewer than 1,000 "foreign born" residents in 1900. Akin to the county's overall population growth, the "foreign born" population increased at its fastest pace in the 1890s. Among the immigrants to settle in Jefferson County were some Eastern European Jews. Fleeing persecution and oppression in Europe, they largely settled in Beaumont. Dutch immigrants accounted for another sliver of the immigrant population. Beginning in 1897, around 100 Dutch immigrants arrived and settled in Nederland as part of Arthur Stillwell's railroad and land development scheme. (See Land-Use Patterns and Community Development below for a discussion on the founding of Nederland).

Agriculture

After the Civil War, farmers and ranchers slowly recovered. Pre-war farming trends generally continued under Reconstruction, as a majority of the county's farmers practiced subsistence farming. In the place of enslaved labor, some farmers adopted a system of sharecropping, allowing a tenant to work the land in return for a share of the crops. Farm owners could abuse the system though, providing scant wages or even withholding wages from tenants. Some freedmen and women entered sharecropping after the war, working for their former enslavers. While some African Americans remained sharecroppers or tenant farmers, census records from the period reveal that some Black residents in Jefferson County owned their own farms. The majority of farmers and ranchers though were White; according to the 1900 census, only 88 (14 percent) of the county's 630 farmers were Black.[23]

In the two decades following the war, farmers and ranchers slowly increased the amount of farm acreage in the county. Farmers grew a variety of crops including rice, corn, sweet potatoes, and some cotton, while cattle and milk cows accounted for much of the county's livestock. By the 1890s, though, agricultural practices began shifting as new technology and transportation systems aided farmers and ranchers. New steam-powered equipment, including tractors, threshers, and combines supplemented and replaced some animal-powered equipment, while railroads opened new markets (Figure 22). One of the biggest developments, though, was the advent of irrigation systems in the county, opening up more land for farming and improving existing farmland and crop yields. While all farmers and crops benefited from the system developed in the 1890s, rice farmers in particular saw an increase in their harvest yields.



Figure 22. A rice thresher on the Port Arthur Irrigation Company's farm around 1902. The thresher was one of the advancements that farmers used in the late nineteenth century to increase crop yields. Source: Thomas U. Taylor, "Irrigation Systems of Texas," Department of the Interior, United States Geological Survey (Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1902), 97.

Real Estate Promotion and Agriculture

In addition to railroads and town, irrigation, and port development, Arthur Stilwell was also involved in agriculture. As part of the promotion for the railroad and town development, Stilwell organized the Port Arthur Experimental Farm on 200 acres south of Nederland in 1895. The goal was to determine what crops and animals did well in the area and use that information to attract settlers to Nederland - the agricultural community he envisioned. A Dutch bulb grower and horticulturist came from the Netherlands to work on the farm and serve as a guide for the Dutch settlers. Among the various plants, vegetables, and fruit and nut trees grown on the farm, an 1897 report indicated success with cotton, rice, asparagus, tobacco, as well as pear, olive, and fig trees.[24] The farm also experimented with a variety of non-fruit-bearing trees and determined that umbrella china trees should be planted on the front lawns of the houses in Nederland.[25] Stilwell had a thousand trees brought over from Europe, though very few of these remain.

RICE AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF IRRIGATION SYSTEMS

Farmers in Jefferson County had grown rice since the mid-nineteenth century, though yields fluctuated since the type of rice grown, dubbed "Providence Rice," relied on good weather and the right amount of rain. By the late 1880s, with the benefit of steam-powered equipment, farmers began producing larger, commercial rice yields grown on several hundreds of acres. Despite these larger yields, without a reliable source of water, farmers across the county were unable to realize the potential of rice as a commercial crop.

Between 1898 and 1902, private companies and individuals built hundreds of miles of main and lateral irrigation canals, primarily in eastern and southern Jefferson County (Figure 23). Pulling water from the

Neches River and its tributaries, Taylor Bayou, Hillebrandt Bayou, and Pine Island Bayou, the canal systems provided irrigation to roughly 44,380 acres in proximity to these waterways.[26] The systems consisted of canals, flumes, lifts, and one or multiple steam-powered pumping stations (Figure 24). Smaller, privately owned systems, like the Gill system on Taylor Bayou, irrigated between 400 and 600 acres and cost around $5,000.[27] Willard G. Lovell, using mules and manpower, dug his own system: three-and-a-half miles of main canal and three miles of lateral canals capable of irrigating 850 acres.[28] When he added a pumping system along the banks of Taylor Bayou, Lovell created Lovell Lake, one of several such reservoirs created as a result of the development of irrigation systems in the county (see Figure 23).

The irrigation companies had larger systems, costing up to $135,000 and irrigating between 2,000 and 12,000 acres.[29] In addition to the irrigation systems, the irrigation companies also owned rice farms serviced by their systems. Some companies, like McFaddin and Weiss, farmed their own land or sold it outright to settlers, while other companies entered into various rental agreements with settlers and farmers. The Jefferson County Rice Company sold its more than 10,000 acres of farmland south of Taylor Bayou to settlers on the crop-payment plan. Under this agreement, settlers paid $20 to $25 per acre-and-a-half and in return gave the company half their crop yield until the debt was erased.[30] Other companies, including the Port Arthur Rice and Irrigation Company and the Beaumont Irrigation Company—the largest in the county—rented land and charged for water. Under this system, the Beaumont Irrigation Company, which drew water from Pine Island Bayou, charged "2 sacks (162 pounds) an acre for water alone and 2 additional sacks where the company rents the land, making a total of 4 sacks an acre where both land and water are rented."[31] Though the full impact of the irrigation systems was not felt until the twentieth century, farmers and companies began seeing the benefit of irrigation by the end of the 1890s, putting Jefferson County rice farmers "first [in Texas] in extent of acreage and in successful cultivation."[32]

In areas outside the irrigation systems' reach, particularly in western and northwestern Jefferson County near Nome, Hamshire, and China, farmers relied on wells for watering crops. In Hamshire, farmers' steam-powered pumps drew from wells between 81 to more than 200 feet deep, irrigating between 120 to 300 acres.[33] Near China, a system of around five wells, owned by individual farmers, irrigated 875 acres of farmland.[34] Land in this part of the county, while producing lower crop yields, was also more affordable, selling for between $5 to $15 per acre, as opposed to $25 to $40 per acre serviced by the irrigation systems.[35]

In response to the rising rice harvests in the county—acreage rose from only 1,500 acres in 1891 to 43,000 acres in 1900—a thriving rice milling industry emerged.[36] By the turn of the century, Jefferson County was home to half of the state's rice mills. Often owned by the irrigation and farm companies, the mills opened in eastern Jefferson County. While the majority of the mills opened in Beaumont, other cities, including Port Arthur and Nederland, opened mills in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Figure 25).



FIG. 20.—Map showing irrigation systems in the eastern half of the Beaumont section.

1. George Gill.
2. J. H. Garland.
3. J. C. Ward.
4. Jefferson County Rice Company.
5. J. H. Hoopes.
6. Lovell Brothers.
7. Ed. Moore.
8. Gulf Rice Growing Company.
9. Southern Rice and Trust Company.
10. C. A. Place.
11. Mr. Davis.
12. Schumacher & Fox.
13. Cameron & McClure.
14. Viterbo Brothers.
15. Beaumont Rice Company.
16. McFadden & Wiess Company.
17. Port Arthur Rice Company.
18. Des Moines Irrigation Company.
19. Cow Bayou Canal and Irrigation Company.

Figure 23. Map from around 1902 showing the location of the county's irrigation systems. Note the prevalence in eastern Jefferson County. Source: Thomas U. Taylor, "Irrigation Systems of Texas," Department of the Interior, United States Geological Survey (Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1902), 86.



Figure 24. The pumping station at the Jefferson County Rice Company around 1902. Companies and individuals in the late nineteenth century built similar pumping stations along the county's waterways to pull water into the canal systems. Source: Thomas U. Taylor, "Irrigation Systems of Texas," Department of the Interior, United States Geological Survey (Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1902), 97.



Figure 25. Postcard from 1912 of the McFaddin, Kyle and Weiss Rice Mill in Beaumont. The mill was one of several in the city that opened in the late nineteenth century as farmers in the county produced larger rice yields as a result of irrigation systems. Source: G. O. Schull, University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting McFaddin-Ward House Museum, accessed January 2, 2022, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth562721/.

CATTLE

Recovering from a loss in cattle during the Civil War—when numbers dropped from 51,638 in 1862 to 40,163 in 1865—ranchers also faced several complications and changes during the period.[37] Ranchers contended with anthrax outbreaks, one in 1886 and one in 1899, as well as tick-borne diseases. While the tick-borne disease known as Texas Fever predominantly struck counties north of Southeast Texas, Jefferson County ranchers felt the repercussions as restrictions on cattle shipments from Texas limited out-of-state markets. Severe weather also impacted the livestock numbers in the county, with a storm in 1865 and the hurricane in 1886 inundating grazing lands along the coast and killing cattle.[38] One of the biggest impacts to ranching, though, was the decline in grazing lands due in part to the adoption of barbed wire and pasture fencing and the loss of land to rice farmers. Barbed wire, invented in 1874 and sold in Texas by John Gates (of Port Arthur fame), grew more popular in the state in the late nineteenth century, all but ending the era of the open range. As irrigation systems developed in the 1890s, rice farmers also increasingly sowed more acreage in the southern coastal areas historically used for grazing. These farmers became strong proponents of fencing as a means of keeping cattle out of the cultivated fields.

Despite the obstacles, ranching was not all complications during this period. Before the completion of the railroad network, ranchers continued the practice of driving cattle to market. Each year ranchers rounded up their cattle for branding before making the trek to Louisiana via the Opelousas Trail. Upon construction of the railroads in the county in the 1880s, ranchers began shipping their cattle to market via rail, losing fewer heads along the way. Ranchers also used barbed wire to subdivide their lands. This effort helped improve pastures after years of overgrazing caused areas of pasture depletion.[39] Considering the various factors associated with ranching in this period, ranchers increased the county's

cattle numbers steadily after the war, maintaining around 47,000 head of cattle during the late nineteenth century.[40]

One of the largest cattle owners in the period was William Perry Herring McFaddin. Despite selling some land to the Port Arthur Townsite Company (which became Port Arthur), McFaddin ultimately acquired additional ranch land. In the 1870s, McFaddin joined with the Weiss brothers and Obadiah Kyle of Beaumont and organized the Beaumont Pasture Company. The company purchased land in south Jefferson County with the intent of stocking it with cattle.[41] McFaddin ultimately acquired the land shortly after Kyle died and the Weiss brothers instead focused on milling.[42] In addition to the number of cattle he kept—3,000 in 1880—McFaddin was reportedly also the first rancher in the county to fence his land, erecting a fence from the Neches River to Rodair Gully (near FM 365 and Jade Avenue) in 1878.[43]

Lumber and Sawmilling Industry

One of the first prosperous industries to emerge after the Civil War was the lumber and sawmilling industry. The industry began prior to the Civil War but entered into a period considered the "bonanza" era of lumber, in part fueled by demand for lumber and lumber products as a result of railroad construction, rebuilding after the war, and new town development in the county and Texas.[44] The booming industry not only served as an economic driver in the county, but it was also largely responsible for much of Jefferson County's population growth in the late nineteenth century.

Lumber and the Emergence of a Black Community in Beaumont

The booming sawmilling industry attracted an influx of workers to Jefferson County, many of them African American. By 1880, 55 percent of the sawmill labor force in the county was African American, many coming from farms in rural areas in and around Jefferson County.[45] As a result, Beaumont's Black population increased by 150 percent between 1860 and 1880, and new Black population nodes developed. Because a majority of the Black population worked at the sawmills, neighborhoods developed near the city's mills. Some companies, including the Reliance Lumber Company, had housing within their yard. Known as "Red Town" because the houses were painted red, a Black community developed within and along the roads to the yard in north and northwest Beaumont. In south Beaumont, near the Beaumont Lumber Company and Beaumont Sawmill, the South End Black (Charlton-Pollard neighborhood) community developed and would grow after the discovery of oil at Spindletop in 1901.[46] Additional Black neighborhoods developed in the twentieth century in Beaumont, but these early nodes formed the nuclei for the thriving African-American communities that contained their own business districts, medical facilities, schools, and churches. Outside of Beaumont, research did not reveal the emergence of similar Black lumber communities until the early twentieth century.

While new rail lines enabled more efficient shipping methods for moving timber to mills and lumber products to market, the pre-war practice of floating timber to mills downriver remained popular throughout the nineteenth century. Though Jefferson County had wooded areas along Pine Island Bayou and near Fannett, the lumber companies in this period primarily sourced their timber in counties to the north, including Jasper, Tyler, and Hardin. From the forests, companies shipped their lumber down the Neches River to mills in Jefferson County, where Beaumont emerged as the center of the industry. Other mills also operated sporadically in Port Neches and Sabine Pass during the period, but neither community rivaled Beaumont. By the turn of the century, six sawmills operated in and around Beaumont on the Neches River, cutting on average 300,000 board feet of wood, predominantly pine.[47] The county also had planing mills and sash and door plants. From the mills, wood products, including planed lumber, shingles, cross-ties, and bridges, were shipped out via rail and ship. By 1900, Beaumont ranked second in the state in the production of lumber products.[48]

Transportation Networks

RAILROADS

One of the most significant developments in Jefferson County after the Civil War was the construction of railroads. The two pre-war railroads had been abandoned or torn up for materials during the war, leaving the county without any railroad immediately after the war. By the end of the century, though, a network of railroads fanned outward from Beaumont in every direction (Figure 26).

The rebuilding of the railroad began in the late 1870s with the Texas and New Orleans Railroad. The first train ran on rebuilt track from Orange to Houston through northern Jefferson County in 1876, and by 1881, the line was extended east to New Orleans.[49] By 1883, with the completion of lines outside the county, the Texas and New Orleans Railroad became part of a major transcontinental route responsible for transporting both passengers and freight. The railroad added stops along the line in Buttfield (present-day Nome), Nashland (present-day China), Pine Island, and Amelia (within present-day Beaumont city limits).

The Texas and New Orleans Railroad expanded its holdings in 1882 by acquiring the Sabine and East Texas Railway. A year earlier, the company, originally named the East Texas Railway Company, completed lines between Beaumont and Sabine Pass and Beaumont and Kountze in Hardin County.[50] Railroad companies also built smaller, regional lines in the period. One such line was the Gulf, Beaumont and Kansas City, completed between 1896 between Beaumont and Kirbyville in Jasper County. The line, built by lumber baron John Kirby, was primarily a freight-lumber rail, but it also carried passengers into Beaumont.[51] Another regional line was the Gulf and Interstate Railway between Port Bolivar and Beaumont. Stops along this line included Hamshire, Fannett, and Cheek.

The Texas and New Orleans Railroad was not the only transcontinental railroad completed in the county during this period. Between 1895 and 1897, the Kansas City, Pittsburg and Gulf Railroad (KCP&G) (acquired by the Kansas City Southern Railway in 1900) completed its line from Kansas City, Missouri, to Port Arthur. The line was part of Arthur Stilwell's larger land- and port-development plan for Jefferson County. Stillwell, a spiritualist, author, railroad promoter, and town developer, arrived in Jefferson County from Kansas City, intent on establishing a shipping connection between the Midwest and the Gulf of Mexico. Using his railroad, the KCP&G, Stilwell aimed to connect Midwest farmers to a port on the Gulf Coast, opening new international markets for their goods. After a failed attempt at purchasing land from the Kountze family in Sabine Pass, Stilwell, under the corporate direction of the Port Arthur Townsite and Land Company, purchased 4,000 acres in 1895 for the new town and railroad terminus: Port Arthur.[52] Stilwell also ran his line through another townsite he helped develop: Nederland.

The rapid railroad construction of the late nineteenth century had immediate and long-term impacts on the growth of Jefferson County. As a result of the rail network, new markets opened, and existing ones were made more easily accessible, benefiting the county's agriculture, ports, and industries. The new transportation network also spurred the growth of existing communities, like Beaumont. Concentrated in and around the county seat and eastern Jefferson County, the railroads contributed to the city's importance and development as the county's commercial and industrial hub. The railroad also spurred the development of new communities in and outside of eastern Jefferson County (See the Land-Use Patterns and Community Development discussion).



Figure 26. Map of Jefferson County in 1898 showing land division. Note the number of tracts patented to railroad companies, as well as the early development (through subdivision of parcels) of rural communities including Hamshire and Fannett. The map also shows the railroad network that developed over the late nineteenth century. Stops along the lines are noted. Source: Pattillo Higgins, University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Texas General Land Office, accessed January 11, 2022, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth89195/.

Early Hunting and Sporting in Jefferson County

With the opening of the railroads, previously hard-to-reach hunting lands in the county grew more easily accessible. Prior to the railroads, the southern marshlands, known for their abundance of waterfowl and muskrats, were mostly restricted to locals due to inaccessibility. Coinciding with a growing business class with leisure time, the completion of rail lines, first to Sabine Pass and then to Port Arthur, facilitated a growing hunting and outdoor culture as sportsmen from Houston and across Southeast Texas traveled to Jefferson County (Figure 27). A small industry developed around hunting, as hired guides took hunters from Port Arthur and Sabine Pass to the marshlands via boats. Though hunting clubs would not organize until the twentieth century in Jefferson County, a hunting lodge for visiting sportsmen at Keith Lake may have been the first such building in the county, built around 1897 (not extant).[53]



Figure 27. Undated photograph of hunter, J. M. Beaty, standing with ducks. Throughout the period, outdoorsmen increasingly traveled via train to Jefferson County to hunt waterfowl in the southern marshlands. Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting the Port Arthur Public Library, accessed December 2, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth79156/.

PORT DEVELOPMENT

As early as the 1850s, government engineers recommended improvements to the Neches River and Sabine Lake to permit navigation of steamships. Despite the waterway's shallowness of depth in some areas, Sabine Pass emerged as an important port throughout the nineteenth century. Soft mud impacted early dredging attempts at Sabine Pass in the 1870s, but in 1882 the federal government approved the construction of jetties to protect the inlet and aid navigation.[54] Work on the jetties began

almost immediately and continued for roughly four decades, completed in the 1920s. At the time construction began, not only was Sabine Pass the county's second-largest city, but the completion of new rail lines and the jetty construction all suggested continued growth for the city and port.

The first blow to Sabine Pass was the hurricane of 1886. Hitting the city in October, the hurricane killed 86 people and destroyed all but two of the city's 77 residences.[55] The storm, in addition to its destruction, highlighted Sabine Pass's vulnerability to hurricanes and contributed to the town's decline. The second blow was the founding of Port Arthur. Originally wanting to end his rail line in Sabine Pass, Stilwell, unable to reach a deal with the Kountze family, settled on land to the north in what is now Port Arthur. From the new townsite emerged a port that rivaled Sabine Pass.

To develop Port Arthur into an official seaport and major shipping and commercial center, Stilwell realized the necessity of a deep-water canal. In 1899, the Army Corps of Engineers and Stilwell's KCP&G completed a 25-foot-deep channel along the west side of Sabine Lake from Taylor Bayou to Sabine Pass (Figure 28). The channel represented the first major improvement to the waterway and was a necessary first step in the development of Port Arthur and Beaumont as significant Texas port cities. The completion of the channel, opposed by citizens in Sabine Pass who argued the dredging for the project would impair their harbor, also shifted money and importance to Port Arthur and away from its southern neighbor. Sabine Pass maintained its port status through the end of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century, though subsequent hurricanes in 1900 and 1915 and continued growth and investment in Port Arthur diminished its port activity and significance.



Figure 28. Men celebrating the completion of the deepwater canal at Port Arthur in 1899. The channel was the first major improvement to the waterway. Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting the Museum of the Gulf Coast, accessed January 11, 2022, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth201917/.

Land-Use Patterns and Community Development

EASTERN JEFFERSON COUNTY

Due to the prevalence of industry centered in and around Beaumont, the city experienced significant growth in the late nineteenth century. Already the government, commercial, and entertainment center of the county, industrial prosperity only strengthened its status as the county's principal city. As mills opened along the railroad lines and river between 1880 and the late 1890s, Beaumont's population rose from 1,600 to 9,000. Development mimicked the population growth as two postwar building booms, one in the 1870s and one in the 1890s, filled in downtown and residential areas.[56]

> ***Learn More!*** *Read about the development of Beaumont in the Beaumont Commercial Historic District National Register nomination and boundary and period of significance increase: https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/NR/pdfs/78002959/78002959.pdf and https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/NR/pdfs/07000892/07000892.pdf.*

The other large development of note was Port Arthur. Founded in 1895 by Arthur Stilwell, as part of his railroad and land development scheme, the city boasted 900 residents by 1900. In addition to its businesses, Port Arthur, by design, also had sites of recreation and entertainment, including Pleasure Pier, a 2,000-foot-long pier over Sabine Lake with restaurants and a natatorium. By the end of the century, John Gates, a Chicago businessman and barbed wire promoter, supplanted Stilwell as head of the railroad and oversaw the continued development of the bustling city.

> ***Learn More!*** *Read about the founding and development of Port Arthur in the Port Arthur Downtown Historic District National Register nomination: https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/NR/pdfs/100006046/100006046.pdf.*

Meanwhile, existing communities in eastern Jefferson County—Sabine Pass and Port Neches (Grigsby's Bluff)—remained relatively small. As previously discussed, Sabine Pass, despite early growth, suffered as a result of the 1886 hurricane and the founding of Port Arthur. With 460 residents in 1880, Sabine Pass only had 363 residents in 1900.[57] Port Neches maintained fewer than 100 residents throughout the nineteenth century. Bypassed by the railroads, Port Neches was rooted in agriculture and to a lesser extent milling, boasting a gristmill and shingle mill on the river at various times in the nineteenth century. A small commercial node with a grocery store was also established in what is known as Old Town Port Neches.[58]

Southeast of Port Neches, Arthur Stilwell's Port Arthur Townsite Company and the Port Arthur Land Company laid out the new community of Nederland around 1897. As part of the railroad promotion for Stilwell's KCP&G, he envisioned Nederland as a Dutch agricultural community. Named for the Dutch investors who provided Stilwell with capital for the construction of his railroad, Nederland was meant to stimulate development, population growth, and business along the new rail line while also creating money through the sale of land. The company promoted the town in the Netherlands, as well as in Dutch communities in Michigan and Iowa.[59] On present-day Boston Avenue, a three-story hotel, the Orange Hotel (not extant) opened along with two stores (not extant).[60] By the end of the nineteenth century, roughly 100 Dutch settlers arrived, most engaged in rice, truck, and dairy farming. The house at 505 North 12th Street—currently Broussard's Mortuary—is one of the few extant houses from the nineteenth century in Nederland (Figure 29). A two-story Classical Revival residence, the house was presumably one of the grander and larger homes built in Nederland during this period.

Despite their relatively small populations, both Port Neches and Nederland opened schools in the late nineteenth century. In Port Neches, a small school may have opened as early as 1860, but otherwise, education continued in private residences until the 1880s when small private schools opened first at Lee and Marion Streets and then on Sycamore Street.[61] In the 1890s, as the school grew crowded and in need of repairs, a local donated land for the construction of a new building (not extant, was located at the site of the First National Bank building). The building functioned as both a school and church, hosting

local Methodist and Baptist congregations (Figure 30).[62] In Nederland, a school was part of Stilwell's vision for the community, particularly since the majority of children needed to learn English. Behind the hotel, a one-room building served as the local school until 1900 when a hurricane destroyed the building.[63]



Figure 29. The house at 505 North 12th Street—currently Broussard's Mortuary—is one of the few extant houses from the nineteenth century in Nederland. Source: HHM, 2022.



Figure 30. The building completed at Nall and Port Neches Avenues in Port Neches served as both a school and church between 1894 and 1911 (not extant). Source: "A History of the Port Neches Independent School District," Port Neches-Groves Independent School District, 5, accessed November 30, 2021, https://www.pngisd.org/domain/11.

RURAL JEFFERSON COUNTY

Outside of eastern Jefferson County, farmers and ranchers slowly continued settling in the sparsely populated lands. The 1862 map of the county shows that much of the land in the western half of the county, particularly removed from the waterways, remained in state control or had been patented to a railroad company for improvements (Figure 31). By 1898, very little change in regard to the division of land occurred, with the exception of railroad companies, in particular the Texas and New Orleans, having accumulated more patents (see Figure 26). While much of the land remained unsettled, the 1898 map does show the early development of several rural communities, while also providing insight into sites of future community development. Built around 1899, the property at 600 Blanch Road in China is an example of an early settler's homestead (Figure 32).

Directly associated with the new railroad lines in the county, small population nodes took root. Along the Gulf and Interstate, the nuclei of Fannett and Hamshire were both formed by 1898. As stops on the railroad, Fannett began after a general store opened near the tracks in the mid-1890s, while Hamshire's start began when it received a post office in 1897.[64] Cheek, another stop on the line, would be laid out in the early twentieth century. Similarly, along the rebuilt Texas and New Orleans line, the rural communities of China (originally named Nashland) and Nome (originally named Buttfield) were founded as water stops in the late nineteenth century.

For these communities, nineteenth-century development was generally limited to a post office and/or store, or nothing at all, though several newspaper accounts reveal an ice plant opened in 1898 in Hamshire in support of a local dairy farm.[65] Otherwise, farmers and ranchers living in and around these railroad stops remained fairly isolated. As in the early settlement period, education occurred in private residences and circuit priests and pastors primarily provided religious services. One exception was the Catholic church built in Hamshire around 1898. On one acre donated by local landowners Lovan and Azema Hamshire, the church served the area until it burned in 1960.[66] Despite the early formation of these rural communities, much of the community development and population growth occurred in the twentieth century. Typically, the only extant resources associated with early settlement include cemeteries.



Figure 31. Map of Jefferson County in 1862 showing land divisions and ownership. Note that much of the land in the western part of the county, particularly removed from the waterways, remained in state control or was patented to railroad companies. The southern marshy areas also remained unclaimed. Source: Texas General Land Office, General Map Collection, accessed November 2, 2021, https://historictexasmaps.com/collection/search-results/3727-map-of-jefferson-county-general-map-collection.



Figure 32. Photo of 600 Blanch Road in China. This property is a clear example of an early settler's homestead. Source: HHM, 2022.

ENDNOTES

[1] "A History of Jefferson County, Texas," Jefferson County Historical Commission, 9, accessed November 3, 2021, https://co.jefferson.tx.us/historical_commission/pdfjs/web/viewer.html?file=files/History/Jefferson_County_History_2015-12-03.pdf.

[2] "A History of Jefferson County, Texas," 9.

[3] "A History of Jefferson County, Texas," 9.

[4] W. T. Block, "Area Civil War period marked by hard times," *Beaumont Enterprise*, October 30, 1999, http://www.wtblock.com/wtblockjr/hard_times.htm.

[5] Block, "Area Civil War period marked by hard times."

[6] "A History of Jefferson County, Texas," 11.

[7] "A History of Jefferson County, Texas," 50-51.

[8] Robert Wooster, "Fort Griffin," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed January 03, 2022, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/fort-griffin-QCF06.

[9] Gabriel Culver, "Sabine Pass Battleground," East Texas History, accessed January 3, 2022, https://easttexashistory.org/items/show/152.

[10] Alwyn Barr, "Sabine Pass, Battle of," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed January 03, 2022, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/sabine-pass-battle-of.

[11] Barr, "Sabine Pass, Battle of."

[12] Wooster, "Fort Griffin."

[13] "Spanish-American War Fortifications," Official Texas Historical Marker, Atlas Number 5245010568, 1983, atlas.thc.state.tx.us.

[14] Carl H. Moneyhon, "Reconstruction," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed October 14, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/reconstruction.

[15] Jean Carefoot, "Narrative History of Texas Secession and Readmission to the Union," Texas State Library and Archives, published April 1997, last modified August 25, 2011, https://www.tsl.texas.gov/ref/abouttx/secession/index.html.

[16] "An Act to admit the State of Texas to Representation in the Congress of the United States, March 30, 1870," Texas State Library and Archives, https://www.tsl.texas.gov/ref/abouttx/secession/30march1870.html.

[17] "African-American Legislators of 19th Century," Texas Almanac, accessed October 14, 2021, https://texasalmanac.com/topics/history/african-american-legislators-19th-century.

[18] U. S. Census Bureau, *Bulletin 49, Population of Texas by Counties: 1890 and 1900,* 1900, 12, https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/decennial/1900/bulletins/demographic/49-population-tx.pdf.

[19] Terry G. Jordan, "A Century and a Half of Ethnic Change in Texas, 1836-1986" *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 89, no. 4 (1986): 402, from JSTOR, accessed February 4, 2021.

[20] Judith Linsley, "African-American neighborhoods grew where the people worked," Stephen F. Austin State University, Center for Regional Heritage Research, May 2014, https://www.sfasu.edu/heritagecenter/9191.asp.

[21] "A History of Jefferson County, Texas," 58.

[22] W. T. Block, "Rice Still Dominates Jefferson County Agriculture," *Beaumont Enterprise*, May 29, 1999, http://www.wtblock.com/WtblockJr/ricefarming.htm.

[23] U. S. Census Bureau, "Agriculture – Texas," 1900, 642, https://agcensus.library.cornell.edu/wp-content/uploads/41033898v7ch6.pdf.

[24] W. T. Block, "Tulip Transplants to East Texas: The Dutch Migration to Nederland, Port Arthur, and Winnie, 1895-1915," East Texas Historical Journal 13, no. 2 (October 1975): 38. https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/ethj/vol13/iss2/7.

[25] W. T. Block, "Tulip Transplants to East Texas: The Dutch Migration to Nederland, Port Arthur, and Winnie, 1895-1915," East Texas Historical Journal 13, no. 2 (October 1975): 38. https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/ethj/vol13/iss2/7.

[26] Thomas U. Taylor, "Irrigation Systems of Texas," Department of the Interior, United States Geological Survey (Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1902), 88.

[27] Taylor, "Irrigation Systems of Texas," 89.

[28] Taylor, "Irrigation Systems of Texas," 92.

[29] Taylor, "Irrigation Systems of Texas," 95.

[30] Taylor, "Irrigation Systems of Texas," 91.

[31] Taylor, "Irrigation Systems of Texas," 95.

[32] Taylor, "Irrigation Systems of Texas," 87.

[33] Taylor, "Irrigation Systems of Texas," 97.

[34] Taylor, "Irrigation Systems of Texas," 97.

[35] *Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide for 1904*, from the University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Texas State Historical Association, 299, accessed November 10, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth123779/.

[36] Denise Gomez, "First Providence, Then Prosperity: A Brief History of Beaumont's Rice Culture," *Houston History Magazine,* July 2016, 6, https://houstonhistorymagazine.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Beaumont-.pdf.

[37] W. T. Block, "Early Livestock Industry," *A History of Jefferson County, Texas*, accessed January 7, 2021, http://www.wtblock.com/wtblockjr/History%20of%20Jefferson%20County/Chapter%2011.htm.

[38] Block, "Early Livestock Industry."

[39] Arlene Christiansen, "McFaddin Ranches," *McFaddin-Ward Viewpoints* 35, no. 4 (2019), 6, https://mcfaddin-ward.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/2019-09_Viewpoints.pdf.

[40] Block, "Early Livestock Industry."

[41] Block, "Early Livestock Industry."

[42] Block, "Early Livestock Industry."

[43] Christiansen, "McFaddin Ranches," 6.

[44] Robert S. Maxwell, "Lumber Industry," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed January 05, 2022, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/lumber-industry.

[45] Judith Linsley, "African-American neighborhoods grew where the people worked," Stephen F. Austin State University, Center for Regional Heritage Research, May 2014, https://www.sfasu.edu/heritagecenter/9191.asp.

[46] Linsley, "African-American neighborhoods grew where the people worked."

[47] *Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide for 1904*, 299.

[48] Darrel L. McDonald and David Kulhavy, Daniel R. Unger, and Paul R. Blackwell, "The Sawmill's Role in East Texas Development," *East Texas Historical Journal* 54, issue 1 (2016), 44. https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/ethj/vol54/iss1/6.

[49] "Texas and New Orleans Railroad," Jefferson County, Texas, accessed December 2, 2021, https://sites.rootsweb.com/~txjeffer/PLACES/Railroads/tx_no_rr.htm.

[50] Nancy Young, "Sabine and East Texas Railway," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed January 04, 2022, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/sabine-and-east-texas-railway.

[51] S. G. Reed, "Gulf, Beaumont and Kansas City Railway," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed January 04, 2022, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/gulf-beaumont-and-kansas-city-railway.

[52] Erin Tyson, "Port Arthur Downtown Historic District," National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, Texas Historical Commission, Austin, December 2020, 8-15, https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/NR/pdfs/100006046/100006046.pdf.

[53] R. K. Sawyer, *A Hundred Years of Texas Waterfowl Hunting: The Decoys, Guides, Clubs, and Places: 1870s to 1970s* (College Station, Texas: Texas A&M University Press, 2012) 90.

[54] Lynn M. Alperin, *Custodians of the Coast: History of the United States Army Engineers at Galveston* (Galveston, Texas: United States Army Corps of Engineers, 1977) 64.

[55] "1886 Hurricane at Sabine Pass," Official Texas Historical Marker, Atlas Number 5245012425, 2001, atlas.thc.state.tx.us.

[56] Joe Williams and David Hoffman, "Beaumont Commercial District," National Register of Historic Places Inventory/Nomination Form, Texas Historical Commission, Austin, 1978, 8-2 and 8-3, https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/NR/pdfs/78002959/78002959.pdf.

[57] Robert Wooster, "Sabine Pass, TX," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed January 04, 2022, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/sabine-pass-tx.

[58] "A History of the Port Neches Independent School District," Port Neches-Groves Independent School District, 4, accessed November 30, 2021, https://www.pngisd.org/domain/11.

[59] W. T. Block, "Tulip Transplants to East Texas: The Dutch Migration to Nederland, Port Arthur, and Winnie, 1895-1915," East Texas Historical Journal 13, no. 2 (October 1975): 37. https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/ethj/vol13/iss2/7.

[60] Block, "Tulip Transplants to East Texas," 38.

[61] "A History of the Port Neches Independent School District," Port Neches-Groves Independent School District, 3-4, accessed November 30, 2021, https://www.pngisd.org/domain/11.

[62] "A History of the Port Neches Independent School District," 4.

[63] W. T. Block, "Part 1: Nederland Schools from 1898 Until 1950: A History of Nederland Education and the Nederland Independent School District," accessed December 22, 2021, http://www.wtblock.com/wtblockjr/education_history.htm.

[64] Robert Wooster, "Fannett, TX," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed January 05, 2022, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/fannett-tx.; Robert Wooster, "Hamshire, TX," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed January 05, 2022, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/hamshire-tx.

[65] "Made Ice Yesterday," *Beaumont Journal*, September 24, 1898, 8.

[66] "Hamshire-Beaudreaux-Arceneaux," historical markers, Jefferson County Historical Commission, 16, accessed November 2, 2021, https://co.jefferson.tx.us/historical_commission/pdfjs/web/viewer.html?file=files/markers/10533.pdf?Marker%20No.=10533.

THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY: 1900–1940

In 1900, Jefferson County had an established robust economy based on logging, agriculture, and transportation of goods via the railroad and ships. The discovery of oil at Spindletop in 1901, however, completely transformed the economy and development of the county. By World War II, Jefferson County was among the petrochemical leaders in Texas. Along with advances in agriculture and the expanded transportation network built over the period, Jefferson County experienced a period of rapid population growth that saw new nodes of development and urbanization. These locale-specific events were influenced by various national political shifts and events. Among these were immigration policies, the Good Roads Movement, World War I, and the Great Depression – each impacting the demographics and development of Jefferson County in various ways.

POPULATION DEMOGRAPHICS

Between 1900 and 1940, Jefferson County experienced tremendous growth, adding over 130,000 new residents, a nearly 920 percent gain. The most significant growth occurred in the first decade of the twentieth century, after the discovery of oil at Spindletop. As the county's economy grew with rapid industrialization and increased agricultural production, each subsequent decade saw an increase in population, as new residents sought job opportunities in the county. Though the population growth significantly slowed during the 1930s and the Great Depression, Jefferson County still added over 10,000 residents over the decade.

Table 3. U. S. Census statistics for Jefferson County showing population growth and demographic breakdowns between 1900 and 1940. Note that census statistics are subject to error, and census methodologies for recording race and ethnicity were inconsistent from decade to decade.

Year	Total	Growth Rate	White		Black		Foreign Born		Hispanic Origin	
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1900	14,289	144%	10,290	72.0	3,942	27.6	947	6.6	-	-
1910	38,182	167%	27,482	71.9	10,676	27.9	2,672	7.0	-	-
1920	73,120	91%	49,687	67.9	19,580	26.8	3,081	4.2	-	-
1930	133,391	82%	97,453	73.1	33,027	24.8	3,541	2.7	-	-
1940	145,329	9%	107,933	74.3	33,821	23.3	3,519	2.4	-	-

White and Black residents contributed to the county's growth nearly evenly; the White population consistently accounted for around 70 percent of the county's total population, and the Black population consistently accounted for around 25 percent of the county's total population, many of them living in the county's largest cities, Beaumont and Port Arthur. Cajuns from Louisiana accounted for a considerable portion of the White growth, as they continued migrating to Jefferson County during this period. With fewer job opportunities in Louisiana, many came to Jefferson County for its many industry jobs in the oil fields, refineries, and shipyards. Some also left Louisiana and worked as farmers. So many Cajuns migrated to Jefferson County and Southeast Texas during this period that the region earned the moniker "Cajun Lapland."[1] Small numbers of second-generation European Americans also moved to Jefferson County. Among them were some Swedish Americans from the Midwest who settled outside the county's urban areas and engaged in farming.[2] Black residents also came to Jefferson County for work opportunities. The industrialization and urbanization in eastern Jefferson County provided a number of unskilled and manual labor jobs in the two largest cities. Black residents also worked in the lumber industry. Throughout the period, the majority—over 90 percent in 1940—of the county's Black population lived in Beaumont and Port Arthur.[3]

One small segment of the population, despite more than tripling in number, incrementally accounted for a smaller percentage of the county's population throughout the period. The percentage of foreign-born residents grew in the first decade of the twentieth century and declined over each subsequent decade until 1940. During the first decade of growth, small numbers of Dutch farmers continued trickling in and around Nederland in the first few years of the 1900s, as did some Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe who primarily settled in Beaumont, where a small Jewish community was developing. As in the late nineteenth century, Russian and Eastern European Jewish immigrants in the early twentieth century fled Europe to escape persecution, oppression, and state-sponsored murder.[4] Small numbers of Mexicans also settled in Jefferson County as part of a larger wave of Mexican migration to the United States between 1910 and 1930, during and immediately following the Mexican Revolution. During this period the U. S. census did not report the number of "Hispanic" residents, but records reveal Mexicans in Jefferson County working as laborers on farms, as well as in plants like the Union Sulphur Company plant in Sabine.[5] Mexicans also worked in the refineries, replacing men drafted during World War I.[6]

The other foreign-born population of note is the Japanese, first arriving in Jefferson County in the early twentieth century for rice farming. Invited by the U. S. government and welcomed by municipalities and local chambers of commerce in Southeast Texas, Japanese men came to the region in search of economic advancement. (See the discussion that follows on the rice industry for more information). Though Texas was home to fewer than 400 Japanese individuals in 1910, growing xenophobia and nationalism at both the state and national level led to the passage of new laws that significantly curtailed immigration in the early 1920s. In 1921 Texas passed the Alien Land Law, prohibiting foreign-born Japanese people from purchasing or leasing any additional farmland.[7] The subsequent passage of the federal Immigration Act of 1924, which limited the number of immigrants allowed into the United States and particularly targeted the Japanese, essentially ended Japanese immigration to Jefferson County and contributed to the return of Japanese in the county to their home country. In Jefferson County, the number of Japanese was likely less than 100.

AGRICULTURE

The twentieth century ushered in a new era of farming in Jefferson County. For much of the previous century, with several exceptions, farmers grew crops primarily for subsistence, and outputs were generally small. The groundwork laid in the late nineteenth century—including the completion of canals for irrigation and the opening of northern markets with the completion of the Kansas City Southern Railway—led to large-scale agricultural production in Jefferson County. Over the subsequent four decades, the growing population, mechanization of agriculture, and expanded transportation and irrigation and drainage networks created more agricultural lands, facilitating increased livestock and crop revenues. During this period, the number of farms and land devoted to agriculture increased in Jefferson County. As a result, productivity of livestock and many crops reached their historic highs (Tables 4-5).[8]

Table 4. Table showing the increase in farms over the period. Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture Census of Agriculture Historical Archive, 1900-1940, https://agcensus.library.cornell.edu/.

Year	No. Farms
1900	360
1910	586
1920	419
1925	651
1940	1,616

Table 5. Chart showing the increase in agricultural land in Jefferson County between 1850 and 1969. Improved acreage in blue and unimproved acreage in green. Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture Census of Agriculture Historical Archive, 1850-1969, https://agcensus.library.cornell.edu/.



The expanded agricultural production in the county also saw the opening of more mills—grain, corn, feed, and rice—along with gins, canneries, creameries, and produce dealers. While the farmers in Jefferson County generally lived in the central, western, northern, and eastern areas outside of the urban areas, the mills, gins, and dealers were by-in-large confined to Beaumont and Port Arthur. Outside those cities, Nederland at various times in the period was home to the Nederland Rice Company and the Nederland Grain Company.

As in the previous period, farm tenancy remained common in the early twentieth century. While tenancy dropped across much of the state during this period, tenancy fluctuated in Jefferson County, increasing significantly in the 1900s, before declining and increasing again during the Great Depression. Farm tenancy increased so much during the Great Depression that the number of owner-operated farmers and tenant farms were nearly equal.[9]

> ***Learn more!*** *Read about tenant farming in Texas: https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/farm-tenancy.*

Truck and Fruit Farming

Though rice was the leading commercial crop grown in the county, farmers also grew a variety of crops both supplementally and independently of rice. Truck farming—small-acreage farms that grew a variety of fruits, vegetables, and nuts—was popular across the county until the late 1930s. Some produce—particularly cabbage and potatoes—was shipped to markets outside the state, but most was consumed in-county and sold at stores in Beaumont and Port Arthur.[10]

Throughout the period, and particularly during periods of decline in the rice industry, farmers also grew cotton, sugar cane, pecans, and figs, and experimented with crops including citrus plants. These crops, particularly cotton, sugar cane, and figs, proved important in the county's agriculture economy. Accounting for a significant portion of the county's crop output, historian W. T. Block, Jr. recalled fields of cotton lining present-day US 90 to the north and orchards of fig trees to the south between Amelia and China.[11] Citrus on the other hand was grown with varying degrees of success. Farmers first planted around 40,000 orange and tangerine trees in the county in 1910 on the recommendation of the U. S. Department of Agriculture after a period of decline in the rice industry.[12] Farmers continued planting citrus plants into the 1920s, though many were thwarted by periods of unseasonable cold before largely abandoning the orchards late in the period. Sugar cane proved more successful in Jefferson County. By the 1910s, Jefferson County produced enough sugar cane that around five small sugar mills opened in Port Neches and Nederland. By 1940 sugar was one of the county's top crops, with farmers having more than doubled the number of pounds of sugar cane grown since 1910.[13] Farmers also found success with fig trees. Around 1910, farmers planted approximately 50,000 fig trees in and around Amelia (present-day Beaumont), Cheek, and Hamshire, and by the late 1910s and early 1920s, Jefferson County had several fig canning plants.[14] Though Beaumont claimed most of the plants, one of the fig canning companies in the city also operated a cannery in Hamshire. Opened in 1924, the Beaumont-Hamshire Fig Company plant was owned by around 25 fig growers in the county and produced up to $120,000 worth of preserved figs throughout the 1920s (Figure 33).[15] Labeled "Texas Pride," the canned figs from the plant were primarily sent to cities on the East Coast.[16]

The Great Depression, combined with other factors including overproduction and blight, saw the decline of some crops, including figs and cotton – a trend that continued into the latter half of the twentieth century. Even so, by 1940, farming remained an essential economic sector in Jefferson County and employed a majority of the population outside of Beaumont and Port Arthur.



Hamshire Fig Preserving Plant Does $100,000 Trade First Year

Interior View of Hamshire Fig Preserving Plant.

Figure 33. Interior view of the fig preserving plant built in Hamshire in the early 1920s. Source: *Beaumont Enterprise*, November 8, 1925, 51.

Rice

In 1900, Jefferson County produced less than 10,000 pounds of rice and by 1940, near the industry's peak, farmers harvested over 100,000,000 pounds, or 2 million bushels.[17] Annually, farmers devoted 40,000 to 100,000 acres of land to rice, accounting for more than half of the county's improved farmland some years (Figure 34). Throughout the period, Jefferson County was among the state's top rice producing counties—the top in 1940—as well as one of the country's top rice producers.[18] Mechanization was a significant factor in the growth of the rice industry during this period. New technology, including the combine harvester-thresher, previously used only for wheat, made harvesting and separating rice more efficient. Another advancement was the rice dryer, a machine used to dry wet rice before storing or milling. In 1930, the Texas Public Service Company of Beaumont erected the county's first rice dryer in Nome (replaced in the postwar period) (Figure 35).[19]

Despite advances in technology that aided growth, the rice industry and its farmers faced a number of difficulties. Factors, including overproduction, salination of canal water caused by the dredging of the Neches River, World War I, and the Great Depression all contributed to periods of decline. As a whole though, the industry weathered these storms and rebounded, aided by the new technology, as well as new seed, immigration of workers, improved irrigation and drainage, and farmer organization.



Figure 34. A farmer in a rice field with water-filled ditches. Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting the Museum of the Gulf Coast, accessed December 15, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth202443/.



Figure 35. The first rice dryer in Nome, built in 1930. Located along the railroad tracks, the facility was replaced in the postwar period. Source: William Daniel Smith, "Artificial Drying of Rice on the Farm" (U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1933): 12.

JAPANESE RICE FARMERS

One of the first significant factors was the arrival of Japanese immigrants in the county. Through a collaboration between the U. S. Department of Agriculture and the Japanese government, Japanese men arrived in Southeast Texas beginning in the early 1900s. Hoping the Japanese would invest in the state's rice industry, the U. S. government and local municipalities sought men with money—bankers, professionals, etc.—rather than farmers. These men would in turn hire Japanese farmers to come and work on their farms in the United States. The government hoped the rice seed brought over from Japan and the Japanese horticulture knowledge and experience would help Texas farmers, teaching them, among other things, how to grow rice in hurricane-prone areas (similar to typhoons in Japan).[20] The Japanese, believing Japan was on the verge of a food shortage caused by a population explosion, saw Texas as a refuge and possible source of food for Japan.[21] As a result, Japanese rice colonies popped up across Southeast Texas, including in Jefferson County (see Sidebar on Yoshio Mayumi). For nearly two decades, the Japanese rice colonies were largely successful, and the Houston chapter of the Japanese American Citizens League reported that the Japanese seed yielded two times as much rice in the first several years.[22] By the mid-1920s though, most of the Japanese farmers had returned to Japan, following the economic difficulties created by World War I and the immigration, naturalization, and property ownership restrictions placed on them by the Texas Alien Land Law and the Immigration Act of 1924.

Yoshio Mayumi

The historic rice industry present in Jefferson County attracted people from all over the world, including Japanese investor Yoshio Mayumi. On December 1, 1874, Yoshio Mayumi was born to the prominent Mayumi family in Tsukiji-machi, Tsu City, Mie Prefecture, Japan (Figure 36). Though the Mayumis' status as a powerful samurai family waned by the time of his birth, Yoshio was determined to become a successful businessman. At age 16, Yoshio traveled to Tokyo to attend Keio Gijuku, now known as Keio University, where he became specifically interested in overseas investments.

In the early twentieth century, Mayumi arrived in Texas from Japan after learning the potential of rice growing in the area. Mayumi surveyed different plots of land, eventually purchasing 1,734.43 acres of land in Fannett in Jefferson County. Mayumi then hired Japanese contract workers to farm the land, which proved to be difficult manual labor. His younger brother Yasuo joined him soon after, and together they solved labor issues and

improved efficiency. They built a large, three-story house with quarters for laborers and roads and irrigation pumps to match the machine-powered rice farms in Texas (no known buildings associated with Mayumi remain). By 1909, Mayumi's rice operation was the third-largest Japanese rice farm in Texas. Still, they initially faced some suspicion from the community in Fannett, most likely due to American anti-Asian sentiment at the time. To combat this, Yoshio and Yasuo made a concerted effort to be a part of the community by building a long, one-room dance hall where people from the area would come to socialize. The people of Fannett warmed to the Mayumi family and their hospitality, but the U. S. government would not mirror that welcome. Though the Mayumi farm survived the rice market collapse in 1920, the U. S. government became more and more hostile to Japanese immigrants, with the Texas legislature barring Japanese immigrants from buying land in 1921 and the U. S. Congress banning Japanese immigrants and foreign-born Japanese people from acquiring citizenship. Feeling that it was time to leave, Yoshio sold all 1,734.43 acres to brothers John Jay and George Burrell for $21,000. Yoshio left many of his furnishings and traditional Japanese kitchenware to his friends in Fannett. Until 2004, the road on which Mayumi lived was named Jap Road. Outside of Fannett, the 4.3-mile stretch of road was renamed Boondocks Road after advocacy groups, including the Japanese American Citizens League and the Anti-Defamation League, filed complaints.



Figure 36. Japanese rice farmer, Yoshio Mayumi. Source: Hellmut Klicker, "A Road in Texas," Hiraski.net, accessed January 10, 2021, http://hirasaki.net/Family_Stories/Mayumi/Mayumi_History.htm.

RICE FARMER ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATIONS

By 1905 and 1906, the rice harvest in Jefferson County's was so bountiful it resulted in an oversupply and subsequent drop in prices. The fall in rice prices caused the closure of several of the county's four rice mills, including the Nederland Rice Milling Corporation, organized just several years earlier.[23] Rice farmers were hurt further by the national recession in 1907 and increasing contamination of irrigation canals with salt water from deepening the Neches River, forcing some farmers out of the county or into other crops including cotton, figs, and sugar cane. Other rice farmers, in reaction to the setbacks of the early twentieth century, formed the Jefferson County Rice Farmers Association in 1906. The group met monthly, discussing "subjects of vital importance," including fertilizers, irrigation and cultivation

methods, and seeds.[24] In 1908, *The Standard Blue Book of Texas*, a who's who guide to Texas, called the association the "strongest independent organization of rice farmers in the United States."[25]

A reflection of their power, the county's rice growers, worried about increased dredging of the Neches River and saltwater encroachment in the canals, successfully attached a bond provision requiring the construction of a saltwater guard lock. If the City of Beaumont was to contribute to the project, they had to agree to a saltwater guard lock. One was constructed six miles above Port Arthur, and it worked for a time, but continuing work on the waterway proceeded to let saltwater into the canals. The lock was eventually removed in the 1950s. Despite its limited success, the investment in construction of the lock reflected the rice growers' influence and power.[26]

County rice growers could also join the Texas-Louisiana Ricer Farmers Association (organized in 1909), the Southern Ricer Growers Association (organized in 1910 with headquarters in Beaumont), and the American Rice Growers Cooperative Association (organized in 1921). These groups advised farmers on a variety of issues, including when to sell or hold on to crops. The rice growers' associations also worked with organizations including the U. S. Department of Agriculture and Texas A&M University, which opened a rice experiment farm in Amelia in 1909 (moved to a new location in Beaumont in 1945) (Figure 37). The experiment farm, which became Substation No. 4 of the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, helped the association and county rice farmers develop a new seed, when the Honduran and Japanese seeds commonly used began producing increasingly smaller and deteriorated yields.[27] The organization and cooperation between farmers and the government proved crucial in helping the industry weather subsequent rice crashes following World War I and during the Great Depression.



Figure 37. Image of the Amelia Experimental Farm from around 1920. Researchers and farmers at the station worked on improving rice propagation and varieties. The farm operated at the site in Amelia until 1945 when it outgrew the facilities. At that time the farm relocated to Beaumont where it remains. Source: *The School Review of Jefferson County, Texas,* published for the Schools of Jefferson County (1921): 36.

IRRIGATION AND DRAINAGE

One of the other critical pieces that benefited not only rice farmers, but all farmers in the county, was improved irrigation and drainage. In 1900, all the irrigation canals in the county were privately owned and primarily benefited farmers along Pine Island Bayou, Taylor Bayou, Hillebrandt Bayou, and the Neches River. Authorization by the Texas legislature in 1905 paved the way for the creation of publicly owned and operated drainage districts that would, among other things, open more land for irrigation and drainage, creating tillable land in areas previously untillable. In Jefferson County, the County Commissioners Court and voters agreed on the need for drainage districts for future development and agriculture in the county, establishing several districts during the period.[28]

The first drainage district in Jefferson County was Drainage District No. 3 in west central Jefferson County. A group of around 50 citizens in the Hamshire area petitioned the County Commissioners Court in 1912 to establish a drainage district, arguing the need for area farmers.[29] Voters approved the district in May 1912; it was only the third drainage district in the state.[30] Funded through the issuance of a bond and constructed in part with equipment borrowed from local farmers and ranchers, the drainage district widened and deepened area waterways and constructed ditches that improved drainage, reduced mosquitoes, and facilitated better farming (Figure 38).[31] A second drainage district, Drainage District No. 6, was established in 1920 in northern Jefferson County, encompassing Beaumont, China, Nome, Fannett, Cheek, and LaBelle.[32] The new drainage districts created new farmland across the county. In some instances, as demand for rice grew, some marshlands in the south were drained to make way for rice fields.

Water control in the county was further improved in 1933 with the establishment of the Lower Neches Valley Authority (LNVA). Created by the Texas legislature, the purpose of the LNVA was to store, control, and utilize the water of the lower Neches River. The water authority, which encompasses all of Jefferson, Hardin, and Tyler counties and parts of Jasper, Liberty, and Chambers counties, includes 400 miles of canals that supply water to towns, industries, and farmers in Jefferson County. The LNVA incorporated many of the privately owned canal systems from the late nineteenth century into their growing network and also built temporary saltwater barriers on Pine Island Bayou and the Neches River to stop the flow of saltwater into the irrigation canals (removed when a permanent barrier built in the 2000s).



Figure 38. Construction work on drainage ditches in Drainage District No. 3 in the 1910s. Source: Jefferson County Drainage District 3, accessed December 14, 2021, https://jcdd3.org/history/.

Livestock and Dairy

Following patterns set in the nineteenth century, small numbers of livestock grazed on farms across the county, while the majority of dairy farms were located in and around Nederland, and the county's larger

ranches generally occupied the southern part of the county, where the land was well suited for grazing. During this period, livestock numbers and values experienced significant growth, similar to farming. The number of livestock in the county reached its peak between 1935 and 1940, with pigs, poultry, and cattle all reaching their highest numbers in the last decade before World War II. Cattle—beef and dairy—were by far the most significant livestock in the county and in 1936, the county claimed to have "a greater number of cattle per square mile than any area in the United States."[33] Cattle also remained the most profitable livestock in the county, valued at more than $1.2 million in 1940.[34]

DAIRY FARMING

Dairy farming and dairy products were a significant part of the cattle industry in Jefferson County during this period. Growing in economic importance over the period, by 1940, dairy products earned more than beef cattle, bringing in around $750,000 annually.[35] Supporting the growing dairy industry were the dairy farms, mostly located in southeastern Jefferson County, that increased the number of dairy cows by around 30 percent between 1900 and 1940. Many of the farmers in the area first turned to dairying and ranching after the first rice collapse in the early 1900s, with others abandoning the crop and truck farming altogether in the 1910s and 1920 due to the profitability of the business.[36] Over the period, Nederland emerged as the de facto headquarters for the county's dairy industry, as it was "home to hundreds of head of the finest dairy cattle in the section of the country."[37] Its more than 35 dairy farms were among those that formed a dairy cooperative in the early 1920s.[38] Among its dairy farms was the Lohmann Brothers Dairy (became the Walling Jersey Farm in 1939), which in 1935 occupied the land encompassing Doornbos Park, Hillcrest Elementary School, and some of the neighboring subdivisions (Figure 39).[39] These area dairy farmers supplied their milk to creameries in Port Arthur and Beaumont, which produced a majority of the county's milk, butter, and other dairy products.

BEEF CATTLE

Despite falling to the dairy industry in 1940, beef cattle was the county's most important livestock, in terms of income, for much of the period. The number of cattle in the county more than doubled over the first four decades of the twentieth century and brought in more than $500,000 in 1939.[40] Ranching practices from the late nineteenth century carried over—pastures remained fenced and cattle were shipped via rail to market—while ranchers adopted new methods of pasturing, breeding, sanitation, and pest control. During the twentieth century, ranchers replaced most of the longhorns with new breeds of cattle. The Brahma, first introduced in Jefferson County in the early 1900s, was well suited to the Gulf Coast and quickly became the leading breed in the county. Landowners also incorporated practices aimed at pasture improvement and conservation. Methods included planting grass and clover seed in pastures, as well as rotating fields annually between crops—particularly rice—and grazing.[41] These practices, along with the improved road network and cold storage facilities "transformed beef production into a highly specialized industry."[42]

In 1940, Jefferson County recorded around 44,000 beef cattle on approximately 350 farms and ranches. Smaller farms across the county often had cattle, but the majority of cattle in the county were raised on ranches with thousands of head of cattle in the southern part of the county. Some nineteenth century ranch families maintained their operations in the twentieth century, accounting for some of the largest numbers of cattle in the county. Among them were the nearly 30,000-acre Pipkin Ranch near Big Hill and the more than 100,000-acre McFaddin Ranch (partially in Chambers County), owned by W. P. H. McFaddin, Jr., a third-generation rancher and also president of the Coastal Cattle Association (Figure 40).[43] The property belonged to the McFaddin Trust when it was cut in two by the completion of the Gulf Intracoastal Canal in the early 1930s. Barbed wire fences were subsequently erected along the canal, and a new coastal ranching practice was adopted. To keep pastures in rotation, the herd of cattle spent winter south of the canal and the summer in pastures to the north, swimming across the Gulf Intracoastal Canal between the fields (Figure 41).[44] McFaddin, Pipkin, and other ranches also started the practice of opening and/or leasing their ranch lands for hunting and fishing, as they contained some of

the most diverse waterfowl habitats in the state (as further discussed in the Parks and Open Space section).[45]



Figure 39. The Wallings Dairy Farm, one of the many dairy farms in and around Nederland in the early and mid-twentieth century. The farm was located on the north side of SH 365 before it, like many dairy farms, gave way to development in the post-war period. Source: James Everett, University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Port Arthur Public Library, accessed December 12, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth79212/.

NEW SERIAL TODAY

THE SUNDAY ENTERPRISE

NEW SERIAL TODAY

BEAUMONT, TEXAS, SUNDAY, APRIL 5, 1936

SECTION—D

RANDOM SKETCHES

Out Around Big Hill

By Dennis McCarthy













Foreman, the Cook and the Ranch House

It's a gulf breeze-swept savanna of luxuriant marshland over which 3500 head of cattle graze throughout the 12 months of the year. The Pipkin ranch approximates 30,000 acres of level coastal soil stretching to the southern boundary of Jefferson county and has borne the Pipkin name for more than half a century.

Its infinitely flat terrain quite suddenly is broken at Big Hill, where a huge grassy and tree-fringed bubble of earth rises slowly to interrupt the endless monotony of the marsh tableland.

Pipkin ranch headquarters are at Big Hill. Here picturesquely knitted together is an intact group of ranch structures, so distinct in pattern and arrangement as to beggar a conventional architectural period, description, a past or contemporary motif.

Dominating the pens, corrals, bath house, saddle shack and minor adjoining units making up the Big Hill group, is the ranch house proper. A low-roofed, whitewashed, frame dwelling, its spacious screened facade faces the south and, in defiance of summer's parching breath along the marsh, a refreshing and constant breeze from the sea sweeps through the ranch house, its sleeping quarters, mess hall and kitchen.

When it's cow time out around Big Hill, the "Boss Man" over that way is Buckaroo Fred Burrell, a bronzed veteran cattle hand, sketched at upper left. Fred has been foreman at the Pipkin ranch 25 years or more. In fact, Fred has been in the employ of the Pipkin family since he was a 'teen age kid. At one time he worked around John Pipkin's Beaumont livery stable.

Fred was born at Burrell's cove—now Wingate ranch. He can't recall a time in his life when he wasn't around "critters." He started running cattle for Ben Hebert and Lovan Hamshire when he was 13.

Next in command at Big Hill headquarters is another Burrell—another veteran cattle hand—and Fred's brother, Mender. Mender has known many years of range life, but for the last 10 years has supervised the mess at the ranch house, preparing hearty and adequate dishes for a crew—during branding and dipping season—in excess of 15 cow hands.

Just the other day Steve Pipkin allowed Mender was a pretty good cook.

"Of course, you wouldn't expect him to hold down a chef's job in one of Beaumont's downtown hotels, but for dishing out good ranch grub, I'd say Mender would do a right smart job."

So Mender is tops as a ranch victual hand and is sketched herewith at right center.

The sketch at upper right indicates the general pattern of the ranch yard and shows a portion of the interminable stretch of wooden pens that surround the place. The structure in the foreground serves as saddle house.

The sketch at left center shows a corner of the ranch house. In the center sketch the bath house—for the hands, of course—is pictured. A soiled tarpaulin assures privacy; a full cistern assures ample water. There's a bar of kitchen soap there also. The plumbing arrangement? Oh, now let's not get too nosey.

At lower right, houseman Mender is featured, and, surrounded as he is with pots and pans, the worthy gentleman lends a thoroughly domestic tone to this portion of the ranch house.

Figure 40. A 1936 newspaper article with sketches and description of the Pipkin Ranch near Big Hill. Source: *Beaumont Enterprise*, April 5, 1936.



Figure 41. A herd of cattle swimming across a waterway in Jefferson County. Ranchers along canals, rivers, and the Intracoastal Waterway, would swim their cattle across the waterways from pasture to pasture. Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting the Museum of the Gulf Coast, accessed December 14, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth202765/.

INDUSTRY

Lumber

At the turn of the century, lumber was one of Jefferson County's primary industries. Beaumont served as the center of the industry, boasting six sawmills, as well as planing mills and sash and door woodworking plants in the early 1900s.[46] Due to a number of factors though, the industry's importance declined over the period. Despite this decline, the lumber industry was an influential factor in the economy and development of the county in the early twentieth century.

Whereas in the previous period lumber mills in Jefferson County opened on its waterways, in the twentieth century sawmills opened on the railroads. No longer reliant on the waterways for transportation, lumber companies opened mills closer to the source of lumber. While some lumber companies bypassed Jefferson County altogether and opened mills in more heavily wooded counties in East Texas, several lumber companies opened up sawmills in the county in the early twentieth century. Several mills operated for only a few years in the 1900s, including the Odelia Mill (1905–1908) on the Gulf and Interstate Railroad in the Gilbert Woods near Fannett.[47] The Forest Lumber Company and the Industrial Lumber Company also operated a sawmill between 1900 and 1905 north of Beaumont on the Gulf, Beaumont and Kansas City Southern Railway. The town of Helbig developed as a result of the opening of the mill.

The longest-tenured mill opened in Voth (located in present-day Beaumont city limits), south of Pine Island Bayou near the Texas and New Orleans and Gulf, Beaumont and Kansas City Southern railroads, with logs coming from Hardin and Tyler. Lumber baron J. Frank Keith opened the sawmill in 1902. Like many lumber companies operating in East Texas, Keith also built a company town with housing, a company commissary, and a post office.[48] The 1937 description of the town described it as "a typical sawmill town with its uniformly built houses, its general store, and office building."[49] African Americans continued to make up a majority of the workforce at the mills, therefore a Black community with a school developed in Voth. Kirby Lumber Company, which had other mills including several in Beaumont, acquired the property in the 1920s when Keith "had completed cutting all their timber adjacent to the mill and the long rail haul to other available supplies was making logging very expensive."[50] The Kirby Lumber Company had an ample supply of timber, having recently purchased land outside Jefferson County with "two billion feet of standing hardwood timber" that they would transport via rail to the Voth mill.[51] Kirby expanded the mill and, at its peak, produced in excess of 80,000 board feet per day, with much of it going to furniture manufacturers.[52] When it closed in 1952, the mill—the largest inland mill and last mill in operation in the county—had two large sawmills, a band resaw, a planer, dry kilns, a tram railroad, and ancillary buildings including a company commissary and post office (presumably there are remnants of the mill south of Pine Island Bayou off US 287 within present-day Beaumont city limits).

Despite an uptick in activity during World War I, when lumber companies worked with the U. S. government and shipbuilders to build wooden merchant ships, the industry steadily declined over the period, and by 1940 most of the county's mills had closed and/or left Jefferson County. In addition to the railroad, other factors contributed to the industry's decline. The rise of the automobile led to the decline of self-sufficient mill towns like Voth. Able to travel to and from work, millworkers no longer relied on company housing and stores. Due to the impacts of the automobile, combined with union efforts across the South, self-sufficient lumber towns all but disappeared. The depletion of timber was another major contributing factor in the county's declining lumber industry. By 1925, the Texas Almanac reported that "the formerly heavily timbered" northern portion of the county had "been cut away with the exception of along the river bottoms."[53] Conservation efforts, which resulted in the establishment of the Texas Forest Service in 1914, led to some reforestation efforts and contributed to logging changes in the state aimed at protecting the state's timber supply. By 1940, the county again produced some lumber commercially, "from pine, oak, magnolia and cypress, mostly second growth."[54] Even so, by the end of the period, the changes to the industry combined with the economic challenges presented by the Great Depression had all but ended the county's lumber "bonanza" that had started in the 1880s.[55]

Oil

The discovery of oil at Spindletop in January 1901 was of little surprise, as geologists and oilmen had predicted for decades that the salt domes south of Beaumont contained oil. Though companies drilling in the area in the 1890s found little oil, Anthony Lucas, an expert on salt domes, signed a lease and persisted with help from John Galey and James Guffey, oil men from Pittsburgh, who brought in an experienced drilling team. When they hit oil at a depth of 1,139 feet on January 10, the Lucas geyser blew for nine days, blowing streams of oil over 100 feet tall and at an estimated 100,000 barrels a day, beginning the modern petroleum industry in Texas (Figure 42).[56] Afterward, despite several periods in which oil production declined, in part due to an overabundance of drilling, the petroleum industry remained the leading economic sector in the country throughout the period. With advances in technology that allowed for deeper drilling, the Spindletop oil field produced over 20 million barrels of oil a year at its peak in the late 1920s.[57]

The discovery of oil at Spindletop put eastern Jefferson County at the center of Texas's oil industry and contributed to a period of industrial and urbanized growth. Immediately after the discovery, oil companies, investors, and laborers arrived, adding more than 23,000 people to the population in the decade after the Spindletop discovery. Felt most strongly in Beaumont, the city's population rose from

10,000 to 50,000, and land prices around Spindletop rose more than 100 times their pre-1901 worth.[58] Throughout the period, oil companies built refineries, pipelines, and storage facilities in eastern Jefferson County. The largest companies to arrive in Jefferson County during this period included the Texas Company (Texaco), Gulf Oil Corporation, Magnolia Petroleum Company, and Standard Oil (Exxon). While Beaumont and Port Arthur were home to the majority of refineries and company offices, oil companies also opened refineries in several other eastern Jefferson County cities: the Texas Company opened a refinery in Port Neches in 1906, the Pure Oil Company opened a refinery in Nederland in the 1920s, and Atlantic Petroleum opened a refinery in Groves in 1936 (Figure 43). While the arrival of these companies directly spurred population, urbanization, and industrialization in these communities, they also created and boasted secondary industries, including construction, retail, shipping, and manufacturing. The companies constructed a variety of industrial buildings and structures, as well as offices, such as the Texas Company (Texaco) Mid-County Works Building at 100 Port Neches Atlantic Road (Figure 44).[1]

On a much smaller scale, this trend played out in the rest of Jefferson County, as investors spent millions of dollars hoping to find another Spindletop. As a result, wildcatters discovered several oil fields in Jefferson County during the period, including ones near Fannett in 1927, Nome in 1936, LaBelle in 1937, and China in 1939. Though the amount of oil produced at these fields was less substantial than Spindletop, they impacted surrounding communities which experienced varying degrees of population growth and development.



Figure 42. The oil wells at Spindletop shortly after the discovery of oil in 1901. Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting the Museum of the Gulf Coast, accessed December 12, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth202771/.

[1] Due to the high security associated with industrial sites, the field survey was unable to document any extant industrial buildings associated with these companies.



Figure 43. The oil refinery (Texas Company, then the Union Oil Company) in Port Neches in 1923. Source: General Photograph Collection, UTSA Libraries Special Collections, crediting the Windmill Museum, accessed December 15, 2021, https://digital.utsa.edu/digital/collection/p9020coll008/id/7920.



Figure 44. Photo of the Texas Company (Texaco) Mid-County Works Building at 100 Port Neches Atlantic Road. Source: HHM, 2022.

The Depression's Impact on Industry

During the Great Depression, Jefferson County was home to one of the country's 35 federal subsistence homestead colonies; six of the 35 were located in Texas, and the others were in Houston, Dalworthington Gardens (Tarrant County), Wichita Falls, Three Rivers (Live Oak County), and Marshall (Harrison County). Though the robust petrochemical industry positioned the county well to weather the Depression, it still suffered from higher levels of unemployment and a slowed-down economy in the early 1930s. The subsistence homestead colony program, initiated under the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933 and overseen by the Farm Security Administration, served to encourage urban industrial workers to supplement their incomes through agriculture. As part of the program, the federal government developed a 205-acre site between Beaumont and Port Arthur in a predominantly agricultural area (located "between U.S. Highway 69/96/287 and Farm Road 823 six miles southeast of Beaumont").[59] Named Beauxart Gardens, the community consisted of "frame bungalow houses…built in 17 different architectural styles" for 50 families (Figure 45).[60] The community also had two parks, two public roads, and a community center (Figure 46). Each house, purchased for around $3,000 and payable over 40 years, had between 2.5 to 4.5 acres, a combination garage and barn, a chicken house, and garden plot.[61] Beauxart Gardens opened in 1935, and its residents worked part-time at nearby refineries and part-time at the government truck farm at the site. In 1936, the federal government transferred the title for Beauxart Gardens to the Beauxart Homestead Association but continued providing agricultural instruction during the Depression. Today, the street network remains intact, but no houses dating to the 1930s were identified during survey. The subdivision today is filled with houses dating from the 1950s to the 2020s.

***Learn more** about federal subsistence homestead colonies here: https://www.nal.usda.gov/collections/stories/subsistence-homesteads.*



Figure 45. A house and combination barn and garage at a federal subsistence homestead colony in the 1930s. (The author assumes this is at Beauxarts Gardens in Jefferson County despite the Library of Congress description of the image stating it is "Beauxart Gardens, Stillwater, Oklahoma." Research does not indicate that there was/is a Beauxart Gardens in Stillwater, OK.) Source: The Library of Congress, accessed December 12, 2021, https://www.loc.gov/item/2017758795/.



Figure 46. Photo of the park in Beauxart Gardens. Source: HHM, 2022.

TRANSPORTATION

The early twentieth century was a time of significant growth for the transportation networks in Jefferson County. In 1900, Jefferson County relied heavily on the railroad for transportation, as its waterways had not been deepened, and its road network was limited to less than 300 miles of dirt roads.[62] By 1940, however, the county boasted a deep-water port, over 1,000 miles of road, modern bridges, and its first municipal airport, which opened in Beaumont in 1932. While the county's existing industries served as the impetus for much of this growth, the expanded transportation network served as an economic driver for the county by aiding existing and new industries, ultimately bringing in more people and companies to the county.

Railroads and Interurban

Jefferson County's railroad network, nearly complete by 1900, was the primary source of transport for the movement of goods and people. Early in the twentieth century, the construction of several additional lines further expanded the network. Spurred by the discovery of oil at Sour Lake in Hardin County, a new line, the Beaumont, Sour Lake, and Western Railway (now operated by Union Pacific), connected the oil field to refineries in Beaumont in 1904. Oil was also the impetus for several Texas and New Orleans Railroad spurs added in the first decade of the twentieth century, with one connecting Nome to Sour Lake in 1903. Another Texas and New Orleans Railroad spur, the Sabine Pass line near Taylor Bayou, connected to downtown Port Arthur by 1908. The rails not only facilitated the movement of goods and people, but they also resulted in new construction in the communities they passed

through. One extant example is the former Southern Pacific Railroad depot built in China around 1905 (Figure 47).



Figure 47. Photo of the former Southern Pacific Railroad depot built in China around 1905. Source: HHM, 2022.

The growing population and commercial activities in eastern Jefferson County saw the completion of an electric interurban line in 1913. With only crude roads between Beaumont and Port Arthur, the Port Arthur-Beaumont Interurban Railway allowed easier commuting between the two cities. The line, which was approximately 20 miles long, also made 10 stops, including in Nederland, between the two cities. The interurban also offered chartered group and excursion trips.

During this period, the railroad played an important part in the development of towns and the oil industry and also allowed sawmills to open closer to the source of lumber. Into the 1920s, the railroad remained one of the primary modes of transportation in the county. However, increased competition from the Neches-Sabine Waterway and the growing reliance on automobiles and highways saw a decline in rail use in the 1930s, reflected in the interurban's last run in 1932.

Highway and Bridge Building

Highways

Early in the twentieth century, non-rail and ship travel generally consisted of horses, buggies, poorly drained dirt roads, and ferry crossings. By 1914, though, early road campaigns, led by the county and local municipalities, had expended $400,000 on the construction of 100 miles of mud shell paved highway and 500 miles of graded road.[63] Following this early campaign, the national work of the Good Roads Movement helped bring the first major highway through Jefferson County. The Old Spanish Trail

Highway (OST), a national highway from Florida to California, was completed in the 1920s and entered Texas in Beaumont and traveled west through northern Jefferson County. The route generally followed the alignment of the Texas and New Orleans Railroad and the historic Opelousas Trail. The OST Highway was one of only two automobile routes in Jefferson County identified on a 1917 road map of Texas (Figure 48).

Upon the creation of the Texas Highway Department (THD) in 1917, the OST Highway was designated State Highway (SH) 3. In addition to assuming responsibility for the route, the new department also oversaw the construction of additional highways in the county. While local streets remained under municipal control, the THD, with the support of federal and county monies, led the way in creating new highways including SH 105 to Sour Lake, SH 124 to Hamshire, and SH 87 to the Bolivar Peninsula (see sidebar for more information on the Beach Road) (Figure 49). Major federal highways were also designed in this period, including US 90 (the OST Highway) and US 287/69/96 along the east side of the county. Like the Old Spanish Trail, the new highways generally followed established roadways and rail lines, and many of them intersected in Beaumont.



Figure 48. Inset of a 1917 map showing Jefferson County and its reliance on railroads for most of its transportation: automobile roads in red, railroads in black. The OST Highway cuts through the northern section of the county. Source: The Clason Map Co., Texas, 1917, from Old Highway Maps of Texas, http://www.dfwfreeways.com/old-highway-maps.



Figure 49. 1936 General Highway Map of Jefferson County. In addition to the main state and national highways, Jefferson County also had many county roads by 1936. The map also highlights how the roads followed rail alignments. Source: Texas State Highway Department, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Public Roads, 1936. Partially revised to February 1, 1940. From the Texas State Library and Archives Commission, https:/www.tsl.texas.gov/apps/arc/maps/maplookup/04906.

Beach Road

Beach Road is a historic coastal section of Texas Highway 87 that stretches along the Gulf of Mexico. This historic route was essential to Jefferson County's early development as settlers, Native Americans, tradesmen, cattle farmers, and mail carriers used the route. The route was also used by confederate soldiers during the Civil War. However, by 1920, residents experienced difficulty navigating the stretch of unmaintained road, so by 1923 Commissioner W.A. Vaughan proposed using shell deposits from along the coast to repair the route. This improvement increased traffic to McFaddin Beach and Port Bolivar, causing a business boom for the local economy. In 1931, the Texas Highway Commission named this new roadway a part of state highway 87. The roadway was a popular route to Galveston, but it was also used for coastal defense preparedness during World War II. Hurricanes and tropical storms have since eroded nearby coastline and decimated the roadway, forcing its closure in 1989. Some sections remain in use for local traffic.

The county and county-feeder road system also expanded during this period, aided by the passage of bond issues and overseen by the County Commissioners Court and individual precincts within the county. By 1936, the General Highway Map for Jefferson County shows, in addition to the U.S. and State highways, a network of secondary county and feeder roads crisscrossing all but the southern third of the county. While some of the county roads, including the lone road in the southern third, Beach Road, were subsumed into the State and U.S. Highway system during this period, others remained "unimproved" and "graded and drained" until the post-war period and the establishment of the Texas Farm-to-Market road system.

In addition to benefitting the county's existing businesses, industry, and agriculture, the new highways also contributed to the rise of new businesses and commercial enterprises catering to tourists and automobile travelers. Gas stations, auto dealerships, garages, tourist courts, and motels are just some of the new buildings that became commonplace along the highways. In Jefferson County, while the majority of this type of development occurred in and around Beaumont and Port Arthur in eastern Jefferson County, small communities along the highway in the rest of the county likely saw some increase in commercial development and activity. In the southeastern section, road development attracted visitors to the beach and saw restaurants open at the intersection of several highways in Sabine Pass (Figure 50). A number of the restaurants that opened served seafood caught by local fisherman who kept boats in Sabine Pass and Port Arthur. Bus excursions, including the "beach road bus line" operated by Coastal Coaches, also transported people along the coast between Galveston and Port Arthur.[64] And in Nome, a 1923 travel guide listed several businesses on the OST Highway. Travel guides for Black motorists, including *The Green Book*, listed nearly 80 locations in Jefferson County between the 1930s and 1960s, all in Beaumont and Port Arthur.[65]



Figure 50. Granger's Restaurant (not extant), one of the restaurants in Sabine Pass to open with the expanded road network in the first half of twentieth century. A number of restaurants served seafood caught from local fishermen. Photo from 1939. Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting the Museum of the Gulf Coast, accessed December 12, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth202658/.

Bridges

An integral piece in completing the county's road network was the construction of bridges. During this period, a series of new bridges over the county's waterways replaced crude nineteenth century bridges and ferry crossings, facilitating faster travel. In addition to new bridges over the Neches River, new bridges appeared over Hillebrand Bayou on present-day US 90, Taylor Bayou, and the LNVA canal during this period. The deepening of the Sabine-Neches Canal and the subsequent creation of Pleasure Island also necessitated the construction of a bridge. The first of three bridges built over the Sabine-Neches Canal was completed in 1913. Known as the Pleasure Pier Bridge, it replaced a ferry that had operated between the mainland and the island between 1910 and 1913. Struck by a steamship in 1916, the bridge was replaced with a bascule bridge in 1931 (this bridge was replaced in 1970 by the current Martin Luther King, Jr. Bridge).

The most important bridges constructed during this period spanned the Neches River. In 1925, the Neches River Bridge opened in Beaumont (not extant). Funded by the sale of bonds, the bridge, located on the OST Highway, provided an alternate route across the river than the one provided by Collier's Ferry. A second important crossing across the river opened in 1938. The Port Arthur-Orange Bridge, or the Rainbow Bridge, connects Port Arthur with Orange County along SH 87. Despite the recognized need for a bridge in Port Arthur, created by the growth of the oil industry, the Great Depression and political

and business in-fighting delayed movement on the project. In the meantime, the Dryden Ferry—a substitute for a bridge—proved woefully inadequate for the amount of traffic crossing the river immediately after opening in 1926 (Figure 51). In 1934, Texas Governor Miriam A. Ferguson signed a law allowing the use of county bonds and Federal Public Works Administration funds for construction of the bridge. New Deal relief labor provided construction manpower and the Public Works Administration (PWA), the Texas Highway Department (THD), and Jefferson County, whose voters approved $750,000 for the project, split the cost of construction.[66] Designed by THD engineer G. G. Wickline, the bridge spans 7,742 feet and has a 680-foot horizontal and a 177-foot vertical clearance that ensure a Navy ship with a moored dirigible may pass unimpeded.[67] Upon its completion, the bridge was one of the tallest in the southern United States (Figure 52).

> ***Learn More!*** *Read the National Register Nomination for the Rainbow Bridge: https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/NR/pdfs/96001127/96001127.pdf.*



Figure 51. Cars waiting in 1934 for the Dryden Ferry across the Neches River in Port Arthur before the completion of the Port Arthur-Orange Bridge. Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting the Museum of the Gulf Coast, accessed December 12, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth202553/.



Figure 52. Postcard of the Port Arthur-Orange Bridge. The bridge opened in 1936, providing a vital link in southern Jefferson County to Orange County. The cantilever truss bridge was built by Union Bridge and Construction Company and the Taylor-Fitcher Steel Construction Company. The bridge is listed in the NRHP. Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Heritage House Museum, accessed December 12, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth36701/.

Waterways

Sabine-Neches Waterway

After the discovery of oil at Spindletop, urgency in Jefferson County grew for access to a deep-water port along the lower Neches River. The canal dredged in 1899 provided ship access from the Gulf of Mexico to Port Arthur, but the lack of deep-water access along the Neches River kept Beaumont cut off from Sabine Lake and the Gulf. In acknowledgement of the importance of Beaumont and its role in supplying oil to the country, Congress approved funding for a deep-water channel from Sabine Lake to Beaumont and Orange in 1904, and voters in Beaumont approved bond issues for the project. Property owners along Sabine Lake donated land, and the Army Corps of Engineers began work in 1906.[68] The deepened barge canal (the Sabine-Neches Canal) was finished in 1908, but the entirety of the project (named the 25-feet deep Sabine-Neches Waterway) did not reach Beaumont and Orange until 1916. Less than a decade later, in 1925, the waterway was deepened to 30 feet. In addition to deepening the channel, the project also cut off natural bends in the river.

Port Arthur was designated an official U. S. port of entry in 1906, having turned over the canal, a turning basin, and a strip of land along the west side of the canal to the U. S. government. Together with Orange, the region was ranked first among the nation's oil ports shortly after the completion of the Sabine-Neches Waterway.[69] In addition to oil, the ports also shipped rice, lumber, cotton, and other agricultural products. After a steady increase in tonnage, by the late 1930s, the ports handled more than 45,000,000 tons of cargo annually.[70]

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway

The other significant waterway project completed during this period was the Intracoastal Waterway. Part of a larger system connecting ports from Brownsville, Texas to Florida, the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway through Jefferson County was finished in 1933. The idea for the waterway dated back to the nineteenth century, but due to factors including wars and competition from the railroads, the project was never completed. After the discovery of oil at Spindletop and the subsequent growth in the petrochemical industry along the Texas coast, the project came to life. Financed by the U. S. government and constructed by the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway was finished to Brownsville in 1949. Used primarily by barges for the transport of oil and petrochemical products, the waterway also handles a variety of manufactured and agricultural products.

In Jefferson County, the channel cut through the southern marshlands, connecting the Sabine-Neches Canal in Port Arthur to Galveston Bay. Paralleling the coast, the approximately 12-feet deep and 125-feet wide channel is between 3 to 9 miles from the coast. By cutting and separating properties in two, the project had significant impacts on property owners and the ecology of the marshes. As discussed in the cattle section, ranchers changed their grazing practices, and some inland lakes were lost due to refuse from dredging the channel. Additionally, the channel cut off fresh water provided by some of the lakes on the separated piece of land to the south, allowing saltwater to invade the upper marshes.[71] Because the fresh water was critical to rice farmers and ranchers, some built levees, dams, and pumping stations in order to access water.[72] In doing so, new ponds and lakes were created, including Big Hill Reservoir, Boggy Slough, and Monteaux Pond.[73]

LAND-USE PATTERNS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TRENDS

Eastern Jefferson County

Eastern Jefferson County remained the most populated and urbanized part of the county, home to most of the county's industry and its largest cities, Beaumont and Port Arthur. Home to between 58 to 81 percent of the county's population between 1900 and 1940, Beaumont and Port Arthur were the only two cities in the county with more than 3,000 residents by 1940 (as shown in Table 6). Beaumont remained the commercial, entertainment, and government center of the county, experiencing a commercial, residential, and industrial boom that saw its downtown fill in and residential areas added. In response to Jefferson County's growth, the county replaced the 1893 county courthouse in Beaumont with its current one in 1931. (See the sidebar on the history of the Jefferson County Courthouse). Port Arthur experienced similar growth and, in 1936, a new County Building, funded in part with PWA funds, opened to meet the needs of the county (Figure 53).

Table 6. Population growth in Jefferson County's most populous cities. Source: U. S. Census Bureau, 1900–1940, https://www.census.gov/.

Year	Beaumont	Port Arthur	Sabine Pass	Port Neches
1900	9,427	900	363	-
1910	20,640	7,663	400	-
1920	40,422	2,251	-	-
1930	57,732	50,902	-	2,327
1940	59,061	46,140	567	2,487



Figure 53. The South County Office Building in Port Arthur. Built in 1936 through the PWA, the completion of the building reflects the growth of the county, particularly southeastern Jefferson County, as a result of the petrochemical industry. The building is an RTHL and also a contributing building in the NRHP-listed Port Arthur Downtown Historic District. Source: HHM & Associates, Inc., 2018.

The Jefferson County Courthouse

The current Jefferson County Courthouse in Beaumont is the fourth building erected to represent the justice system for the county. The first county building, which appeared in 1838, was a wooden structure that was also used as a jailhouse.[74] After the first building burned in 1844, a second two-story Greek Revival building surrounded by a picket fence replaced it in 1854. In addition to its governmental role, the building was also used by Baptist and Methodist congregations for worship services, and it was also leased to a Confederate surgeon who used it as a hospital during the Civil War.[75] In 1893, twelve years after the incorporation of Beaumont, another courthouse was constructed. The three-story, red brick Italianate building with white trim was designed by Eugene Thomas Heiner at a cost of $39,000.[76] The current high-rise brick courthouse was constructed in 1931, following the oil boom and subsequent population growth of the early twentieth century. Local architects Fred C. Stone and A. Babin designed the fourteen-story building in the Art Deco style, implementing sculpted ornamentation and marble interior work to create a unique Texas government landmark (Figure 54). Details include and celebrate county life through carved limestone vignettes of lumbermen, farmers, oilmen, and cowboys at work.[77] This fourth and final Jefferson County courthouse cost $1,000,000. The building's high-rise form and Art Deco style are unique in Texas courthouse design, and they serve as reflections of the county's mid-century prosperity. The courthouse is a Recorded Texas Historic Landmark (RTHL) and is listed in the National Register of Historic Places.



Figure 54. The current Jefferson County Courthouse in Beaumont, built in 1931, was designed by Fred Stone and A. Babin. The Art Deco courthouse is listed in the NRHP. Photo from 1979. Source: David Moore, University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting the Texas Historical Commission, accessed December 4, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth663541/.

Communities established in the late nineteenth century near Beaumont and Port Arthur benefitted from the proximity to the two cities, as well as to the oil fields and the Neches River. Among these cities, Nederland and Port Neches, the county's third and fourth largest cities, both experienced growth in the twentieth century. In addition to the oil jobs associated with the nearby Spindletop oil wells, Nederland's other source of economic income until the 1920s was related to agriculture, particularly its dairy farms. Connected to Port Arthur and Beaumont by the interurban line in 1913, the city boasted a population around 1,600 by the early 1920s. It had a small commercial center along Boston Avenue, as well as an independent school district with 256 White students, and several churches.[78] In line with nationwide trends of suburbanization and increased automobile ownership, new residential areas, including the Hillcrest Subdivision, opened south of downtown, reflecting Nederland's growth, with over 50 new houses built in just two years in the early 1920s (Figure 55).[79] The extant houses in Hillcrest from this era—bungalows constructed in styles including Craftsman and Tudor Revival—are representative examples of the types of houses constructed in this period in communities across Jefferson County (Figure 56).

IMPROVEMENTS!

Costing Thousands Are Being Made for Owners of

HILLCREST

Some of HILLCRESTS' New Owners

W. T. Jackson.
W. J. Bailey.
J. L. Leach.
W. M. Lester.
J. L. Wikoff.
G. B. Wilson.
H. G. Cooper.
Dalton McDonald.
J. L. Williams.
D. E. Bonnette.
W. L. Parrish.
Lawrence Parrish.
H. L. Peavey.
I. F. Cryer.
W. T. Tyler.
G. I. Townson.
G. B. Hamthell.
W. N. Wolfe.
John Taylor.
P. G. Crook.
Leslie Jarrett.
E. C. Bushman.
G. E. Murphy.
Virgil Furby.
George T. Smith.
C. L. Baddom.
E. A. Dohmann.
Joe Evers.
W. H. and F. Newton.
Lewis Blach.
R. P. Breeden.
Joe Preznick.
Alex Weber.
Lee Prestize.
Mrs. Fay Caldwell.
Mrs. Etta Hall.
Mrs. H. Cooper.
A. Gobel.
S. B. Brixton.
F. A. Roach.
R. F. DuBois.
J. W. King.
L. O. Odom.
J. G. Spoor.
C. E. Russell.
Alex Gautreaux.
Mrs. A. S. Dilley.
H. A. Booz.
W. A. Smith.
Jessie Bertram.
Allen Miller.
S. O. Love.
A. R. Casey.
J. A. McAdams.
R. M. Lockler.
Frank Perdue.
Francis D. Creswell.
E. Troscrair.
D. O. Jefferson.
Kirby Rhodes.
T. A. Hieth.
Jessie Oehler.

Its Broad Boulevards Are Being Paved and Its Acres Beautified

Visit Us Sunday

THIS SHOWS THE LOCATION OF HILLCREST



Jefferson County, Texas, Is Today the Oil Refining Center of the World

Ships Come Here From the Ports of the World. We Furnish Fuel for the Automobiles of the World---Where Thousands Live and More Thousands Will Come, There Will Be New Homes--HILLCREST in the Center of the Refineries--Answers the Question "Where"

Ask These Who Have Bought

W. L. Sloane.
Sam Gallier.
F. A. Netterville.
George Netterville.
Mrs. J. W. Bush.
J. M. Harris.
Spot Hellman.
J. M. Thompson.
H. E. Woods.
Mr. and Mrs. Chas. P. Cullinan..
J. W. Roberts.
J. E. Creswell.
Reme Richard.
C. C. Lindley.
H. M. Corley.
C. H. West.
V. M. Andrus.
E. L. Hix.
J. M. Aswell.
L. Roff.
I. W. West.
L. P. Landry.
M. D. Richardson.
R. W. Carpenter.
J. M. Redman.
Joseph Schoin.
Anton Larson.
Robert Cates.
C. D. Perkins.
Edward L. Vandergriff.
C. A. Slayton.
Allen E. Foster.
U. P. Odom.
L. Casey.
Mrs. C. L. Tubre.
Aude Dugas.
Owen McCann.
S. C. and Bessie Hanchette.
C. Chance.
K. M. Wise.
John Burch.
G. W. Jolly.
A. B. Modawell.
Tom Gallier.
E. D. Rose.
W. E. Butler.
Gordon L. Butler.
Charles Buemont.
Mary Eva Biermortt.
L. L. Sweeney.
Ethel U. Gray.
J. M. Ramsay.
A. Boutee.
H. A. Richey.
E. Tyer.
John Henderson.
L. Butler Gordon.
C. T. Culpepper.
Gladys May Kinsey.
S. E. Bernard.
M. A. Price.

TYRRELL-COMBEST REALTY COMPANY

REALTORS

Beaumont ⁘ ⁘ ⁘ ⁘ **Port Arthur**

Figure 55. A 1923 advertisement for lots in the new Hillcrest subdivision in Nederland. Founded as an agricultural community, Nederland experienced growth in the early twentieth century due to the petrochemical industry and the opening of a refinery in 1922. Source: *Beaumont Enterprise*, August 19, 1923, 13.



Figure 56. Photo of 2304 Avenue B in Nederland. The bungalow constructed in the Craftsman style is just one example of the types of houses constructed in the 1920s in communities across Jefferson County. Source: HHM, 2022.

Much of the early 1920s growth was in anticipation of the opening of Humphrey Oil Company refinery at Smith's Bluff northeast of downtown. The company itself constructed bunk houses in Nederland for around 600 men – both construction workers at the refinery and refinery workers.[80] Upon its opening in 1922, the refinery (taken over by Pure Oil in 1923 and currently the Phillips 66 Terminal) spurred additional growth in Nederland throughout the pre-war period. By 1940, the year of incorporation, Nederland boasted several thousand people. Keeping up with its population, Boston Avenue added several more stores and a theater, and the residential areas slowly added more residences (Figure 57). In 1932, the local library moved out of a former dry-cleaner's building and into a new building at Boston Avenue and 10th Street (not extant).[81] The library, part of the Jefferson County Library system that organized in 1929, served both Nederland and Port Neches and was a stop on the county's bookmobile route beginning in the 1930s (Figure 58). The school district also built a new high school on South 12th Street in 1924, adding a gym in 1928 on South 12th Street (neither extant), and a new elementary school, Langham Elementary School (extant), at 800 South 12th Street, in 1940 (Figure 59).[82]

In Port Neches, early growth stemmed from the Spindletop oil wells and the subsequent opening of the asphalt plant in 1901. The town, founded as Grigsby's Bluff in the nineteenth century, was laid out a year after the plant's opening in 1902, located along the Kansas City Southern Railway. Spurred by the oil industry, the city's population grew to 600 by 1915 and to nearly 3,000 by 1940.[83] When the Texas Company took over the plant in 1906 to use as a refinery, an influx of Cajuns arrived, settling in small clusters near the refinery dubbed "Little Maurice" and "Petite Abbeville."[84] Extant clusters of housing from the early to mid-twentieth century near the plant are found along Pine Street, east of the former

plant, and in the Rachford and Dearing subdivision to the west. Commercial activity first centered along Avenue A (now Grisby Street) and then migrated to Port Neches Avenue by the 1920s, where masonry buildings lined the street (Figure 60). Businesses included a drug store; mercantile and dry goods store; hardware, furniture, and sporting goods store; a bank; clothing store; and a theater.[85] The two-part commercial block building at 1117 Port Neches Avenue is representative of the type of commercial building constructed in this period (Figure 61). Residential development occurred in new additions north and south of Port Neches Avenue and east of the refinery (Figure 62). In 1927, the town officially incorporated. [86] Port Neches boasted a public park, several churches, and several newly constructed schools, including what was said to be the first modern school building in the county—Port Neches High School—during the period to keep up with the growing population (not extant).[87]

> ***Learn More!*** *Read about the history of education in Port Neches: https://www.pngisd.org/cms/lib/TX02205731/Centricity/Domain/11/history.pdf.*



Figure 57. 1938 aerial image of Nederland. Note the edge of the refinery to the north, and Port Arthur (in orange) to the southeast. Residential development had spread from downtown, though the city remained confined to a small area during the period. Source: Texas General Land Office, 1938 image, via Google Earth.



Figure 58. Stemming from the Progressive Era and pushed by women's clubs, bookmobiles first began in the U. S. in the nineteenth century but grew more common in the early twentieth century and expanded during the Great Depression due to WPA library expansion efforts. In Texas, the Texas Federation of Women's Clubs advocated for bookmobiles and helped usher in legislation that established traveling libraries in the state. Jefferson County boasted the first bookmobile in the state when the Tyrrell Public Library initiated service in 1930. This truck, purchased in 1935 and replaced in 1948, traveled to libraries and schools in eastern Jefferson County. By the postwar period, the bookmobile traveled across the county. The bookmobile operated until 2010. Source: Traces of Texas, Facebook page, accessed December 3, 2021, https://www.facebook.com/TracesofTexas/photos/a.162532927112178/1078850065480455/.



Figure 59. Langham Elementary School at 800 South 12th Street in Nederland. The school was built in 1940. Source: Courtesy of Larry D. Moore, CC BY-SA 4.0, https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0, via Wikimedia Commons, https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Langham_elementary_nederland_tx.jpg.



Figure 60. The First National Bank (1126 Port Neches Avenue, extant) and other commercial development on Port Neches Avenue in Port Neches. Source: James Everett, University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Port Arthur Public Library, accessed December 14, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth79409.



Figure 61. Photo of a two-part commercial block building at 1117 Port Neches Avenue, which is representative of the type of commercial building constructed in the 1920s. Source: HHM, 2022.



Figure 62. 1938 aerial image of Port Neches. Much of the city's growth in the early twentieth century stemmed from the area refineries. Source: Texas General Land Office, 1938 image, via Google Earth.

New population nodes also developed in eastern Jefferson County, spurred by the railroad and oil industry. The towns of Guffey (continued as a community during periods of oil prosperity but was largely abandoned by the 1970s), Groves, Port Acres (annexed by Port Arthur in the 1960s), Pear Ridge (annexed by Port Arthur in 1980s), and Griffing Park (annexed in 1983 by Port Arthur) were laid out

along rail lines, including the Kansas City Southern Railway and the Beaumont-Port Arthur interurban line, in the 1900s and 1910s. Central Gardens, six miles southeast of Beaumont on the Kansas City Southern Railway, was founded later, around 1930, as a result of the growing oil and petrochemical industries in the area.[88] Largely comprised of oil men and refinery workers, these communities experienced modest growth during the period but never grew to more than 1,900 people prior to the war. Among the fastest growing of these towns was Groves. Just northeast of Port Arthur, Groves, known for the hundreds of pecan trees planted there in the 1910s, was acquired by the Port Arthur Land and Development Company around 1920. Developed as a stop on the Kansas City Southern Railway, the town added a post office in 1927, a school in 1929, and a library on Lincoln Avenue in 1934.[89] A commercial node developed along Jefferson Street and Lincoln Avenue. In 1936, the Atlantic Refinery opened in Groves, boosting its growth.[90]

Similar to most of the new residential construction across the nation, Federal Housing Administration (FHA) loans made many of Jefferson County's new developments possible. These low-cost mortgages typically had stipulations for home siting, lot uniformity, setbacks, and street widths. In addition to uniformity within subdivisions, these loans contributed to racial segregation and housing inequality. FHA loans favored single-family suburban development over home improvements for extant houses, and the program overwhelmingly extended loans to White families over non-White families. While racial housing inequity was most prevalent in housing practices in Beaumont and Port Arthur, where the majority of the county's Black population lived and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation (HOLC) created redlining maps, other communities were not immune to the systemic racism that was prevalent across the country (Figures 63, 64). Though these newly developed residential areas were predominantly White, developers likely used deed restrictions to ensure non-White families were not allowed to move into certain parts of these communities.



Figure 63. HOLC (redlining) map for Beaumont. Areas in yellow and red highlighted where FHA loans should not be issued. These areas typically included industrial areas and racial and ethnic minority neighborhoods. Source: Robert K. Nelson, LaDale Winling, Richard Marciano, Nathan Connolly, et at., "Mapping Inequality," American Panorama, ed. Robert K. Nelson and Edward L. Ayers, accessed June 9, 2021, https://dsl.richmond.edu/panorama/redlining/map/TX/Beaumont/areas#loc=14/30.0729/-94.1079.



Figure 64. HOLC (redlining) map for Port Arthur. Areas in yellow and red highlighted where FHA loans should not be issued. These areas typically included industrial areas and racial and ethnic minority neighborhoods. Source: Robert K. Nelson, LaDale Winling, Richard Marciano, Nathan Connolly, et at., "Mapping Inequality," American Panorama, ed. Robert K. Nelson and Edward L. Ayers, accessed June 9, 2021, https://dsl.richmond.edu/panorama/redlining/map/TX/PortArthur/areas#loc=13/29.8943/-93.9289.

Central, Southern, Northern, and Western Jefferson County

Further removed from Beaumont and Port Arthur, the area remained characteristically rural throughout the period, home to mostly farmers and ranchers. The small population nodes that did develop lay along the railroads, close to rail stations used for agriculture and the lumber industry. These new nodes—typically comprised of fewer than several hundred people—developed in north, northwest, southeast, southwest, west, and central Jefferson County.

North of Beaumont, the lumber industry spurred the creation of new towns on and near the railroad. Both Helbig (founded 1900, on the Gulf, Beaumont and Kansas City Southern Railway) and Voth (founded around 1902, near the Texas and New Orleans Railroad and the GB & KC Railway) developed because of the sawmills located there: the Forest Lumber Company in Helbig and the Keith Lumber Company in Voth. While the sawmill company left Helbig in 1905, a small residential community remained and slowly grew. In Voth, the population reached an estimated high of around 750 in the mid-1920s. Among its residents were African American and Mexican sawmill workers.[91] In the post-war period, Beaumont annexed both communities.

In much of the rest of the county, communities developed in support of farmers and ranchers. New towns from the period include China (founded 1900, along the Texas and New Orleans railroad), Meeker (founded around 1904, on the Beaumont, Sour Lake and Western Railway), Cheek (founded in 1906, on the Gulf and Interstate Railway), and Big Hill (founded in 1909, not on a railroad). Both China and Cheek were largely inhabited by rice farmers. In Cheek, per current residents, an African-American community developed, particularly along Lawhon and Boyt roads. Though still predominantly African American, Cheek retains few early twentieth-century resources associated with the community's development. Among the extant resources from this period include a single-family residence built around 1915 per its current owner (Figure 65). In Big Hill, settlers included Swedish-American fig and citrus farmers from the Midwest.[92] Big Hill is the only community that did not survive the period. After a hurricane in 1915 destroyed houses, barns, and orchards, many in the community relocated to Hamshire and Winnie in Chambers County.[93]

Established communities, including Nome, Fannett, and Hamshire, all founded in the late nineteenth century as stops on the railroads, also experienced some growth. Early on, Nome benefitted from the influx of people in Hardin County after the discovery of oil at Sour Lake around 1900. Throughout the period, though, Nome, as well as Fannett, prospered as a result of the area's increased agriculture, in part due to the expanded and improved irrigation and drainage network. Hamshire, though platted and subdivided in 1911, did not experience much growth until the late 1920s with the discovery of the Fannett oil field. A similar trend played out in many of Jefferson County's rural communities of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Despite experiencing some early growth, many communities experienced slowed or decreased growth, until the discovery of new oil fields in and adjacent to the county in the late 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s. New oil fields at Fannett (1927), Nome (1936), LaBelle (1937), and South China (1939) during the period all contributed to an influx of new residents in nearby communities.

Throughout the period, development in these rural communities was minimal, stretching from one to several streets off the rail (Figures 66-68). Some of the first buildings were train depots, like the one in China, and post offices, but most of them lost their post offices in the early twentieth century. Commercial and industrial development was confined to the larger communities (including China, Nome, and Hamshire) and typically consisted of warehouses, a store, and in Hamshire's case, a canning factory (not extant). Nome in the early 1900s also boasted a hotel with a restaurant across from its depot.[94] The completion of highways in the 1920s and 1930s spurred some additional commercial activity, at least in Nome, which listed a general store, a garage and a tourist court, Oak Grove (not extant), in a 1923 OST Highway travelers' guide (Figure 69). Some communities also had one or more

churches, including China, which boasted three in the late 1930s. At least one church, Our Lady of Sorrow Catholic parish built in 1935, remains [245 US 90].[95]



Figure 65. Photo of a single-family residence built in Cheek around 1915. Source: HHM, 2022.



Figure 66. 1938 aerial image of Nome. Commercial development lined the rail alignment and the US 90, while residential development was located to the north and south. Source: Texas General Land Office, 1938 image, via Google Earth.



Figure 67. 1938 aerial image of Hamshire. Development in Hamshire reflects much of the rural communities in Jefferson County in the early twentieth century, with commercial development limited to warehouses along the rail alignment. Source: Texas General Land Office,1938 image, via Google Earth.



Figure 68. 1938 aerial image of China. Like other rural communities in Jefferson County, China experienced some growth due to the discovery of oil wells in the 1920s and 1930s. Note the oilfields to the south. Source: Texas General Land Office, 1938 image, via Google Earth.



BEAUMONT

OST Officials—J. D. Roberts, Councilor.
Pop. 40,422 Elevation 22 ft. Six banks.
Tourist Camp—At Fair Grounds. Well equipped.
Products—Rice, cattle, dairying, lumber. Deep sea port. Largest oil refinery in the U. S. Famous old Spindle Top oil field—first gusher field in the U. S.

LINN BROS MOTOR CO **1002 Pearl St**	Chevrolet distributors for East Texas. Ignition and service station.
HOTEL BEAUMONT **V. G. Bidenharn, Mgr**	Beaumont's new million dollar hotel.
PLAZA HOTEL **European plan**	Rooms $1.00, with bath $1.50 Heart of the city.
SEAPORT MOTOR CO **787 Broadway**	Overland garage. Day and night service. Willys-Knight and Overland dealers. Phone 867
FULLER'S CAFE **574 Pearl St**	Beaumont's exclusive cafe. Tourist comfort assured. Also Port Arthur.
FABRA AUTO SUPPLY CO **Magnolia and Laurel Sts**	Day and night road service. Filling station and accessories. A. W. Fabra. Phone 205

PORT ARTHUR

OST Tributary Line south from Beaumont to the Gulf
OST Officials—F. C. Gifford, Councilor.
Pop. 22,251 Elevation 10 ft. Three banks.
Concrete road from Beaumont. Port Arthur is developing into a great refinery and shipping point. Orange, Beaumont and Port Arthur are attaining distinction as the seaports of the southwest.

NOME

OST Officials—F. B. Hammers, Councilor.
Pop. 110 Elevation 44 ft.
Tourist Camp—Oak grove; not equipped.
Products—Rice, oil, cattle, truck.

GENERAL MERCHANDISE **Mrs. Nettie Weaver**	Cold drinks, lunches and tourists' rest. Filling station.
NOME GARAGE **F. B. Hammers**	Gas, oil, tires, tubes and everything. First-class mechanic.

Figure 69. OST Highway map and travel guide from 1923 showing listings for Beaumont, Port Arthur, and Nome. Source: Old Spanish Trail Centennial Celebration Association, accessed December 12, 2021, http://www.oldspanishtrailcentennial.com/travel_logs/1923-1.pdf.

A number of rural communities also boasted schools early in this period. Though public education was established in the late nineteenth century, the passage of a several laws at the state level in the early twentieth century aided education efforts for much of Jefferson County by establishing county boards of education and expanding aid to rural schools.[96] By 1920, as reported in the *1921 School Review of Jefferson County*, the county had more than 10 public school districts and more than 20 schools, 6 of which provided teacherages.[97] Outside of current boundaries of Beaumont and Port Arthur (which each had a high school and elementary schools), and excluding Port Neches and Nederland, Jefferson County boasted schools in Nome, China, Meeker, Fannett, LaBelle, Cheek, and Hamshire. Additionally, the county had one school in a rural area outside of Hamshire named New Holland School. In 1924, several of the smaller, one-teacher schools closed, as the trend of district and school consolidating began.[98]

A reflection of the communities to which they belonged, many of the schools had classes on farming in addition to the required lessons. In China, for example, "boys and girls born and bred on the farm are taught practical agriculture in connection with their other studies."[99] The school property contained, in addition to the school building, a barn with a blacksmith shop and a field where male students grew crops. The girls, who were taught sewing and cooking, also learned poultry husbandry.[100] The rural schools also played a role in the life of the community, providing spaces for entertainment and social functions, as well as playgrounds and sports fields. In Fannett, fundraisers and gatherings at the school

raised money for a "handsome Grafanola [phonograph]…for the entertainment of the gatherings" and music class.[101] In China, the school also offered night classes to the "farmers of French descent" who did not speak English."[102]

The student bodies at each of these schools also reflected their community demographics. While White and Black students did not attend classes together, Black children in these rural areas received educations in separate buildings, according to the 1937 School Adequacy Book (Figure 70). While White children accounted for the majority of the student body, Black students made up between 3.3 percent (in LaBelle) and 42 percent (in Cheek) of the student body in these rural schools in 1921. The Nome School and China School each had one Black teacher.[103] The 1937 School Adequacy book shows that the communities of Nome, China, Cheek, Hamshire/New Holland, and possibly LaBelle all had Black schools. Additionally, Beaumont and Port Arthur had all-Black schools, including two Rosenwald Schools.

Many of the rural schools, which organized in the early twentieth century, built small wood-frame school buildings, aided by the increase in funds from the state. At least one of these school buildings, the old La Belle School, remains, having been moved to its current location at 12542 LaBelle Road after it closed (Figure 71). Reflecting their larger student bodies and the prosperity of their communities, Nome and China built larger masonry buildings. While many of these early school buildings are no longer extant, one school building built around 1920 and associated with the China School remains at 717 N. Broadway Street (Figures 72-73). (In 1937, Nome added a separate school gymnasium with a basketball court and a 400-seat capacity, paid entirely with funds from the local maintenance fund (Figure 74)).[104] Built at 1675 Texas Street (extant), the building cost $12,000 and was considered "one of the most complete small structures of its kind available to a school the size of Nome [110 students] in this section."[105] As schools began consolidating in the mid-1920s, smaller schools were sold and larger new schools were built. In Fannett, where the district assumed the LaBelle and Burrell Schools, a new, larger building opened in 1924 (not extant).[106] During the Depression, New Deal programs aided some of these smaller rural schools. In Fannett, the National Youth Administration (NYA) helped build a vocational and manual arts classroom and workshop in 1938 (not extant).[107] In Cheek, the PWA helped build a new school in 1939 (not extant).[108]



Figure 70. 1937 map of the schools in Jefferson County. Black schools are indicated by the letter "N." Source: "Texas School Adequacy Survey," Texas State Board of Education, 1937, 840.



Figure 71. The LaBelle School - a typical wood-frame school building found in rural towns in Jefferson County. The school was built at the southwest corner of LaBelle Road and Burrell Wingate. When it was closed after consolidating with the Fannett School, the building was moved to its present location at 12542 LaBelle Road. Source: *The School Review of Jefferson County*, Texas, published for the Schools of Jefferson County (1921): 56.



Figure 72. Photo of 717 N. Broadway Street in China. Built around 1920, the school building is the only extant building associated with the China School. Source: HHM, 2022.



Figure 73. The early twentieth-century brick school building in China (not extant). Source: *The School Review of Jefferson County*, Texas, published for the Schools of Jefferson County (1921): 26.



Figure 74. Current photo of the school gymnasium built in Nome in 1937.Source: HHM, 2022.

Parks and Open Space

During this period, public park creation was generally confined to the larger cities of Beaumont and Port Arthur. One of the few public parks created outside Beaumont and Port Arthur was Port Neches Park in Port Neches sometime around 1920. In Sabine Pass, the state erected the Dick Dowling statue in what is now Sabine Pass Battleground Park as part of the 1936 State Centennial Celebration (Figure 75).

Tyrrell Park, Beaumont

The majority of New Deal programs and projects in Jefferson County fell within Beaumont and Port Arthur. Among the projects funded by New Deal programs was a WPA public swimming pool at Alice Keith Park (only entrance remains) in Beaumont, the County Building in Port Arthur (extant), the Beaumont Municipal Airport (original terminal replaced), and the Rainbow Bridge (extant). Another project was the development of Tyrrell Park. Between 1935 and 1941, more than a decade after local philanthropist W. C. Tyrrell donated roughly 1,500 acres in southwest Beaumont for the creation of a city park, the Civilian Conservation Corps built drainage ditches, roads, nature trails, picnic tables, a horse stable, recreation building, and an entrance portal.[109] The public park was the largest in the county, and it also contained the county's first municipal golf course—the first private club (Beaumont Country Club) opened in 1906—also built by the CCC.[110] Many of the CCC improvements remain but have been badly damaged by hurricanes over the years (Figure 76).

Despite the lack of public parks outside Beaumont and Port Arthur, Jefferson County had an abundance of open land that residents used recreationally. The expanded road network, particularly the completion of Beach Road, made the southern section of the county and the publicly owned beach land more accessible (Figure 77). A 1924 *Port Arthur News* article reported that a refinery workers' picnic had attracted "the greatest crowd in history," with around 25,000 people enjoying swimming, dancing, games, and fireworks.[111] Without fences or cattle guards across the road, though, beachgoers sometimes had to share the space with cattle that roamed over from the ranch lands to the north.

The privately owned southern marshlands, visited by waterfowl and muskrat hunters and fishermen since the nineteenth century, also grew in popularity among outdoorspeople. Rather than coordinating with private property owners individually, as was the situation in past periods, hunting and sportsmen clubs organized and leased land from the property owners for recreational use. Some of the first clubs in the county formed in the early 1900s, hunting at Keith Lake and at John Gate's Lost Lake Preserve.[112] Some private clubs, including the Millionaire Sportsmen's Club—comprised of prominent local businessmen—had clubhouses in Port Arthur, while others built clubhouses and camps in the marshes, along the roads—Clam Lake Road and Beach Road—and along the Intracoastal Canal (Figure 78). By the 1930s, shacks, camps, and lodges dotted the southern marshes, with around 50 camps on Big Hill Bayou alone.[113]

Port Arthur Hunting Club

Among the largest and most prominent private clubs in the county was the Port Arthur Hunting Club. Established in 1926, the club counted some of the county's most prominent local oilmen and business owners as members. Founded by Henry Joseph LeBlanc, who also founded the Standard Brass Manufacturing Company in Port Arthur, the club leased between 30,000 and 40,000 acres of land on the McFaddin Ranch.[114] Wanting a place to take visiting executives and clients on hunting, fishing, and boating trips, LeBlanc coordinated with McFaddin for a lease. McFaddin agreed in the hopes that it would curtail trespassing on his property. The club set up driftwood camps with corrugated tin roofs on the beach dunes. In the early 1930s, LeBlanc built Breeze Inn, a building atop pilings with a bar, dance floor, and kitchen as an escape from the mosquitoes and weather (Figure 79).[115] During World War II, the U. S. government used the building as a patrol station. For a short period of time, the club used a yacht as its clubhouse before the Standard Brass Camp was built on the south side of the Intracoastal Canal. Like most of the camps in Jefferson County, both the Breeze Inn and the Standard Brass Camp were destroyed by hurricanes.

In addition to the private clubs, property owners also offered guided hunts and day passes for hunting and fishing. One of the first day hunting operations opened in the 1920s at Pipkin's Hunting Ranch – 18,000 acres of fresh and salt wetlands, prairie, and rice fields near Big Hill and Star Lake (Figure 80).[116] Another popular day hunting operation opened near Sea Rim Marsh. Named Sea Rim Hunting Club by the 1930s, the operation had been so popular in the 1920s that for a short period of time (before the sheriff intervened), an enterprising man collected tolls at a gate he erected on the road to the ranch.[117] At the McFaddin Ranch, owner W. P. H. McFaddin commercialized muskrat trapping on the property, holding a yearly auction at warehouses he built on the ranch for fur trappers to sell their goods.[118]The sporting culture associated with these lands became an important part of Jefferson County and one that would play a role in the next period during the creation of refuges and state parks.



Figure 75. As part of the Texas Centennial Celebration, the monument to Dick Dowling (sculpture not shown in photo) was erected in Sabine Pass at the intersection of SH 87 and Broadway Street. This photo, from the 1950s, shows it dismantled in preparation for its relocation to its current location at the Sabine Pass Battleground State Historic Site. Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting the Museum of the Gulf Coast, accessed December 12, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth202659.



Figure 76a. The CCC-built Tyrrell Park Clubhouse in Beaumont with damage caused by hurricanes. Source: Larry D. Moore, CC BY-SA 4.0 April 4, 2015, from The Living New Deal, accessed December 12, 2021, https://livingnewdeal.org/projects/tyrrell-park-beaumont-tx/.



Figure 76b. The CCC-built Tyrrell Park Clubhouse in Beaumont after renovations. Source: Jefferson County Historical Commission, 2024.



Figure 77. A family at McFaddin Beach in Jefferson County in 1922. Once the roads were improved, the county's beaches became more accessible to leisure-seekers. Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting the Museum of the Gulf Coast, accessed December 12, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth201944.



Figure 78. A typical hunting camp erected in the marshes in southern Jefferson County in the early and mid-twentieth century. This camp was located on the south shore of Johnson Lake in Sabine Pass (presumably not extant). Source: Fletcher White Collection, courtesy Charles Stutzenbaker, from R. K. Sawyer, *A Hundred Years of Texas Waterfowl Hunting: The Decoys, Guides, Clubs, and Places: 1870s to 1970s* (College Station, Texas: Texas A&M University Press, 2012).



Figure 79. The Breeze Inn on McFaddin Beach. The building was lost to a hurricane. Source: John Marshall LeBlanc, Gulfway Drive Memories Facebook page.



Figure 80a. 1918 map of Jefferson County. Source: H. F. McDonald and H. M. Bramlette, 1918, via the Texas General Land Office, https://historictexasmaps.com/collection/search-results/16860-jefferson-co-general-map-collection.



Figure 80b. Inset of the 1918 map with land in southern Jefferson County owned by Pipkin and McFaddin noted with an orange dot. Source: H. F. McDonald and H. M. Bramlette, 1918, via the Texas General Land Office, https://historictexasmaps.com/collection/search-results/16860-jefferson-co-general-map-collection.

ENDNOTES

[1] Jason P. Theriot, "The Migration of Cajuns to Southeast Texas," *The Journal of the Louisiana Historical Association* 58, no. 4 (2017), 452, https://jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26290932.

[2] Robert Wooster, "Big Hill, TX (Jefferson County)," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 06, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/big-hill-tx-jefferson-county.

[3] U. S. Census Bureau, "Texas," 1940, 968, https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/decennial/1940/population-volume-2/33973538v2p6ch9.pdf.

[4] "A People at Risk," Library of Congress, accessed October 10, 2021, https://www.loc.gov/classroom-materials/immigration/polish-russian/a-people-at-risk/.

[5] "Union Sulphur Company," Genealogy Trails, accessed December 3, 2021, http://genealogytrails.com/tex/gulfcoast/jefferson/history_union_co.htm.

[6] Diana J. Kleiner, "Jefferson County," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 15, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/jefferson-county.

[7] Edward J. M. Rhoads, "Japanese," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 03, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/japanese.

[8] Kleiner, "Jefferson County."

[9] Kleiner, "Jefferson County."

[10] Marvin L. Brown, "Truck Gardening, The New Venture in the Great Gulf Coast Region," *The Kansas City Southern Railway Agricultural and Industrial Bulletin* 3-9 (1922): 6.

[11] W. T. Block, "Jefferson County, Texas Its Geological, Historical and Agricultural Background," accessed December 1, 2021, http://www.wtblock.com/wtblockjr/jefferso.htm.

[12] *Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide for 1910*, from the University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Texas State Historical Association, 217, accessed November 10, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth123780/.

[13] "Soil Survey of Jefferson and Orange Counties, Texas," completed for the United States Department of Agriculture, June 2006, 3-4, from University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting UNT Libraries Government Documents Department, accessed February 5, 2024,https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth278928/. .

[14] *Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide for 1910*, 217.

[15] "Hamshire Fig Preserving Plant Does $100,000 Trade First Year," *Beaumont Enterprise*, November 8, 1925, 51.

[16] "The Canning Industry," *The Kansas City Southern Railway Agricultural and Industrial Bulletin* 3-9 (1922): 10.

[17] *Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide for 1939-1940*, from the University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Texas State Historical Association, 428, accessed November 10, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth117163/.

[18] *Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide for 1939-1940*, 428.

[19] Jeon Lee, "The Historical Geography of Rice Culture in the American South," *LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses* (1988), https:/digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses/4655.

[20] Isaac Schultz, "How a Japanese Family Jumpstarted Rice Farming, Deep in the Heart of Texas," *Atlas Obscura*, January 8, 2021, https://www.atlasobscura.com/articles/japanese-rice-cultivation-texas.

[21] Schultz, "How a Japanese Family Jumpstarted Rice Farming, Deep in the Heart of Texas."

[22] Schultz, "How a Japanese Family Jumpstarted Rice Farming, Deep in the Heart of Texas."

[23] W. T. Block, "Tulip Transplants to East Texas: The Dutch Migration to Nederland, Port Arthur, and Winnie, 1895-1915," *East Texas Historical Journal* 13, no. 2 (1975): 43, https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/ethj/vol13/iss2/7.

[24] Denise Gomez, "First Providence, Then Prosperity: A Brief History of Beaumont's Rice Culture," *Houston History Magazine,* July 2016, https://houstonhistorymagazine.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Beaumont-.pdf.

[25] Gomez, "First Providence, Then Prosperity: A Brief History of Beaumont's Rice Culture."

[26] Lynn M. Alperin, *Custodians of the Coast: History of the United States Army Engineers at Galveston* (Galveston, Texas: United States Army Corps of Engineers, 1977) 77.

[27] Gomez, "First Providence, Then Prosperity: A Brief History of Beaumont's Rice Culture."

[28] "History," Jefferson County Drainage District No. 7, accessed December 3, 2021, https://dd7.org/history.asp.

[29] "History," Jefferson County Drainage District 3, accessed December 5, 2021, https://jcdd3.org/history/.

[30] Hidalgo County established the first drainage district and Willacy County established the second. "History," Jefferson County Drainage District 3.

[31] "History," Jefferson County Drainage District 3.

[32] "About the District," Jefferson County Drainage District No. 6, accessed November 19, 2021, https://dd6.org/about/.

[33] "Plains of Texas Ideal for Cattle Ranches," *Beaumont Enterprise*, May 31, 1936, 38.

[34] U. S. Census Bureau, "Texas," 1940.

[35] *Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide for 1941*, from the University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Texas State Historical Association, 465, accessed November 10, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth117164/; U. S. Census Bureau, 1945 agricultural census.

[36] Block, "Tulip Transplants to East Texas," 44.; "Nederland on Verge Of a New Land Boom," *The Port Arthur News*, July 1, 1923, 87.

[37] "Nederland on Verge Of a New Land Boom," *The Port Arthur News*, July 1, 1923, 87.

[38] "Nederland on Verge Of a New Land Boom," *The Port Arthur News*, July 1, 1923, 87.

[39] W. T. Block, "Dairy farm's end stopped wonder bra for milk cows," February 13, 1999, http://www.wtblock.com/wtblockjr/dairy.htm.

[40] Based on U. S. Census Bureau numbers

[41] W. T. Block, "Early Livestock Industry," *A History of Jefferson County, Texas*, accessed December 1, 2021, http://www.wtblock.com/wtblockjr/History%20of%20Jefferson%20County/Chapter%2011.htm.

[42] "Plains of Texas Ideal for Cattle Ranches," *Beaumont Enterprise*, May 31, 1936, 38.

[43] "Random Sketches," *Beaumont Enterprise*, April 5, 1936, 25.

[44] Rosine McFaddin Wilson, "McFaddin Ranches," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed November 16, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/mcfaddin-ranches.

[45] R. K. Sawyer, *A Hundred Years of Texas Waterfowl Hunting: The Decoys, Guides, Clubs, and Places: 1870s to 1970s* (College Station, Texas: Texas A&M University Press, 2012) 23.

[46] *Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide for 1904*, from the University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Texas State Historical Association, 299, accessed November 10, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth123779.

[47] "A History of Jefferson County, Texas," Jefferson County Historical Commission, 55, accessed November 3, 2021, https://co.jefferson.tx.us/historical_commission/pdfjs/web/viewer.html?file=files/History/Jefferson_County_History_2015-12-03.pdf.

[48] "A History of Jefferson County, Texas," 55.

[49] "A Visit to the Kirby Mills," Texas Transportation Archive, September 1, 1937, https://www.ttarchive.com/Library/Articles/Kirby-Lbr_1937_Visit-Kirby-Mills.html.

[50] "Lumber concern Takes Over Voth Mills for $750,000," *Beaumont Enterprise*, Feb. 17, 1922, 3.

[51] "Lumber concern Takes Over Voth Mills for $750,000," *Beaumont Enterprise*, Feb. 17, 1922, 3.

[52] "Old Voth Sawmill," Geocaching, accessed November 4, 2021, https://www.geocaching.com/geocache/GCMRP1_old-voth-sawmill?guid=e160a7ad-8891-49d6-bcab-fdd131e08b62.

[53] *Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide for 1925*, from the University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Texas State Historical Association, 301, accessed November 10, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth123783/.

[54] *Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide for 1939-1940*, from the University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Texas State Historical Association, 428, accessed November 10, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth117163/.

[55] Robert S. Maxwell, "Lumber Industry," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 13, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/lumber-industry.

[56] Robert Wooster and Christine Moor Sanders, "Spindletop Oilfield," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 13, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/spindletop-oilfield.

[57] Wooster and Sanders, "Spindletop Oilfield."

[58] Wooster and Sanders, "Spindletop Oilfield."

[59] "Beauxart Gardens – Nederland, TX," The Living New Deal, accessed December 1, 2021, https://livingnewdeal.org/projects/beauxart-gardens-nederland-tx/.

[60] "Subsistence Homesteads," A National Agricultural Library Digital Exhibit, U. S. Department of Agriculture, accessed November 2, 2021, https://www.nal.usda.gov/exhibits/ipd/small/files/original/b1ec8ffd2d2ff5b60455a35db802cff9.jpg.

[61] "Beauxart Gardens – Nederland, TX," The Living New Deal, accessed December 1, 2021, https://livingnewdeal.org/projects/beauxart-gardens-nederland-tx/.

[62] *Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide for 1904,* 301.

[63] *Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide for 1914*, from the University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Texas State Historical Association, 295, accessed November 10, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth117157/.

[64] "Beach Road," Texas Historical Commission OTHM Marker, July 26, 2006, https://co.jefferson.tx.us/historical_commission/pdfjs/web/viewer.html?file=files/markers/13645.pdf?Marker%20No.=13645.

[65] "African American Travel Guide Survey Project," Texas Historical Commission, accessed June 27, 2022, https://www.thc.texas.gov/content/african-american-travel-guide-survey-project.

[66] Regina A. Lauderdale, "Port Arthur-Orange Bridge," National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, Texas Historical Commission, September 1996, 8-6, https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/NR/pdfs/96001127/96001127.pdf.

[67] "Rainbow Bridge," Texas Historical Commission OTHM Marker, 1990, https://atlas.thc.state.tx.us/Details/5245010555.

[68]Alperin, *Custodians of the Coast,* 72.

[69] Alperin, *Custodians of the Coast,* 72.

[70] Robert Wooster, "Sabine-Neches Waterway and Sabine Pass Ship Channel," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 09, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/sabine-neches-waterway-and-sabine-pass-ship-channel.

[71] Sawyer, *A Hundred Years of Texas Waterfowl Hunting*, 80.

[72] Arlene Christiansen, "'Other Views,' McFaddin Ranches," *McFaddin-Ward House Viewpoints* 35, no. 4 (September 2019): 6. https://mcfaddin-ward.org/viewpoints-vol-35-no-4/.

[73] Sawyer, *A Hundred Years of Texas Waterfowl Hunting*, 80.

[74] "The Jefferson County Courthouse County Seat - Beaumont, Texas," Jefferson County Courthouse, Beaumont Texas, accessed December 7, 2021, http://www.texasescapes.com/TexasGulfCoastTowns/BeaumontTexasJeffersonCountyCourthouse.htm.

[75] "Jefferson County Courthouse," Texas Historical Commission OTHM Marker, 1980, https://atlas.thc.state.tx.us/Details/5245010536/print.

[76] "Jefferson County," Courthouses.co, accessed December 7, 2021, http://www.courthouses.co/us-states/o-u/texas/jefferson-county/.

[77] "The Jefferson County Courthouse County Seat - Beaumont, Texas," Jefferson County Courthouse, Beaumont Texas, accessed December 7, 2021, http://www.texasescapes.com/TexasGulfCoastTowns/BeaumontTexasJeffersonCountyCourthouse.htm.

[78] "Nederland on Verge Of a New Land Boom," *The Port Arthur News*, July 1, 1923, 87.; *The School Review of Jefferson County, Texas,* published for the Schools of Jefferson County (1921): 14.

[79] "Nederland on Verge Of a New Land Boom," *The Port Arthur News*, July 1, 1923, 87.

[80] "Nederland on Verge Of a New Land Boom," *The Port Arthur News*, July 1, 1923, 87.

[81] "Library History," Marion and Ed Hughes Public Library, accessed November 1, 2021, https://www.ned.lib.tx.us/my-library/mehpl-library-history.

[82] Based on 1949 Sanborn maps of Nederland, Sheets 2 and 6.

[83] Robert Wooster, "Port Neches, TX," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 06, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/port-neches-tx.

[84] Theriot, "The Migration of Cajuns to Southeast Texas," 452.

[85] *The School Review of Jefferson County*, 75-76.

[86] "Port Neches Park to Open Tomorrow," *Beaumont Journal*, March 31, 1927, 5.

[87] "A History of the Port Neches Independent School District," Port Neches-Groves Independent School District, 15-16, accessed November 30, 2021, https://www.pngisd.org/domain/11.

[88] Laurie E. Jasinski, "Central Gardens, TX," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 06, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/central-gardens-tx.

[89] "Groves History – 'A City amid the Groves,'" City of Groves, Texas, accessed December 8, 2021, https://www.cigrovestx.com/page/city.history.

[90] Robert Wooster, "Groves, TX," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 8, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/groves-tx.

[91] Robert Wooster, "Voth, TX," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 8, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/voth-tx.

[92] Wooster, "Big Hill, TX (Jefferson County)."

[93] Wooster, "Big Hill, TX (Jefferson County)."

[94] "Something About Nome," *Beaumont Enterprise*, Nov. 28, 1903, 28.

[95] "About us," Our Lady of Sorrows Church, accessed December 8, 2021, https://www.ourladyofsorrowschina.com/about-us.

[96] "An Overview of the History of Public Education in Texas," Texas Education Agency, accessed December 9, 2021, https://tea.texas.gov/about-tea/welcome-and-overview/an-overview-of-the-history-of-public-education-in-texas.

[97] *The School Review of Jefferson County*, 11.

[98] "Three More One-Teacher Schools to Pass This Week; Big Building is Finished," *Beaumont Enterprise*, Feb. 21, 1924, 2.

[99] *The School Review of Jefferson County*, 28.

[100] *The School Review of Jefferson County*, 29.

[101] *The School Review of Jefferson County*, 54.

[102] *The School Review of Jefferson County*, 29.

[103] *The School Review of Jefferson County*, 13-14

[104] "$12,000 Gymnasium at Nome Dedicated," *Beaumont Journal*, October 23, 1937, 22.

[105] "$12,000 Gymnasium at Nome Dedicated," *Beaumont Journal*, October 23, 1937, 22.

[106] "Three More One-Teacher Schools to Pass This Week; Big Building is Finished," *Beaumont Enterprise*, Feb. 21, 1924, 2.

[107] *Victoria Advocate*, June 13, 1938, 2.

[108] Robert Wooster, "Cheek, TX," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 9, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/cheek-tx.

[109] "Tyrrell Park – Beaumont, TX," The Living New Deal, accessed December 9, 2021, https://livingnewdeal.org/projects/tyrrell-park-beaumont-tx/.

[110] "Club History," Beaumont Country Club, accessed December 9, 2021, https://beaumontcountryclub.com/BCC.

[111] "Beach Road," Texas Historical Commission OTHM Marker.

[112] Sawyer, *A Hundred Years of Texas Waterfowl Hunting*, 90-91.

[113] Sawyer, *A Hundred Years of Texas Waterfowl Hunting*, 97.

[114] Sawyer, *A Hundred Years of Texas Waterfowl Hunting*, 82.

[115] Sawyer, *A Hundred Years of Texas Waterfowl Hunting*, 82.

[116] Sawyer, *A Hundred Years of Texas Waterfowl Hunting*, 93.

[117] Sawyer, *A Hundred Years of Texas Waterfowl Hunting*, 94.

[118] Christiansen, "'Other Views,' McFaddin Ranches," 6.

WORLD WAR II: 1941–1945

World War II ushered in a period of intense industrialization. Existing industries expanded and new ones emerged in response to the country's wartime needs. As a result of the rapid industrialization and the loss of labor due to the war, an influx of new workers settled in the county. The population increase was not without growing pains, and Jefferson County was forced to deal with that fallout. The war also impacted agriculture in the county, though the arrival of thousands of prisoners of war (POW) helped make up for the loss of farm and ranch hands due to the war. Lastly, the county's wartime maritime heritage played a role in coastal defense during the war.

IMPACT ON INDUSTRY

During the war, Jefferson County experienced rapid industrialization that saw existing industries expand and new ones emerge. The oil industry remained the economic backbone of Jefferson County during the period, and wartime oil and gas demands saw drilling increase and the county's refineries—in Beaumont, Nederland, Port Arthur, and Port Neches—increase production. No new refineries opened during the war, but the county's seven refineries expanded production by two million barrels and added more than 6,500 more workers.[1] In addition to oil, a related new product—synthetic rubber—became an important wartime commodity, and several new plants in Jefferson County helped the country meet its rubber demands. Lastly, one of the county's oldest industries, shipbuilding, added around 8,500 workers to its rolls during the period, necessitated by the country's need for wartime ships.[2] These three industries—oil, synthetic rubber, and shipbuilding—not only employed the most people in Jefferson County during the war, but their products also played a critical role in the U. S. military victory.

Rubber

Used by the military for truck and plane tires, rubber was an important commodity during World War II. Cut off in the early 1940s from East India, which provided around 97 percent of the country's rubber, the U. S. government took steps to manufacture and stockpile its own rubber.[3] Under the auspices of the Rubber Reserve Company and Defense Plant Corporation, the government ordered the country's four largest rubber companies—Goodyear, Firestone, B. F. Goodrich, and the United States Rubber Company—to construct and operate new synthetic rubber plants. With its "huge and dominating oil supply and refining business" Texas was the ideal location for rubber plants. As a result, between 1940 and 1944, around 15 new plants opened across the state in oil and natural gas rich regions, and by 1950 the state produced more than 50 percent of the country's synthetic rubber.[4]

In Jefferson County, Port Neches became known as the "Synthetic Rubber Capital of the World" during the war.[5] In addition to the county's established petroleum industry, the city's location on the Neches River and proximity to the Gulf of Mexico attracted several rubber companies to Port Neches. Between 1942 and 1944, the U. S. government and private companies coordinated and built several plants on undeveloped land in Port Neches, employing as many as 15,000 construction workers (located east of downtown on the remains of the C. O. Baird land, roughly situated between Main Street and SH 136).[6] In 1942, the United States Rubber Company (still in operation as Lion Elastomers) began producing emulsion styrene butadiene, a synthetic rubber, at its new Port Neches plant at 1615 Main Street. Neches Butane Products Company (under current operation as TPC Group) also built a plant in Port Neches. Formed by five oil companies in 1942, NBPC produced butadiene, a critical component in synthetic rubber produced from petroleum. When completed in 1944, the NBPC complex was the largest butadiene plant in the world.[7] The plant occupied 485 acres and consisted of 23 buildings, pressure vessels, reactors, furnaces, tanks, and 48 17-story steel butadiene towers (Figure 81, located south of downtown).[8] During the war, the plant was the largest producer of butadiene in the world. The plant remained in operation until 2019 when 6,000 gallons of butadiene leaked, causing an explosion

that destroyed the plant. The government also helped fund the construction of the B. F. Goodrich Company and the Firestone Tire and Rubber Company plants on 124 acres of undeveloped land. When the Goodrich plant opened in February 1944, it was the world's largest petroleum-derived butadiene rubber plant and employed 8,000 workers (Figure 82).[9] By late 1944, the government began selling some of its industrial plants, including some of the rubber plants in Port Neches which were purchased by the private companies operating them.[10] This trend continued into the 1950s until all the plants were privately owned.

Learn more! *Watch the video on the construction of the plant at https://texasarchive.org/2016_05631.*



Figure 81. The Neches Butane Plant, one of the synthetic rubber plants built in Port Neches during World War II. Source: postcard, eBay, accessed November 30, 2021, https://www.ebay.com/b/San-Antonio-Texas-USA-Collectible-Topographical-Postcards/262042/bn_3048174.



Figure 82. Another synthetic rubber plant, the B. B. Goodrich Synthetic Rubber Plant, that opened in Port Neches during World War II. Source: postcard, ebay, accessed November 30, 2021, https://www.ebay.com/itm/202806588542.

Shipbuilding

Southeast Texas's and Jefferson County's abundance of yellow pine—a suitable material for ship construction—sawmills, and various waterways predisposed the region to shipbuilding. Beginning in the nineteenth century, Jefferson County's history of shipbuilding, like the rest of Southeast Texas's, experienced periods of diminished activity and growth, particularly during periods of conflict, such as the Civil War and World War I. Slowed by the Great Depression, the industry rebounded on the eve of World War II.

In preparation for war, the federal government financed shipyard expansion through the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Across Southeast Texas, existing companies expanded their yards, while new companies established themselves in the region. Between 1937 and 1940, the number of shipbuilding companies in Texas increased from 7 to 10.[11] Of the 10 shipbuilding companies in the state, Jefferson County claimed two: the Neches Shipyard in Beaumont and the Pennsylvania Shipyard in Beaumont.[12] By 1945, a third, the Samuelson Shipyard, was also building ships in Beaumont. In addition to shipyard expansion, the Neches River ship channel was also deepened and extended to the Pennsylvania Shipyard on Island Park in the late 1930s in preparation for war. By 1939, the Pennsylvania Shipyard began building simple cargo ships for transporting troops and materials overseas under the federal government's Emergency Shipbuilding Program.

Shipyard expansion continued during the war under President Roosevelt's shipbuilding program, with local shipyards getting lucrative contracts from the government. New shipbuilding technology and techniques—with welding replacing riveting—also increased shipbuilding production, though they required new equipment and skilled welders. In addition to installing new mass production equipment, some companies offered on-the-job training.[13] Throughout the war, the shipyards in Beaumont produced over 100 minesweepers, cargo ships, tugs, and barges for the federal government.

Throughout the war, the shipyards in Jefferson County employed around 9,000 people and still, in early 1942, companies enacted two 10-hour daily shifts to keep up with demand (Figure 83).[14] The labor shortage caused by war and the wartime demand also saw women employed and trained as welders at the shipyards (Figure 84).



Figure 83. Scene of the Pennsylvania Shipyard in Beaumont in 1943 during World War II. Even though Black laborers experienced some economic advancements during the war due to the labor shortage, note that the White and Black workers are still separated as they leave their shifts. Source: John Vachon, May 1943, Library of Congress, https://www.loc.gov/item/2017856452/.



Figure 84. Women were also trained to take on jobs due to the labor shortage. Here is a woman welding at the Pennsylvania Shipyard in Beaumont in 1943. Source: John Vachon, May 1943, Library of Congress, https://www.loc.gov/item/2017856282/.

SOCIAL IMPACTS OF EXPANDED INDUSTRY

Population Growth: Influx of Laborers and Impacts

Expanded industrial production and economic development in Jefferson County contributed to a rise in population during the war. The economic climate combined with the loss of labor due to fighting abroad created a void that was filled by an influx of new workers, attracted by on-the-job training and good pay offered by many companies. Between 1941 and 1948, Jefferson County added over 56,000 new residents.[15] A large number of laborers came from Louisiana and many of the Cajun and Creole laborers remained in Jefferson County after the war. So many Louisiana migrants settled in Port Arthur that it became known as the Texas capital of Louisiana.[16] Black laborers also came to Jefferson County in droves during the war. Between 1940 and 1950, the county's Black population increased by more than 200 percent. Accounting for 11 percent of the county's population in 1940, by 1950 Black residents made up 23 percent of the total population in Jefferson County.[17]

HOUSING SHORTAGES

One of the consequences of the county's rapid population growth was a housing shortage. Since most of the jobs were located in Beaumont, Port Arthur, Port Neches, and nearby Orange in Orange County, the majority of the new residents settled in eastern Jefferson County, in and around its largest cities (Table 7). As early as December 1941, Beaumont reported a housing shortage, with only "11 vacant houses, 27 apartments, and 218 rooms available for rent in the city."[18] The shortage worsened as the U. S. entered the war, and reports of housing shortages in Beaumont, Port Arthur, and Port Neches littered the local newspapers throughout the war. While some defense workers slept in their cars, others moved outside of town and commuted to work daily.[19] Cities encouraged homeowners to open their unoccupied rooms to renters, and the National Housing Agency sent hundreds of trailers to house workers.[20] In Port Neches, the government set up trailers across from Port Neches Park.[21] Despite the federal government's rationing of commodities, including some construction material, through its War Production Board the government funded and allowed some construction projects to help alleviate the county's shortage.

Table 7. Table showing population growth during World War II in the county's most populous cities.

Year	Beaumont	Port Arthur	Port Neches	County Total
1940	59,061	46,140	2,487	145,329
1950	94,014	57,530	5,448	195,083

The U. S. Maritime Commission (USMC) backed two of the largest wartime construction projects. The first, Multimax Village off Gulf Street in north Beaumont, opened in 1942. Designed by Federal Public Housing Administration architects, David Williams, Roy A. Worden, Karl R. Schwarz, and William P. Jones, the complex was designed to "free the housewife for war work" and used a minimal amount of materials.[22] The complex, a blueprint for other war workers' housing, cost around $1,500,000 and provided 600 rental units for defense workers (Figure 85).[23] One year later, the USMC completed a second 600-unit complex next to Multimax Village. The 81 two-story buildings and 31 one-story buildings, designed by Beaumont architectural firms Stone and Pitts and Steinman and Goldman, housed workers from the Pennsylvania Shipyard.[24] In 1956, the City of Beaumont demolished both complexes.

The U. S. government also funded the construction of 720 low-cost prefabricated houses for construction workers building the rubber plants in Port Neches. Camp Neches, located on the rubber plant tract, also had two cafes, a warehouse, and nearly 100 ancillary buildings. By 1944, after the completion of the plant, the government deconstructed the houses and sold them for $22.50.[25]

Private investors also funded wartime housing projects. In early 1944, construction began on new residences in Beaumont, Port Arthur, and Port Neches. Approved by the War Production Board, the

project added 795 one- and two-bedroom wood-frame houses; 145 in Beaumont, 400 in Port Arthur, and 250 in Port Neches.[26]



Figure 85. Newspaper clipping showing Multimax Village, one of the housing developments built in Beaumont during World War II to house the influx of industrial workers (not extant). Source: C*orpus Christi Caller-Times*, June 21, 1942, 26.

RACIAL TENSION

The sheer number of new residents in the county stretched thin much of its infrastructure, facilities, and institutions. The growth of the Black population forced integration since services and facilities could not accommodate segregation. The labor shortage and President Roosevelt's 1941 executive order prohibiting ethnic and racial discriminatory hiring practices in the defense industries forced employers to hire more Black workers for semi-skilled and skilled jobs, positions previously reserved for White workers. As a result, Black and White laborers worked side by side in the shipyards, on construction sites, and in plants. Combined with the food shortages and ration cards issued in Beaumont in 1941, tensions increased throughout the war to a point where the regional food administration head declared the atmosphere "conducive to riot."[27]

Following several incidents in Beaumont, including the shooting and injury of a Black military policeman on a city bus, tensions came to a head over several days in June 1943 during the Beaumont Race Riot. Sparked by the unsubstantiated claim that a Black man raped a White woman, White workers at the Pennsylvania Shipyard began terrorizing Black residents in Beaumont on June 15. Around 4,000 White looters pillaged Black-owned businesses and assaulted and terrorized Black residents with a variety of weapons, including guns. The city was placed under martial law and the mayor called in the Texas National Guard, who patrolled the city along with Texas Rangers and state police (Figure 86). In total, looters burned a number of buildings, ransacked hundreds of homes, injured around 60 people, and killed three people—two Black and one White—two during the riot and one weeks later due to injuries.[28] The police arrested around 200 people, and a military tribunal charged 29 of them with crimes including assault and battery, unlawful assembly, and arson. The remaining individuals were released, and no one was held responsible for the deaths caused by the riot.[29] Acting Texas governor A. M. Aikin, Jr. lifted the period of martial law on June 20, at which time Black and White workers returned to the Pennsylvania Shipyard.



Figure 86. Scene in Beaumont during the race riot of 1943. Simmering racial tensions fueled by the influx of laborers, housing and food shortages erupted in violence in the summer of 1943. Source: "Racial tensions engulfed Beaumont in 1943," *Beaumont Enterprise*, June 14, 2009, https://www.beaumontenterprise.com/news/article/Racial-tensions-engulfed-Beaumont-in-1943-963194.php#photo-529710.

AGRICULTURE AND PRISONERS OF WAR

During the war, Texas held over 50,000 prisoners of war (POWs), mostly Germans and Italians, at around 70 camps around the state.[30] Military bases held large numbers of POWs, while smaller non-military camps and branch agricultural camps typically held fewer than 400 men. Of the nearly 70 camps in Texas, small branch camps overseen by the Texas Agricultural Extension Service at Texas A&M University accounted for around a third. Small branch camps opened in areas in need of agricultural labor and where daily trips from larger base camps were impractical due to distance. Prisoners at these camps worked on farms and ranches across the state, helping fill the labor shortage created by war.[31]

Beginning in October 1943, German POWs arrived in Jefferson County. Joe Combs, the county agricultural extension agent in charge of overseeing POW labor, coordinated with larger camps in Texas and Louisiana to transfer approximately 500 POWs to Jefferson County to help with the annual rice harvest.[32] The first prisoners were first held at Tyrrell Park in Beaumont. To prepare the park, a barbed wire fence was built around the recreation center (extant), where prisoners were held, and guard towers were built at the four corners of the stockade. Army guards stayed in tents in the park's picnic area. During the park's time as a camp, between 1943 and 1945, all but the area around the recreation center remained open to the public.[33]

Throughout the remainder of the war, more German POWs arrived in Jefferson County at the request of rice farmers. To accommodate the additional POWs, the government established a second agricultural camp near China (an Official Texas Historic Marker denoting the site is located at North China Road, 2.4 miles north of US 90). Opened in September 1944 on a ten-acre tract of land leased by the U. S. government from the Stanolind Oil and Gas Company, the camp held 403 prisoners at its peak in August 1945.[34] Each day farmers picked up prisoners in the morning and returned them to the camp at night. Prisoners earned 25 cents per hour for general farm labor and up to three dollars a day for harvesting rice.[35] According to the president of the American Rice Growers association, POW labor proved crucial to rice farmers across the country, stating "They helped save our crop last year and they are doing it again now."[36] While most of the prisoners at the camp worked on area farms, some also worked at nearby sawmills. When the camp closed in December 1945, prisoners first returned to Huntsville and later to Germany. A water well dug by prisoners at the camp was the only remaining resource associated with the camp in 2000 when the THC erected an Official Texas Historical Marker at the site.[37]

DEFENSE OF THE HOMEFRONT

In addition to the role the county's industries played in the war effort, the county also prepared itself against the possibility of an attack or invasion. Since the Civil War, the strategic location on the Gulf of Mexico made the country vulnerable to attack. The twentieth-century improvements to the county's port facilities and the county's oil refineries made its defense even more critical. In response to the need to protect the Texas coast and Jefferson County's industries, the federal government and civilians engaged in activities aimed at preventing an invasion and an attack from the coast.

Sabine Pass Harbor Entrance Control Post

Leading up to the United States' entrance into World War II, the U. S. Army established regional command formations charged with defending the home front. Among the formations established in March 1941 was the Southern Defense Command. Headquartered at Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio, the command coordinated defense efforts along the Gulf of Mexico, home to the majority of the country's refineries and among the more vulnerable locations in the event of an invasion. The military built harbor entry defenses (called Harbor Entrance Control Posts) at Brownsville, Port Aransas, Cameron, Burrwood, and Sabine Pass.[38] The post at Sabine Pass consisted of several station buildings, an observation tower, searchlights, commander post, and part of the Coast Guard lifeboat station.[39] The

post also consisted of several storage facilities and munitions magazines for fuses, projectiles, and powder.

During the war, more than 20 German U-boats made their way to the Gulf of Mexico. They targeted oil tankers and cargo ships and successfully sunk 58 American ships in the Gulf of Mexico during the war.[40] U-boats were spotted off the coast of Corpus Christi during the war, and a sunken ship, discovered in 2009, near Sabine Pass suggests U-boats made their way to the Jefferson County coast during the war.[41] Despite the likelihood that German U-boats submerged near Sabine Pass during the war, the military at the post engaged in no military operations, only patrolling the beach and waters off the coast. The post remained active until 1944 when it was decommissioned and declared surplus. In 1945, the Army dismantled and abandoned the site, leaving only the munitions magazines that remain today within the Sabine Pass Battlefield Historic Site (Figure 87).



Figure 87. One of the extant World War II ammunition magazines built as part of the U. S. military's defense of the coast. The munition magazines are located within the Sabine Pass Battleground State Historic Site. Source: "Sabine Pass Battleground State Historic Site," Texas Historical Commission, accessed December 3, 2021, https://www.thc.texas.gov/historic-sites/sabine-pass-battleground-state-historic-site.

Civilian Contributions

Jefferson County civilians also helped patrol the coast during World War II. In 1942, the Office of Civilian Defense (OCD) activated 21 Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Coastal Patrols. In Texas, the OCD established three posts – at Beaumont, Corpus Christi, and San Benito.[42] Between 1942 and 1943, CAP Coast Base No. 10, headquartered at the Municipal Airport in Beaumont, logged over 14,000 coast patrol flights between 1942 and 1943 (Figure 88). Comprised of both White and Black women and men—those unable to fight abroad for a number of reasons including age—the CAP helped scan for German U-boats in the Gulf of Mexico. Only White men flew aircraft in the CAP, while women and non-White men worked as radio operators, in administration, plotting board operators, and as typists (Figures 89-90).

> ***Learn More!*** *Read about the history of the Civil Air Patrol: https://www.gocivilairpatrol.com/about/history-of-civil-air-patrol.*



Figure 88. A Civil Air Patrol truck and plane at the Beaumont Municipal Airport in 1942 during World War II. Source: Larry Jene Fisher, photographer, University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Lamar University, accessed December 12, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth587503/.



Figure 89. Though women could not pilot planes, they did volunteer for the Civil Air Patrol during World War II. Source: Larry Jene Fisher, photographer, University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Lamar University, accessed December 12, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth587363/.



Figure 90. A group of women in the mess hall of the Civil Air Patrol at the Beaumont Municipal Airport in 1943 during World War II. Source: Larry Jene Fisher, photographer, University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Lamar University, accessed December 12, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth587450/.

ENDNOTES

[1] *Area Manpower Guidebook: 174 Metropolitan Labor Market Areas,* U. S. Department of Labor, U. S. Bureau of Employment Security (1957), 290, https://www.google.com/books/edition/Area_Manpower_Guidebook/DzpXAAAAMAAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1&bsq=beaumont.

[2] *Area Manpower Guidebook,* 290.

[3] Stan Solamillo and Rosa Clipper-Fleming, "Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company Building and B. F. Goodrich Building," National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, Texas Historical Commission, Austin, January 2002, 8-17, https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/preserve/survey/highway/Goodyear%20Tire%20bldg%20Dallas.pdf.

[4] Will H. Shearon, Jr., "Synthetic Rubber Manufacture," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed November 30, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/synthetic-rubber-manufacture.

[5] "A History of the Port Neches Independent School District: Early Days to 1975," Port Neches – Groves Independent School District, 14, accessed November 2, 2021, https://www.pngisd.org/cms/lib/TX02205731/Centricity/Domain/11/history.pdf.

[6] "A History of the Port Neches Independent School District: Early Days to 1975," 12.

[7] "Neches Butane Products Company," Texas Archive of the Moving Image, from the Museum of the Gulf Coast, 1940s, https://texasarchive.org/2016_05631.

[8] "71 War Plants in Texas Listed for Sale by U. S. After Victory is Gained," *Fort Worth Star Telegram*, October 27, 1944, 15.

[9] Solamillo and Clipper-Fleming, "Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company Building and B. F. Goodrich Building."

[10] "71 War Plants in Texas Listed for Sale by U. S. After Victory is Gained," *Fort Worth Star Telegram*, October 27, 1944, 15.

[11] Robert H. Peebles, "Shipbuilding," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed November 30, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/shipbuilding.

[12] Based on the 1940 city directories for Beaumont, Port Arthur, Port Neches, and Sabine.

[13]Jason P. Theriot, "The Migration of Cajuns to Southeast Texas," *The Journal of the Louisiana Historical Association* 58, no. 4 (2017), 450. https://jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26290932.

[14] *Area Manpower Guidebook*, 290.

[15] James S. Olson, "Beaumont Riot of 1943," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed November 12, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/beaumont-riot-of-1943.

[16] Theriot, "The Migration of Cajuns to Southeast Texas," 456.

[17] U. S. Census Bureau, "Texas," 1950, p. 43-210, https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/decennial/1950/population-volume-2/11027772v2p43ch3.pdf.

[18] "Housing Shortage Is Being Felt in City," *Beaumont Journal*, December 13, 1941, 6.

[19] Judith Linsley, "World War II in Beaumont," Stephen F. Austin State University, Center for Regional Heritage Research, November 2017, https://www.sfasu.edu/heritagecenter/9895.asp.

[20] "Workers Need Homes Here," *Beaumont Journal*, June 11, 1943, 10.

[21] "A History of the Port Neches Independent School District: Early Days to 1975," 12.

[22] Kristin M. Szylvian, *The Mutual Housing Experiment: New Deal Communities for the Urban Middle Class,* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2015) 109. https://cdn.lbryplayer.xyz/api/v4/streams/free/171248/08f020058cf7189e2c3abe3e8c5bf9177178321b/61ea21.

[23] *Corpus Christi Caller-Times*, June 21, 1942, 26.

[24] "600 Units Will Join Multimax,"*Beaumont Journal*, January 5, 1943, 1.

[25] *The Liberty Vindicator,* May 18, 1944, 3.

[26] "Survey Shows Houses Short," *Beaumont Journal*, March 4, 1944, 2.

[27] Olson, "Beaumont Riot of 1943."

[28] Michael Eli Dokosi, "Beaumont Riot of 1943, how 200 Black businesses were destroyed, two died and 300 arrested," Face2Face Africa, January 30, 2020, https://face2faceafrica.com/article/beaumont-riot-of-1943-how-200-black-businesses-were-destroyed-two-died-and-300-arrested.

[29] Olson, "Beaumont Riot of 1943."

[30] "Prisoner of War Camps in Texas," Texas Historical Commission, accessed November 12, 2021, https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/texas-pow-MS-lesson-plan.pdf.

[31] "Prisoner of War Camps in Texas," Texas Historical Commission, 2.

[32] "500 Prisoners Are Available In Rice Fields," *Beaumont Journal,* September 22, 1943, 7.

[33] "POW To Begin Rice Harvest Here Tuesday," *Beaumont Journal*, October 16, 1943, 10.

[34] "Site of World War II Prisoner of War Camp," Texas Historical Commission, Official Texas Historical Marker, Atlas Number 5245011954, https://atlas.thc.state.tx.us/Details/5245011954/print.

[35] "Site of World War II Prisoner of War Camp," Texas Historical Commission.

[36] "100 More POW To Aid China Rice Harvest," *Beaumont Journal*, October 13, 1944, 1.

[37] "Site of World War II Prisoner of War Camp," Texas Historical Commission.

[38] Lynn M. Alperin, *Custodians of the Coast: History of the United States Army Engineers at Galveston* (Galveston, Texas: United States Army Corps of Engineers, 1977) 197.

[39] "Site of World War II Prisoner of War Camp," Texas Historical Commission.

[40] "U-boats in the Gulf," Heart of Louisiana, accessed November 22, 2021, https://heartoflouisiana.com/u-boats-in-the-gulf/.

[41] Murphy Givens, "U-boats prowled Gulf in the deadly summer of 1942," *Caller Times*, August 28, 2018. https://www.caller.com/story/opinion/2018/08/28/u-boats-prowled-gulf-deadly-summer-1942/1114860002/.

[42] Frank A. Blazich, Jr., "An Honorable Place in American Air Power:" Civil Air Patrol Coastal Patrol Operations, 1942-1943, (Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama: Air University Press, 2020), https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Portals/10/AUPress/Books/B_0168_BLAZICH_AN_HONORABLE_PLACE_IN_AMERICAN_AIR_POWER_CIVIL_AIR_PATROL_COSTAL_PATROL_OPERATIONS_1942_1943.PDF.

POSTWAR ERA: 1946–1978

Jefferson County emerged from World War II highly industrialized and urbanized. This trend continued for much of the postwar era, buoyed by the country's defense programs and oil and petrochemical needs spawned from the Cold War, Korean War, and the Vietnam War. Along with oil, agriculture maintained significance in the county, aided by improved farming practices and an expanded highway system that added hundreds of miles of paved roads in the county. These economic drivers and the expanded highway network led to growth and community development in communities in both eastern and rural Jefferson County. This period of continued industrialization, development, and community growth coincided with—and sometimes clashed with—various national trends and events including the end of Jim Crow, the Civil Rights movement, labor movements and strikes, and conservation efforts.

POPULATION DEMOGRAPHICS

Following the rapid population growth of World War II, Jefferson County added fewer than 60,000 people in the subsequent three decades (Table 8). The post-war baby boom and continued industrialization during the Korean War in the 1950s contributed to the largest population growth in the postwar period, adding more than 50,000 people. Afterward, between 1960 and 1980, as the county's industrial markets and demands stabilized and industry and agriculture grew more mechanized, the county's population plateaued, hovering around 245,000.

Table 8. U. S. Census statistics for Jefferson County showing population growth and demographic breakdowns between 1950 and 1980. Note that census statistics are subject to error, and census methodologies for recording race and ethnicity were inconsistent from decade to decade.

Year	Total	Growth Rate	White		Black		Foreign Born		Hispanic Origin	
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1940	145,329	8.9%	107,933	74.3%	33,821	23.7%	3,519	2.4%	-	-
1950	195,083	34.2%	150,858	77.3%	44,122	22.6%	3,225	1.7%	-	-
1960	245,659	25.9%	188,297	76.6%	57,171	23.3%	3,194	1.3%	-	-
1970	244,773	-0.36%	183,100	74.8%	61,064	24.9%	2,937	1.2%	8,600	3.5%
1980	250,938	2.5%	166,985	66.3%	70,143	27.9%	7,277	2.9%	10,279	4.1%

In the postwar era, the county's population remained predominantly urban and comprised of White and Black residents. Throughout the period, Jefferson County's population was roughly two-thirds White and one-third Black. Until 1980, more than 96 percent of the population was either White or Black. The majority of the Black population continued living in Beaumont and Port Arthur. In 1970, 95.9 percent of the county's roughly 61,000 Black residents lived in the county's two largest cities, with only around 2,500 Black residents residing elsewhere.[1] The Hispanic population remained small but made up an increasing percent of the population over the period. Some of this increase may be attributed to the United States' Bracero Program which brought in Mexican men between 1942 and 1964 to work on farms and on the railroad. These men likely worked on farms where equipment had not yet replaced manual labor: typically picking fruit, vegetables, and harvesting nuts.

A small number of Asian immigrants also started settling in Jefferson County toward the end of the period. Largely responsible for the nearly 150 percent increase in the county's "foreign born" population between 1970 and 1980 were Vietnamese refugees who settled in Jefferson County following the end of the Vietnam War in 1975. The first refugees arrived in large part because of three people: Dow Wynn, head of the Port Arthur relocation program; Father Tran Van Khoat, a Vietnamese Catholic priest in Beaumont; and Father William Manger, a Catholic priest in Beaumont (Figure 91). Though Khoat's vision for a Vietnamese farming, fishing, and manufacturing village in Jefferson County never transpired, he helped oversee the arrival of thousands of refugees in the 1970s. Following the arrival of the first

refugees in 1975, others soon followed not because they had a job or sponsor, but because they knew of someone living in the county. In addition to the refugees who arrived on their own, some other American cities sent their refugees to Beaumont, knowing a community existed in the county.[2] Once in Jefferson County, individual sponsors like Wynn and the resettlement program sponsored by the U. S. Catholic Conference through the diocese in Beaumont worked with the Vietnamese, though without much help from the federal government, the program was overwhelmed.[3] By 1976, the Golden Triangle—the name given to the Beaumont, Port Arthur, and Orange area—had over 1,200, mostly urban-dwelling Vietnamese residents, more than the Vietnamese population in some states. Though the federal government's official policy opposed the clustering of Vietnamese immigrants, a lack of enforcement contributed to the influx of Vietnamese into Southeast Texas in the late 1970s. Many of the refugees—tradesmen, fishermen, farmers, and clerks in Vietnam—settled in Beaumont and Port Arthur. With little English language skills, many first worked as fishermen and in blue-collar jobs. While unemployment among the Vietnamese was high throughout the 1970s, by the 1980s, some immigrants had opened shops and restaurants.[4]



Figure 91. Dow Wynn with Vietnamese refugee Nguyen Van Nghi and his family in Port Arthur. Wynn helped with the relocation effort in the 1970s and sponsored a number of families himself. Source: "The Newest Americans," *Texas Monthly*, June 1976, https://www.texasmonthly.com/news-politics/the-newest-americans/.

AGRICULTURE

Shift to Large-Scale Commercial Farming and Ranching

The postwar period saw agriculture remain a significant contributor to Jefferson County's economy. Despite a decline in the number of farms, from roughly 2,500 at the end of the war to 467 in 1978, the county gained agricultural acreage, reaching nearly 500,000 acres in 1950. As the number of farm units declined, farm size increased as agriculture in the county shifted toward large commercial farming and ranching (Table 9). The evolution into this large-scale farming was aided by several factors, including the continued mechanization of agriculture, technological advancements, and expanded irrigation and drainage.

Table 9. U. S. Census of Agriculture statistics for Jefferson County between 1940 and 1978, available via https://agcensus.library.cornell.edu/. Note that census statistics are subject to error, and census methodologies for recording farms were inconsistent from decade to decade.

Year	No. Farms	Avg. Farm Size (acres)	Total Farm Acreage
1940	2,387	n/a	317,684
1945	2,353	141.3	332,478
1950	959	508	487,176
1954	1,038	417.3	433,186
1959	724	583.3	422,292
1964	546	747	408,085
1969	502	697	349,930
1978	467	860	401,722

The modern equipment farmers and ranchers adopted in the postwar included gas-powered tractors. Tractors and other large equipment enabled farmers to till or seed ten times as many rows in a day. Postwar advancements to the combine similarly increased harvesting efficiency of crops including sorghum and corn. These machines allowed farmers to work more land with less power and ultimately contributed to the decline in farm tenancy, as well as the decline of reliance on draft animals (Figure 92).[5]

The period also saw the wide-spread use of pesticides and commercial fertilizers for the first time. Though used on a small-scale by some farmers in the 1930s, by the 1950s new products and the realization that pesticide use improved crop yields greatly increased the production and use of pesticides across the country. Similarly, organic fertilizers had also been used since the nineteenth century, but commercial fertilizers were not widely used until after World War II.

The expansion of irrigation and drainage also aided the county's agricultural sector. During this period, the Lower Neches Valley Authority (LNVA) completed several reservoirs upriver from Jefferson County. The U. S. Army Corps of Engineers completed Town Bluff Dam and B. A. Steinhagen Reservoir in 1953 and Sam Rayburn Reservoir in 1965.[6] The reservoirs added to the LNVA's supply of water used for industrial facilities, cities, hydroelectric power, and farms. The completion of the reservoirs "completely cured any [water shortage] problem," despite the increased acreage of crops according to the LNVA's manager in 1967.[7] In addition to the reservoirs, the LNVA built additional canals while also maintaining and enlarging existing canals, like the 14-mile canal roughly between Fannett and Port Arthur (Figures 93-94).[8] The LNVA, county, and Drainage Districts also continued work on improving drainage in the county, projects that benefited all residents, not just farmers. A new district, Drainage District No. 7 (DD7), organized in 1945 in mid- and south Jefferson County. Covering parts of the most hurricane-vulnerable and flood-prone sections of the county, DD7 helped add a hurricane protection system to the district after Hurricane Carla in 1961 (Figure 95).[9] The existing districts, Drainage District No. 3 (DD3) and No. 6 (DD6), also undertook a variety of projects aimed at improving and enlarging the drainage systems

in their districts, including construction of diversion ditches, storm sewers, and widening and deepening channels, including Taylor Bayou.[10]



Figure 92. Farmers on a machine in a rice field. Machines like the one in the photo from the postwar period transformed agriculture in the county by enabling farmers to work more efficiently on larger swaths of land with fewer people. The back of the photo reads, "Old-type machines could not cope with sticky gumbo soils and mud that modern machinery handles almost to perfection and to the rice-growers increased profit." Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting the Museum of the Gulf Coast, accessed December 30, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth202441.



NEW LNVA CANAL EXTENSION—At a cost of approximately $1 million the Lower Neches Valley Authority is digging a 14 mile long canal from near Fannett to just below Jefferson County Airport near Port Acres where it will intersect with the present LNVA canal system.

The new canal is being constructed for the use of irrigating rice which has been solely dependent for water from Hillebrandt Bayou.

The new canal will augment the present canal which feeds water into Port Arthur, Gulf refinery and Texaco refinery.

Figure 93. Newspaper article with photo showing the new LNVA canal extension between Fannett and the Jefferson County Airport. According to the caption, the canal was built for irrigating rice fields, but also augmented the existing canal that supported the water systems in Port Arthur, and the Gulf and Texaco refineries. The continued expansion of irrigation in the postwar also contributed to industrialized farming. Source: *Beaumont Journal,* February 9, 1966, 11.



Figure 94. One of LNVA's canals in 2017. This one is located over Hillebrandt Bayou; IH 10 crosses over the canal. Source: Gosdin, Flickr, March 23, 2017, https://flic.kr/p/UiGuob.



Figure 95. Aerial view of Groves shows flooding after Hurricane Carla in 1961. Source: "A doomstorm would drown SE Texas," *Beaumont Enterprise*, November 11, 2010, https://www.beaumontenterprise.com/news/weather/article/A-doomstorm-would-drown-SE-Texas-682653.php.

Cattle and Rice

As in past periods, the chief agricultural products in Jefferson County remained rice and cattle. Dairy farming, historically one of the main sources of agriculture income, saw a decline after the war. Between 1940 and 1978, the number of milk cows in the county steadily dropped from over 7,000 to fewer than 1,000.[11] Predominantly located in eastern and southeastern Jefferson County, particularly in and around Nederland, dairy farms, along with smaller truck farms, steadily disappeared. As the area grew more industrialized and urbanized and land grew more expensive, owners sold their farms. Farmland in turn was developed. Cattle in the county, though, remained steady, roughly numbering between 32,000 and 44,000 . Practices from the previous period remained largely unchanged, though ranchers did incorporate new feed crops, such as sorghum, and improved breeding practices. Ranchers also benefited from new equipment and machines, using them to round up cattle and travel faster on large ranch lands (Figure 96). Despite the continued role cattle played in agriculture in the county, the period saw one of the county's largest ranches dissolve. The McFaddin Ranch, with origins dating to the nineteenth century, was sold in tracts between 1951 and 1979. Poaching and theft of cattle were factors in the decision to sell the ranch. Much of the coastal wetland acreage on the ranch became part of one of the three state parks and protected wildlife management areas created towards the end of the period. (See the discussion on Parks and Open Spaces that follows).



Figure 96. A ranch near Port Arthur with airplane in field and men on horseback rounding up cattle. Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting the Museum of the Gulf Coast, accessed December 4, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth202761.

In 1974, Jefferson County's agricultural income was roughly $18 million, with crops accounting for 80 percent of that amount.[12] Farmers grew a variety of crops—primarily feed crops for livestock—including hay, sorghum, corn, and soybeans. Rice, though, remained the county's primary crop and source of agricultural income, grown on approximately 80 percent of the county's cultivated land, or roughly 60,000 acres, throughout the period.[13] The county consistently ranked among the state's top rice-producing counties throughout the period, producing over 2 million bushels each decade. Existing and new rice farmer organizations and cooperatives, as well as the experiment station (which moved from Amelia to Beaumont in 1945), continued to play important roles in the research and the disbursement of knowledge. Among the new practices adopted by farmers during this period was the introduction of new rotator crops. While farmers continued the practice used in past periods of rotating cattle and rice, by the mid-1960s soybeans, and to a lesser extent sorghum, emerged as the most common rotator crops.[14] Soybeans not only benefitted the rice crop by increasing soil fertility, but the crop also complemented rice in terms of labor and machinery needed. In addition to soybeans, farmers began experimenting with crawfish breeding in rice fields towards the end of the period to supplement their incomes. First practiced in Louisiana in the 1950s, the USDA followed with guidelines on proper practices for crawfish farming in the late 1950s. In Jefferson County, some farmers began introducing crawfish into their rice fields in the mid-1960s.[15]

Continued mechanization and technological advancements also aided rice farmers in this period. Larger, more efficient rice dryers replaced older dryers, speeding up the field-to-market time. In Nome, the Nome Rice Drying Company organized and built a new rice dryer facility along the railroad tracks around 1946 (Figure 97).[16] Part of the facility, including the concrete rice silos, are extant. By the end of the period, the Experiment Station in Beaumont was experimenting with new technology, testing out a solar-powered dryer.[17] Several years earlier, the station also installed the state's first underground pipeline irrigation system, a system easier to maintain and less susceptible to damage. The underground system also allowed aboveground land to be returned to cultivation once pipelines were removed. One of the more significant changes to the rice industry, though, was the introduction of planes for planting seed and spraying fertilizer and pesticides. Two veterans, who had easy access to planes, worked with a Jefferson County rice farm to seed the first rice field in country using a plane in 1946.[18] Soon after, the practice was readily adopted by farmers across the county (Figure 98).



Figure 97. A rice dryer facility built around 1946 by the Nome Rice Drying Company. Source: HHM, 2022.



Figure 98. An airplane seeding a rice field. After World War II, the practice of using planes for seeding fields and spreading fertilizer and pesticides became common among rice farmers and was another factor in the industrialization of agriculture. Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting the Museum of the Gulf Coast, accessed December 5, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth202445.

INDUSTRY

Jefferson County remained a highly industrialized county in the postwar period. Despite the closure of the county's last sawmill, marking the end of one of its oldest industries, other industrial sectors grew in importance. The commercial fishing and shrimping industry remained relatively small, compared to other coastal counties, and remained centered in and around Sabine Pass, where seafood shops, docks, and marine service and repair shops operated on the water (Figure 99). Manufacturing and construction were also important economic drivers. In support of these industries, the county's plants and quarries produced and provided concrete, asphalt, and other construction materials. Non-industrial sectors, including retail, finance, and banking, also emerged as important economic drivers, though they were largely confined to Beaumont and Port Arthur. Several emerging industries tied to agriculture also established plants in Jefferson County. In China, the Farm and Agri-Chemical Company built a 6,000-square-foot fertilizer plant north of the railroad tracks in 1965 [field survey did not identify this building].[19] The company, which produced fertilizer, herbicides, insecticides, and pesticides, hoped to help area rice farmers control fire ants causing damage to their crops. Mobil Chemical opened another fertilizer plant near its Mobil Oil plant in Beaumont in 1965.[20]



Figure 99. The Sabine Seafood Inc., a seafood shop, along the dock in Sabine Pass sometime in the late 1940s. Commercial fishing in Jefferson County was comparably small, as Sabine Lake was one of the only major Texas estuaries that did not have a commercial fishery. Even so, shellfish were commercially caught in the waterway. Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Port Arthur Public Library, accessed December 12, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth79686/.

Oil and Petrochemicals

Despite the diversification of Jefferson County's industry during this period, oil and petrochemicals remained the base of the county's economy, contributing to much of the growth in other sectors, like oil field machinery, while also bringing in $60 to $70 million of annual revenue.[21] An immediate post-war oil shortage boosted the industry, as the country's demand for oil spiked as a result of the Korean War and increased use of gas-powered automobiles and equipment. Following the initial spike, the oil industry remained steady, benefiting from events including the Cold War, the oil embargo in 1973, and unrest in Iran, before collapsing in the 1980s. Despite fluctuations in supply and demand and mechanization that led to layoffs, oil and oil-related industries remained the main economic driver in Jefferson County throughout the period.

Immediately after the war and into the 1950s, the country's demand for oil stimulated a surge in exploration, drilling, and production of oil and natural gas. In Jefferson County, drilling continued at existing fields—including Spindletop, Fannett, LaBelle, and South China—while new fields opened at Big Hill, Stowell, and the Gilbert Ranch near Fannett (Figure 100). Consequently, the county's seven refineries remained active throughout the period. Home to two of the country's largest refineries, Jefferson County employed 18,400 refinery workers in 1955, the third highest in the country.[22]



Figure 100 (with insets Jeff-co and Pipelines). 1951 map of Texas (Jefferson County inset) showing oil (black) and gas (red) pools and salt domes. Pipelines and refineries are also shown. Source: *Journal Guide to Texas Oil*, Petroleum Publishing Co., 1951, from the University of Texas at Arlington Library, Special Collections, accessed December 4, 2021, https://cdm16465.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p16465coll1/id/80/.

The petrochemical industry also flourished in this period. Existing plants, including the rubber plant in Port Neches, maintained operations throughout the period, while new plants producing a variety of petrochemicals and organic chemicals including butane, ethylene and isocetyl alcohol, and oxygen also opened (Figure 101).[23] During this period, the Golden Triangle was second only to the Houston area in concentration of petrochemical plants in the state.[24] While Beaumont and Port Arthur maintained their positions as centers of the refinery and petrochemical industries, both adding new plants in the postwar period, including a Gulf Oil plant in Port Arthur and a Dupont plant in Beaumont, other cities also saw plants open in the postwar. In 1961, Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company opened a new chemical rubber

plant on Interstate Highway (IH) 10 in Cheek. Built on a 400-acre site in a former rice field, the plant received raw materials from the refineries via pipelines [11357 IH 10, outside Beaumont city limits].[25]



Figure 101. View of the Texaco Port Neches refinery on the Neches River in 1952. Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting the Museum of the Gulf Coast, accessed December 2, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth201805/.

The flurry of oil exploration also contributed to the growth of several other mineral industries. In addition to oil and natural gas, drillers discovered sulfur in the county. Found in the Spindletop and Fannett salt domes, the Texas Gulf Sulphur Company initiated sulfur mining at these sites in the 1950s. In 1966 a new sulfuric acid plant opened in Port Arthur and by 1980 Jefferson County was one of three counties producing around half of the state's recovered sulfur.[26]

The postwar demand for oil also extended into a new realm that transformed the oil industry: offshore drilling. Until this period, offshore drilling in Texas was limited, restricted by primitive equipment, high costs, and regulations. In late 1930s, exploration for oil fields in the Gulf of Mexico resulted in the state's first offshore well completed near Sabine Pass in 1941. Though it was not commercially successful, it proved the possibility for drilling in the area.[27] World War II and the threat of U-boat attacks halted all offshore drilling activity in the Gulf, but new research and technology developed during the war facilitated more economical drilling in the postwar. Passage of laws at the state and federal level in the 1950s removed a number of restrictions, further contributing to the growth in the offshore drilling industry. As a result, existing oil companies added offshore divisions and new companies entered the industry.

Shipbuilding

The prosperity of offshore drilling extended to the shipyards, which saw a decline in activity after the war. Shipbuilding advances during the war enabled companies to easily transition from shipbuilding to mobile offshore rig building (Figure 102). The Bethlehem Shipbuilding Company (which acquired the Pennsylvania Shipyard in the late 1940s) became one of the nation's most dominate offshore drilling equipment makers, building nearly 70 rigs between 1964 and 1984.[28] To facilitate the rigs, the company expanded the yard in 1950, adding a floating drydock, berthing basin, pier, and bulkhead.[29]



Figure 102. An offshore oil drilling rig in Port Arthur in 1976. Rigs like this one, the J. Storm VIII, were built at the Bethlehem Shipyards in Beaumont during the period as offshore drilling grew more prominent. Source: Christopher Studio, University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Port Arthur Library, accessed December 30, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth79142.

TRANSPORTATION

The postwar period saw expansions and improvements made across most of the county's transportation networks. In 1944, Jefferson County opened the Jefferson County Airport (renamed Jack Brooks Regional Airport in 2010) southwest of Nederland. During the 1950s and 1960s, the county expanded the airport, adding acreage, new buildings, runway lights, and new taxiways (Figure 103). The airport, the county's main civilian facility, was popular among petrochemical, oil, and manufacturing executives with business in the county.[30] In Beaumont, the city transitioned Beaumont Municipal Airport into a general aviation airport after Jefferson County Airport opened and replaced the original terminal building in the 1970s.

Continued dredging and improvements to both the Sabine-Neches Canal and the Sabine-Neches Waterway over the period facilitated increased usage and deepened and widened both waterways. By the end of the period, the canal was 40 feet deep and 400 feet wide and the waterway was 44 feet deep

and 400 feet wide.[31] The widening of the canal required a new bridge, as ships continually hit the 1931 bridge. The new bridge, Gulfgate Bridge (renamed Martin Luther King, Jr. Bridge) along SH 82, opened in 1970 (Figure 104). The continued work on the waterways also created a persistent erosion problem at Pleasure Island and Sabine Lake, as dredged materials washed into the lake. To alleviate the problem, the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers created two disposal areas in the lake, above and below Port Arthur. Earthen levees covered with stone were built between the disposal areas and a roadway between the two opened in 1974 (Figure 105).[32] These improvements were vital to the port activity in Jefferson County, which ranked 15th in the nation in tonnage in 1960. By 1979, over 75,000,000 tons of goods and products passed through Sabine Pass, second in the state only to Houston area ports.[33] Throughout the period, the port and waterways not only provided vital transportation to the county and region's businesses and industries, but they also served as economic drivers, creating and supporting a wide variety of jobs.



Figure 103. The Jefferson County Airport (renamed Jack Brooks Regional Airport in 2010) in 1964. The county opened the airport near Port Arthur in 1944, at which time it became the county's primary passenger airport. Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Edison Museum, accessed December 30, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth769685/.



Figure 104. The Martin Luther King, Jr. Bridge (originally named the Gulfgate Bridge) connecting Port Arthur to the Pleasure Pier. A new bridge was needed due to the widening of the Sabine-Neches Canal in the postwar era. The bridge was completed in 1970. Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Port Arthur Public Library, accessed December 30, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth79076.



Figure 105. Aerial image from 1970 showing the levees built at Sabine Lake to combat erosion caused by the dumping of dredged materials. Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting the Museum of the Gulf Coast, accessed December 24, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth202655/.

The county's road network also continued expanding in the postwar period. Despite the extensive road building of the previous period, much of rural Jefferson County still lacked well-paved roads. As a result, many of the county's farmers and ranchers remained isolated and far removed from services including hospitals, schools, and libraries in the eastern portion of the county. This problem—not unique to Jefferson County—was systemic across the state. In an effort to improve the state's rural secondary roads and provide farmers and ranchers better access to markets, medical facilities, and other services in larger communities, the Texas Highway Department (THD) developed the Farm-to-Market (FM) program in the late 1930s. Set back by the outbreak of World War II, funding and development of the road system began in earnest in 1945, when the THD authorized a three-year pilot program for the construction of new FM highways. Following the success of the pilot, in 1949 the THD expanded the program. The expansion made federal funds available for the construction of FM roads so long as the county or road district furnished the right-of-way and 75 percent of the actual construction cost. In return, the THD covered the remaining costs, provided engineering and construction services, and provided future road maintenance.[34] In consultation with county commissioners, the THD designated and improved hundreds of miles of FM roads in Jefferson County over the period. Between 1948 and 1949, the THD designated FM 364, FM 365, FM 823, FM 1009, and FM 1406.[35] In addition to paving

these roads and providing maintenance throughout the period, THD also built new bridges along their alignments, including the Hillebrandt Bayou Bridge on FM 365 in 1951.

Along with the FM highway system, improvements to the existing highway system and the new interstate highway system built through the county further connected farmers and communities to one another during this period. In addition to grading and paving projects on many of the county's state and U. S. highways, the THD completed US Highway 90 improvements in the 1960s. The project expanded US 90 west of Beaumont and included the construction of two additional lanes, providing a four-lane divided highway and divided urban sections through small towns including Nome and China (Figures 106-107).[36] The largest road project of the period, though, was the completion of Interstate Highway 10 (IH 10). The construction of IH 10 was part of the nationwide development and construction of an interstate highway system, stemming from President Eisenhower's Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956. The legislation called for the construction of 41,000 miles of interstate highways across the country with the federal government paying 100 percent of the land acquisition costs and 90 percent of the construction costs.[37] IH 10 through Jefferson County was part of the country's southernmost cross-county interstate, connecting Florida to California. Completed between 1960 and 1965, IH 10, like many interstate alignments, followed an existing highway alignment. Entering Jefferson County from the east in Beaumont, IH 10 dropped south and roughly followed the alignment of SH 124 though Cheek before slightly diverging from the highway, bypassing Fannett and Hamshire to the north. (See the discussion of Land-Use Patterns and Community Development Trends for information about how these roadways impacted development.)



Figure 106. General Highway map from 1961 showing the expanded highway network in the county due to the Farm-to-Market program (IH 10 is under construction). Source: Texas Highway Department, in cooperation with the U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Public Roads, 1958. State highways revised January 1, 1961. From the Texas State Library and Archives Commission, https://www.tsl.texas.gov/apps/arc/maps/maplookup/05189.



Figure 107. General Highway map from 1972 showing expanded highway and interstate network. By 1972, IH 10 was finished and several major highways, including US 90, had been expanded. Source: Texas Highway Department, Planning Survey Division, in cooperation with the U. S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, 1963. Highways revised July 1, 1972. From the Texas State Library and Archives Commission, https://www.tsl.texas.gov/apps/arc/maps/maplookup/05532.

LAND-USE PATTERNS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TRENDS

Jefferson County grew more urban, suburban, and densely populated due to growth in the eastern part of the county in the postwar period. Between roughly 80 to 94 percent of the population lived in cities and their suburbs in eastern Jefferson County in the postwar period. While eastern Jefferson County experienced continued industrialization and development, much of the rest of the county remained characteristically rural. The prosperity, growth, and development of communities across the county, though, was significantly tied to the county's expanded road network and industry.

Eastern Jefferson County Land-Use Patterns

Between 1950 and 1960, the largest cities in Jefferson County—Beaumont, Port Arthur, Port Neches, Nederland, and Groves—all experienced significant increases in their populations, in large part due to the continued prosperity of the oil and petrochemical industry.

Table 10. Population growth in Jefferson County's most populous cities. Source: U. S. Census Bureau, 1940–1980, https://www.census.gov/.

Year	Beaumont	Groves	Nederland	Port Arthur	Port Neches
1940	59,061	-		46,140	2,487
1950	94,014	-	3,805	57,530	5,448
1960	119,175	17,304	12,036	66,676	8,696
1970	115,919	18,067	16,810	57,371	10,894
1980	118,102	17,090	16,855	61,195	13,944

Though their populations generally plateaued—declining in the case of Beaumont and Port Arthur in the 1960s—land development began to overlap, so that distinguishing one city from the next grew more difficult (Figure 108). Port Arthur and Beaumont both entered into annexation efforts in this period, expanding both of their city limits and bringing "within their boundaries a number of multi-million-dollar industrial plants."[38] Among the communities annexed by Beaumont include Amelia, Helbig, Voth, and Rosedale. Meanwhile, Port Arthur incorporated Griffing Park, Lakeview, Pear Ridge, and Sabine Pass into its city limits during the period and in the early 1980s.

While each city in Jefferson County had a downtown with a commercial node from earlier periods, new commercial development along the highways and interstate drew more and more business away from these historic cores. Suburban commercial nodes developed along US 69 and the Twin City Highway (SH 347) between Beaumont and Port Arthur and stretched north and west of Beaumont along Interstate Highway 10, and US 90 and US 96. In 1965, the *Beaumont Journal* reported that along IH 10 "over half a million dollars in construction work is in progress along the giant thoroughfare," including gas stations, office buildings, and restaurants.[39] Suburban commercial development occurred in the other eastern Jefferson County communities, too. One of the earliest commercial enterprises was the Schooner Restaurant in Nederland. Opened at 1507 US 69 in 1947, the seafood restaurant remains open today (Figure 109). Similarly, historic industrial patterns remained intact, with refineries and plants maintaining their presence along the Neches River, canals, and rail alignments, but new industrial nodes also developed farther removed from city centers, along the major highways and interstates. The industrial development along IH 10 just southwest of Beaumont city limits in Cheek reflects this trend. The Goodyear plant that opened there in the 1960s did so in part for the access to IH 10 and availability of land for expansion.

New residential areas also developed in the cities in eastern Jefferson County. Nederland saw new residential areas open in nearly every direction from downtown, filling in undeveloped and historically agricultural lands within its city limits. Among the new subdivisions include the 45-acre neighborhood developed by William Doornbos and H. P. Youmans along Helena Avenue in 1952 and Armstrong Estates west of downtown in 1958.[40] Likewise, in neighboring Port Neches, new residential areas opened around

its commercial core and its industrial nodes to the east and west. Among the new subdivisions was the Pine Lane housing addition in south Port Neches, opened in 1965.[41] Bounded by Port Arthur to the southeast, southwest, and northeast, and Port Neches to the west, Groves saw much of its undeveloped land fill in with residential subdivisions. Suburbanization also saw the development of a new community in northeastern Jefferson County in the early 1960s. Consisting of two subdivisions, Bevil Acres and River Oaks, Bevil Oaks grew in population from 370 to 1,306 between 1963 and 1980.[42]

New developments continued to benefit from Federal Housing Administration (FHA) loans. As in the previous period, they also continued to favor White families; less than two percent of FHA loans issued between 1947 and 1959 went to African Americans.[43] Even though Port Neches, Nederland, and Groves were predominantly White, developers still used deed restrictions in new subdivisions, preventing Black men and women from buying in the neighborhood; this practice continued until 1968 when a court ruling deemed racial covenants illegal. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, according to a former resident, racism was particularly prevalent in Port Neches, where there was "one overarching, unwritten deed restriction: No blacks were allowed," and where Black residents in Port Arthur and Beaumont "drove through mid-county with great reluctance and only out of necessity."[44]



Figure 108. Aerial image from 1984. Current Beaumont city limits are shaded in purple. Current Port Arthur city limits are shaded in orange. Beginning in the postwar period, the two cities entered into a period of annexation, expanding their city limits and tax revenues. Annexation along with growth in the other mid-county cities in eastern Jefferson County resulted in nearly continuous development along the Neches River. In particular, the boundaries of Port Arthur, Port Neches, Nederland, and Groves grew more indistinguishable during the postwar period. Source: Image Landsat/Copernicus, Google Earth.



Figure 109. The Schooner Restaurant on US 69 in Nederland in 1955. The restaurant is representative of the type of commercial development that occurred in eastern Jefferson County during this period. Located on the highway, the restaurant, like most of the new commercial construction, was not in the historic downtown cores that developed earlier. Opened in 1947, the Schooner Restaurant remains in operation (they rebuilt in the same location after a fire in 1960) at 1507 South Highway 69. Source: Everett James, University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, accessed December 22, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth79486.

Rural Jefferson County Land-Use Patterns

Outside of the urbanized section of eastern Jefferson County, much of the rest of the county experienced minimal to moderate levels of development, remaining characteristically rural. A number of factors led to intermittent growth and decline in rural areas during this period. While closely tied to agriculture, many rural communities also were closely tied to the oil industry. As a result, these communities experienced periods of growth and decline caused by fluctuations in both sectors. During this period, the oil and natural gas fields at Fannett, Stowell, and China helped support nearby communities, and industrial expansion along the interstate and highways west of Beaumont also contributed to development in the nearby communities of Cheek and Fannett. Populations of these communities fluctuated but typically remained in the hundreds. Some communities, including China, Nome, and Hamshire, had higher populations by the 1980s than at the beginning of the period.[45]

Development patterns followed those set in the previous period, with commercial and industrial buildings located along the railroad tracks and main thoroughfares through each community. Gas stations, garages, and convenience stores accounted for most of the new commercial development in this period, spawned by highway improvements and expansions. North and south of the main thoroughfares, residential development filled in and expanded outward from past periods (Figures 110-112). While much of the residential construction was infill and not in new subdivisions, several new subdivisions were planned in rural communities. In Hamshire, spurred by the growth of nearby Winnie in Chambers County and "in anticipation of industrial growth," land developers from Beaumont laid out

a new subdivision with half-acre tracts south of town.[46] Similarly, in Fannett, developers laid out a new subdivision on more than 500 acres northeast of town in the early 1960s. Located just off SH 124, Green Acres was intended for employees at the industrial development, including the Goodyear Tire Company plant in Cheek, on IH 10 southwest of Beaumont (Figure 113).[47] Green Acres, similar to other postwar subdivisions in Beaumont and across the country, incorporated curvilinear streets into its design. In Taylor Landing, in between Port Arthur and Hamshire, a new residential subdivision with curvilinear streets and Ranch-style houses developed in the 1960s. Named Country Club Estates, the subdivision filled in throughout the historic period and in 1978 the adjacent country club opened.



Figure 110. 1989 aerial image of China. Note the expanded residential development north and south of US 90 (running east-west). Source: U. S. Geological Survey, Google Earth.



Figure 111. 1989 aerial image of Fannett. Note the new subdivision to the northeast and a new school track to the south of the town. Source: U. S. Geological Survey, Google Earth.



Figure 112. 1989 aerial image of Hamshire. Note the new residential development north of the old rail alignment. Source: U. S. Geological Survey, Google Earth.



Figure 113. A 1967 advertisement for the new subdivision, Green Acres, in Fannett. Green Acres was one of the few large-scale subdivisions developed outside Beaumont and Port Arthur in this period. The subdivision was planned for the employees of the new Goodyear Tire Plant that opened in nearby Cheek. Source: *Beaumont Journal*, July 1, 1967, 10.

Community Development

While Beaumont and Port Arthur remained the government, commercial, and entertainment centers of the county, community development blossomed in many of the other communities in Jefferson County in the postwar period (see sidebar on Entertainment and Entertainers). As populations grew in these communities, so too did municipal services, recreational facilities, and cultural offerings. In addition to new churches and new post offices, new city government and other public buildings also opened in various communities (13 resources identified during fieldwork are recommended eligible for listing in the National Register as part of a proposed post-war public buildings of Jefferson County multiple property nomination). Nome and Groves, both incorporated in the postwar era, opened new city hall buildings in existing buildings – in Nome at 1586 2nd Street and in Groves at 3998 Lincoln Avenue (Figure 114). Other services, including fire departments, also organized. While Port Neches and Nederland already boasted fire departments, both Groves and Nome added volunteer departments (Figure 115). In Nome, the volunteer fire department organized in 1963. Sponsored by the Nome Lions Club, the department was stationed at the Briggs Motor Company on US 90 in town.[48] In the communities with existing libraries—Nederland, Port Neches, and Groves—population growth facilitated the need for larger libraries in each community. Both Nederland and Port Neches outgrew the libraries constructed in this period in the 1980s, but the Groves Public Library built in 1964 on West Washington Street continues to serve the community (Figure 116). In rural Jefferson County, the county library's bookmobile service, enabled by the improved and expanded roadway network, began servicing the communities of Fannett, China, Hamshire, and Nome during this period. Recreationally, new city parks and recreational facilities opened in both Nederland and Groves. One park, Lions Park in Groves at 6200 Jackson Boulevard, opened in the late 1940s and added a pool in the 1950s with a municipal bond (the pool closed in 2016).[49] The county's first golf course outside of Beaumont and Port Arthur also opened in the postwar. Bayou Din Golf Club, a privately funded golf course, opened in 1959 south of Beaumont at 8537 LaBelle Road, in between Cheek and LaBelle on former agricultural and wooded land (Figure 117). New cultural offerings also developed, including the Dutch Windmill Museum in Nederland in 1969 (1500 Boston Avenue), and festivals including the Nederland Heritage Festival in 1973 and the Groves Pecan Festival in 1969 (Figure 118).



FUTURE CITY HALL—The present First State Bank building of Groves will be the new Groves City Hall by January. Recently, transactions were completed between the city officials and the bank officials for the city to purchase the bank building with payments over a period of years at a cost of $105,000. City officials and department heads expect to occupy the building located at Lincoln Avenue and 39th Street, as soon as the new First State Bank building is completed at 39th Street and Twin City Highway.

Figure 114. In the postwar period, several communities incorporated and opened new city halls. Groves was among the communities to do so. In 1964, City Hall opened in the former First State Bank building at Lincoln Avenue and 39th Street (extant). The bank, following commercial trends, moved to a new building on Twin City Highway. Source: *Beaumont Journal*, July 20, 1964, 20.



Figure 115. Groves Central Fire Station at 6150 Short Street. The fire station, built around 1950, is one of the 13 resources identified during fieldwork recommended eligible for listing in the National Register as part of a proposed post-war public buildings of Jefferson County multiple property nomination. Source: HHM, 2022.



Figure 116. Groves, like other eastern Jefferson County cities, built a new library in the postwar period. The 1964 library on West Washington Street continues to serve the community. Source: Groves Public Library, Groves, Texas, Facebook, December 12, 2017, https://www.facebook.com/grovespubliclibrary/photos/a.190824367606104/1787815944573597/.



BAYOU DIN CLUBHOUSE—This is an artist's drawing of the Colonial-style clubhouse of the Bayou Din Golf Course. Rain has slowed construction but the attractive one-story building is expected to be completed within 90 days from the time the foundation is poured. As soon as weather permits, the foundation will be poured. The Sabine area's newest golf course is expected to be opened about mid-October. The clubhouse, however, probably won't be ready in time for the formal opening. Clubhouse facilities will include golf shop, grill, lounge and locker rooms for men and women.

Figure 117. Bayou Din Golf Course opened in 1959 near LaBelle. Privately funded, the golf course was the first one outside Port Arthur and Beaumont. This artist's rendering shows the Colonial Revival Ranch clubhouse built at the golf course. Source: *Beaumont Journal*, August 28, 1959, 23.



Figure 118. The Nederland Chamber of Commerce and City opened the Dutch Windmill Museum (extant) in 1969 at 1500 Boston Avenue in Tex Ritter Park as a tribute to the city's history. The windmill design of the museum is a replica of a Dutch windmill. The museum reflects the growing cultural offerings that developed in the postwar era outside of Beaumont and Port Arthur. Source: "A Tribute to Heritage," Nederland Chamber of Commerce and Tourist Bureau, accessed November 2, 2021, https://nederlandtx.com/museums/dutch-windmill-museum/.

Jefferson County Musicians and Entertainers

In 1994, the Gulf Coast Music Hall of Fame opened in Port Arthur. Among the more than 60 musicians from the Gulf Coast featured at the museum include a number of musicians who emerged from Jefferson County. The various music genres represented—blues, country, Cajun, zydeco, jazz, and rock-and-roll—reflect the county's diverse ethnic, racial, and cultural influences. Jefferson County artists featured at the museum include Clifton Chenier, the "King of Zydeco," who moved from Louisiana to Port Arthur in 1947, working at a refinery during the day and playing shows at night. Famed rock-and-roller, Jiles Perry Richardson, known as the Big Bopper, was born in Sabine Pass and raised in Beaumont where he later had a popular radio show on KTRM in the late 1940s and 1950s. Country musician and movie star Tex Ritter is also featured at the museum. Ritter lived in Nederland during high school in the late 1910s before he made it big as a country music and movie star. In addition to the Gulf Coast Music Hall of Fame, Ritter is also honored in Nederland at the Dutch Windmill Museum and with Tex Ritter Park. Jazz musician Ted Dunbar got his start playing in Port Arthur in the late 1940s and 1950s is also featured at the museum. Probably one of the most recognizable musicians to come from Jefferson County was Janis Joplin (Figure 119). Born in Port Arthur, the eclectic mix of music played on the radio and in clubs in Port Arthur and Beaumont inspired Joplin. In addition to the museum, historical markers and sculptures in Beaumont and Port Arthur, where the county's clubs were all located, also honor Joplin and other county musicians.



Figure 119. Janis Joplin (second row, second from the left) in 1954 as part of the First Christian Church of Port Arthur Youth Choir. Joplin graduated from Jefferson High School in Port Arthur in 1960 and spent several years at Lamar State in Beaumont before transferring to the University of Texas at Austin and ultimately making it as a blues and rock-and-roll musician. Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting First Christian Church of Port Arthur, accessed December 2, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth34931.

The Civil Rights Movement in Jefferson County

Segregation at public facilities such as parks and pools existed in Jefferson County as it did throughout the country during the Jim Crow era. The fight to end segregation and for civil rights began in earnest in Jefferson County in this period, aided by activists and the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, or nationality. While segregation existed across Jefferson County, Beaumont and Port Arthur, home to the majority of the county's Black population, ultimately became the center of the Civil Rights movement and home to many of the county's integration battles. Leaders of the movement included lawyers Elmo Willard III and Theodore Johns. Together the two worked with the NAACP to fight for desegregation at parks, schools, and other public facilities in Beaumont and Jefferson County (Figure 120). In 1955, they won a federal lawsuit on behalf of Black golfers who wanted to play at the public course at Tyrrell Park. The court decision, the first in the South, ordered Beaumont end segregation at its public golf courses, its public parks, and its recreational facilities.[50] Willard and Johns also successfully argued for the end of segregation at Lamar University (then named Lamar State College of Technology) in Beaumont in 1956. Following the federal ruling ending segregation, violence erupted at the school as White picketers and protesters set crosses aflame and harassed and abused Black students. Willard and Johns, as well as other local members of the NAACP, were also subjected to the threat of bombs and shootings at their homes. Despite the violence, 23 Black students enrolled at Lamar in 1956, and six graduated two years later.[51] Willard also represented plaintiffs fighting for enrollment at local public schools during the fight for integration.

In 1954, the United States Supreme Court ruled in favor of school integration in *Brown v. Board of Education*. In Texas and in Jefferson County, individual school districts were in charge of creating their own integration plans, which often meant the desegregation process was neither immediate nor swift. Port Arthur and Beaumont both began the integration process in the 1960s, though faced court battles and complaints over integration efforts into the twenty-first century. Some rural school districts in Jefferson County also faced court battles over integration following denial of enrollment to Black students. One event occurred in 1962 at Fannett Elementary School in the Hamshire-Fannett school district, when the school superintendent refused admission to fifteen Black students who attempted to enroll at the school.[52] The next year, a father in Cheek filed a civil suit seeking integration of schools in the school district after his children were denied enrollment.[53] The U. S. District Judge overseeing the case, and a similar case in Beaumont, ruled against immediate total desegregation and stipulated that the school district initiate a grade-a-year integration plan, as it had no integration plan in place.[54] The 12-year, grade-a-year plan was overturned in 1967 following the U.S. 5th Circuit Court of Appeals ruling. The ruling required that six states, including Texas, integrate all public schools and facilities by the fall of 1967.

In addition to segregation of businesses, schools, and recreational facilities, African Americans also suffered from political gerrymandering, multimember districts, stub signing requirements, and inhospitable polling locations that limited the Black vote and diluted their voice. White residents and officials also used the threat of force and harassment to prevent the Black population from voting, ultimately keeping Black politicians from winning political office for much of the postwar period. At the end of the period though, in 1976, the citizens in and around Beaumont elected the first African American from Southeast Texas to the Texas House of Representatives. Albert Price, an Air Force veteran who broke barriers as a Black commercial airline pilot, served as a state legislator for 22 years (Figure 121). Following Price, Jefferson County elected its first Black official in 1986. Edward Moore was elected as a County Commissioner after a federal voting rights lawsuit redrew precinct boundaries. He served four terms, stepping down in 2001. Since Moore, Jefferson County elected its first Black County Clerk, Carolyn Guidry, in 2004 and the state's the first Black female sheriff, Zena Stephens, in 2016.



Figure 120. Busts of Elmo Willard and Theodore Johns, two of Jefferson County's most prominent civil rights activists. The two lawyers successfully fought for the integration of Beaumont's golf courses. The Beaumont Foundation donated the busts for placement at the Jefferson County Courthouse. Source: "Known for decades as a leader," *Beaumont Journal*, March 8, 2010, https://www.beaumontenterprise.com/photos/article/Known-for-decades-as-a-leader-731082.php#taboola-6.



Figure 121. Albert Price was the first African American elected to the Texas House of Representatives from Southeast Texas. Elected in 1976, he served 22 years. Source: Photo courtesy of the *Beaumont Enterprise*, via Kenneth W. Jackson, "Price, Albert James, Sr.," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 30, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/price-albert-james-sr.

Educationally, the period witnessed the closing of many of the small, rural one- and two-room schoolhouses from the early twentieth century due to annexation and consolidation efforts. In 1961, Fannett and Hamshire combined, forming the Hamshire-Fannett Independent School District (ISD). The district encompassed the two communities, along with LaBelle and parts of Cheek. Nome, China, and Sour Lake in Hardin County also consolidated in the 1960s, forming the Hardin-Jefferson ISD. As a result of the consolidation, the newly formed school districts built new, larger schools, including the Hamshire-Fannett High School in Hamshire at 12702 2nd Street. In the combined Port Neches-Groves district, the population boom in the two communities in the postwar period resulted in massive expansion. Among the eight new schools, athletic fields and facilities, and administration building constructed in the two cities was the extant Port Neches-Groves High School at 1401 Merriman Street in Port Neches in 1953 (Figure 122).[55] The older high school served as the junior high school before it was demolished (its concrete slab is extant on the rubber plant property).[56] Other new school buildings include Hillcrest Elementary School in Nederland, Van Buren Elementary School in Groves, and Central Middle School in Nederland (Figure 123).



Figure 122. The Port Neches-Groves High School on Merriman Street (extant). The high school, built in 1953, was one of several new buildings constructed by the school district during the postwar population boom. Source: "A History of the Port Neches Independent School District," Port Neches-Groves Independent School District, 15, accessed November 30, 2021, https://www.pngisd.org/domain/11.



Figure 123. Central Middle School at 200 North 17th Street in Nederland. Built around 1950, the school is one of 13 resources identified during fieldwork that are recommended eligible for listing in the National Register as part of a proposed post-war public buildings of Jefferson County multiple property nomination. Source: HHM, 2022.

Parks and Open Space

While cities in eastern Jefferson County created small public parks in this period, environmental conservation and protection efforts led to the development of large-scale parks, preserves, and refuges in the county. The woods in northern Jefferson County, eyed by conservationists as early as the 1930s, became part of the larger, noncontiguous 113,114-acre Big Thicket National Preserve in 1974.[57] Spread across seven Texas counties, the Big Thicket National Preserve runs along Pine Island Bayou along the county's northern border, as well at its confluence with the Neches River north of Beaumont.

In southern Jefferson County, for roughly three decades following the war, land-use patterns in the marshlands remained largely unchanged. Rice farmers and ranchers continued to work the land, outdoorspeople and hunting clubs maintained leases for hunting and fishing (Figure 124). The marshlands were changing, though, affected by years of rice farmers draining and altering fields, the construction of the Intracoastal Canal, and industrial encroachment that saw some marshland filled for road construction and other development. Consequently, the marsh's birds and animals suffered, including the at-the-time rare and endangered red wolf, American alligator, and river otter.[58] Early conservation efforts led to the creation of the John David Murphree Wildlife Management Area. Texas Parks and Wildlife created the WMA in 1958 from 8,200 acres purchased from the McFaddin family trust. In addition to overseeing the conservation and protection of the wetlands and waterfowl in the WMA, TPW also managed waterfowl and alligator hunts, fishing, and mineral development for oil and gas.[59] The creation of the J. D. Murphree WMA stirred little opposition, largely because TPW did not ban hunting or fishing. The story changed, though, when the state, and later the federal government, started

targeting additional lands for purchase that would limit or ban hunting. Despite organized opposition from some prominent Jefferson County outdoorsmen and hunting clubs, Sea Rim State Park, McFaddin National Wildlife Refuge (NWR), and Texas Point NWR opened in the 1970s and 1980s. TPW opened Sea Rim State Park in 1977 on 14,000 acres purchased from Planet Oil and Mineral Corporation and Horizon Sales Corporation; the oil companies had purchased the land from the McFaddin family trust in 1969. Under the authority of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, an arm of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Texas Point NWR opened in 1979 and McFaddin NWR opened in 1980 (Figure 125). The creation of the NWRs put roughly 67,000 acres, many of them former ranch lands, under the protection of the USFWS. Hunting was banned at Sea Rim State Park but permitted under strict regulations at the NWRs. While the creation of the parks and refuges ultimately led to the demise of the private hunting clubs in Jefferson County, the continued expansion and creation of the parks and refuges in the 1980s and 1990s placed nearly the entirety of the southern coastline in Jefferson County under protection.



Figure 124. A hunter with Canada geese and Mallard ducks on McFaddin Ranch before it was sold and eventually incorporated into one of the protected state parks and national wildlife refuges that were established in the 1970s and 1980s. Source: Photo courtesy Leo Foreman, from R. K. Sawyer, *A Hundred Years of Texas Waterfowl Hunting: The Decoys, Guides, Clubs, and Places: 1870s to 1970s* (College Station, Texas: Texas A&M University Press, 2012).



Figure 125. As a nationally protected wildlife refuge, the Department of the Interior has worked to preserve and conserve the natural environment at McFaddin Beach NWR. One of the latest projects focuses on beach and dune restoration. Source: "DOI Texas TIG Restoration Projects," Deepwater Horizon Response & Restoration, U. S. Department of the Interior, October 2019, https://www.doi.gov/deepwaterhorizon/doi-texas-tig-restoration-projects-1.

Sabine Pass Battleground State Historic Site

During this time period, the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) purchased the Sabine Pass Battleground site in 1971. Acquired from the Kountze County Trust, the roughly 55-acre site officially became a state historic site.[60] TPWD oversaw erosion control projects, as well as the construction of shade structures and picnic facilities at the site. In 2008, the Texas Historical Commission (THC) gained control of the site (Figure 126). Home to the 1936 Dick Dowling monument, the park considered taking Houston's Dowling statue after the city removed it from Hermann Park in June 2020 following racial protests across the country. Opposed by Port Arthur's mayor, the THC ultimately tabled a vote on the statue's relocation to the Port Arthur-located park.



Figure 126. In the postwar era, Sabine Pass Battleground site became state-owned and an official historic site. The Texas Historical Commission gained control of the park from Texas Parks and Wildlife Department in 2008. The interpretive pavilion is one of the improvements made to the site upon becoming state-owned. Source: "Sabine Pass Battleground State Historic Site," Texas Historical Commission, accessed December 23, 2021, https://www.thc.texas.gov/historic-sites/sabine-pass-battleground-state-historic-site.

CONCLUSION

Due to the county's lengthy history of hurricanes, a number of historic resources have been lost over the centuries. For such a reason, it is important to identify and document extant historic-age resources. The themes and events in this context aim to place extant historic-age resources into the historical context and development of Jefferson County. The context establishes some of the most significant themes in the development of the county (outside the municipalities of Beaumont and Port Arthur), including rice, oil, and transportation networks. The goal of the context is to help identify and understand historic-age resources and help to tell the history of Jefferson County.

ENDNOTES

[1] "1970 Census of Population and Housing: Census Tracts Beaumont-Port Arthur-Orange, Texas," United States Department of Commerce Publication, 1970, 12, https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/decennial/1970/phc-1/39204513p2ch11.pdf.

[2] Gene Lyons, "The Newest Americans," *Texas Monthly*, June 1976, https://www.texasmonthly.com/news-politics/the-newest-americans/.

[3] Lyons, "The Newest Americans."

[4] Fred R. von der Mehden, "Vietnamese," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 20, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/vietnamese.

[5] Henry C. Dethloff and Garry L. Nall, "Agriculture," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 22, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/agriculture.

[6] "History & Development," LNVA, accessed December 12, 2021, https://lnva.dst.tx.us/about/.

[7] Edythe Capreol, "President of Mill Foresees No Decrease in Rice Price," *Beaumont Journal*, December 28, 1967, 22.

[8] "Bid on Drainage District 6 Project is Accepted," *Beaumont Journal*, February 9, 1966, 11.

[9] "History," Jefferson County Drainage District No. 7, accessed December 22, 2021, https://dd7.org/history.asp.

[10] "History," Jefferson County Drainage District 3, accessed December 22, 2021, https://jcdd3.org/history/.

[11] Historic Agricultural Census, 1940-1978, United States Department of Agriculture, accessed December 2, 2021, https://agcensus.library.cornell.edu/.

[12] *Dallas Morning News Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide for 1974-1975*, from the University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Texas State Historical Association, 319, accessed November 10, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth113812.

[13] T*exas Almanac and State Industrial Guide for 1949-1950*, from the University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Texas State Historical Association, accessed November 10, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth117167.

[14] Jeon Lee, "The Historical Geography of Rice Culture in the American South," L*SU Historical Dissertations and Theses* (1988): 127, https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses/4655.

[15] Lee, "The Historical Geography of Rice Culture in the American South," 131.

[16] "Domestic Charters," *Fort Worth Star-Telegram*, March 7, 1946, 27.

[17] Lee, "The Historical Geography of Rice Culture in the American South," 93.

[18] Denise Gomez, "First Providence, Then Prosperity: A Brief History of Beaumont's Rice Culture," *Houston History Magazine*, July 2016, 24, https://houstonhistorymagazine.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Beaumont-.pdf.

[19] "Fertilizer Plant to Open in China," *Beaumont Journal,* March 18, 1965, 12.

[20] "Expansion Set at China, Nome Plants," *Beaumont Journal*, April 7, 1966, 19

[21] *Dallas Morning News Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide for 1964-1965*, from the University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Texas State Historical Association, 236, accessed November 10, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth113807.

[22] *Area Manpower Guidebook: 174 Metropolitan Labor Market Areas*, U. S. Department of Labor, U. S. Bureau of Employment Security (1957), https://www.google.com/books/edition/Area_Manpower_Guidebook/DzpXAAAAMAAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1&bsq=beaumont.

[23] Robert H. Ryan, "Chemical Industries," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 23, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/chemical-industries.

[24] Ryan, "Chemical Industries."

[25] "Goodyear Plant Began Output Dec. 7, 1961," *Beaumont Journal*, August 11, 1964, 5.

[26] Diana J. Kleiner, "Sulfur Industry," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 22, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/sulfur-industry.

[27] Tai Deckner Kreidler, "The Offshore Petroleum Industry: The Formative Years, 1945-1962," Texas Tech University Dissertation, 1997, 4.

[28] "History of the Offshore Oil and Gas Industry in Southern Louisiana," U. S. Department of the Interior, September 2008, 198, https://espis.boem.gov/final%20reports/4530.pdf.

[29] "History of the Offshore Oil and Gas Industry in Southern Louisiana," U. S. Department of the Interior, September 2008, 198, https://espis.boem.gov/final%20reports/4530.pdf.

[30] "History of the Airport," Jack Brooks Regional Airport, accessed December 22, 2021, https://flysetx.com/airport-information/history-of-the-airport/.

[31] Robert Wooster, "Sabine-Neches Waterway and Sabine Pass Ship Channel," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 21, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/sabine-neches-waterway-and-sabine-pass-ship-channel.

[32] Lynn M. Alperin, *Custodians of the Coast: History of the United States Army Engineers at Galveston* (Galveston, Texas: United States Army Corps of Engineers, 1977) 82.

[33] Robert Wooster, "Sabine-Neches Waterway and Sabine Pass Ship Channel," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 23, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/sabine-neches-waterway-and-sabine-pass-ship-channel.

[34] "Highway Commission to Expand Farm-to-Market Road Program," *The Belton Journal*, June 19, 1947, p. 8

[35] TxDOT Texas Highway Designation Files Search, Texas Department of Transportation, accessed November 22, 2021, http://www.dot.state.tx.us/tpp/default.aspx.

[36] "10-Year Plan For US 90 Completed," *Beaumont Journal*, October 23, 1961, 22.

[37] Richard F. Weingroff, "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956: Creating the Interstate System," *Public Roads*, published by the Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, accessed October 4, 2021, https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/publicroads/96summer/p96su10.cfm.

[38] "Jefferson County 'Annexing Mad,'" *The Austin American*, November 6, 1959, 19.

[39] "Construction Picture Here is Improved," *Beaumont Journal,* April 14, 1965, 13.

[40] "New Subdivision For Nederland," *Beaumont Journal*, June 11, 1952, 9.

[41] "New Subdivision To Be Opened in Area," *Beaumont Journal*, March 12, 1965, 25.

[42] Robert Wooster, "Bevil Oaks, TX," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 22, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/bevil-oaks-tx.

[43] Leif Fredrickson, "Racist Housing? How Postwar Suburban Development Led to Today's Inner-City Lead Poisoning," *The Ecologist*, March 7, 2016, https://theecologist.org/2016/mar/07/racist-housing-how-postwar-suburban-development-led-todays-inner-city-lead-poisoning.

[44] Joe Pratt, "Letter from the Editor: Confronting Jim Crow," Houston History Magazine, December 20, 2010, https://houstonhistorymagazine.org/2010/12/letter-from-the-editor-confronting-jim-crow/.

[45] Robert Wooster, "Hamshire, TX," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 28, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/hamshire-tx.; Robert Wooster, "Nome, TX," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 28, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/nome-tx.; Robert Wooster, "China, TX," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 28, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/china-tx.

[46] "Subdivision Being Planned For Hamshire," *Beaumont Journal*, May 21, 1959, 2.

[47] Charles Culhane, "Workers In Area Benefit," *Beaumont Journal*, August 19, 1960, 1.

[48] "Truck Bought By Fire Unit," *Beaumont Journal*, April 17, 1961, 11.

[49] "Groves decides fate of city pool," *Beaumont Journal*, March 22, 2016, https://www.beaumontenterprise.com/news/article/Groves-contemplating-closing-city-pool-6926418.php#photo-6896634.

[50] George B. Kirsch, "Municipal Golf and Civil Rights in the United States, 1910-1965," *The Journal of African American History* 92, no. 3 (2007): 384. https://jstor.org/stable/20064205.

[51] Office of Diversity and Inclusion, Lamar University, accessed December 23, 2021, https://www.lamar.edu/diversity-inclusion/african-american-history/2012.html.

[52] "Some Texas Schools Bar Negro Pupils," *Corpus Christi Times*, September 5, 1962, 8.

[53] "Low Marks on Negroes Reported," *The Austin American*, December 20, 1963, 30.

[54] "Grad-a-Year Integration Upheld by Judge Fisher," *Beaumont Journal,* April 24, 1964, 1.

[55] "History of Port Neches-Groves High School," Port Neches-Groves High School, accessed December 2, 2021, https://www.pngisd.org/domain/131.

[56] "A History of the Port Neches Independent School District: Early Days to 1975," Port Neches – Groves Independent School District, 14.

[57] "Exploring the Big Thicket," National Park Service, accessed December 2, 2021, https://www.nps.gov/bith/planyourvisit/basicinfo.htm.

[58] "New Sea Rim State Park Model of Unconventional," *El Paso Times*, October 21, 1973, 52.

[59] J. D. Murphree WMA, Texas Parks and Wildlife, accessed December 12, 2021, https://tpwd.texas.gov/huntwild/hunt/wma/find_a_wma/list/?id=40.

[60] Christopher Long, "Sabine Pass Battleground State Historic Site," *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed December 29, 2021, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/sabine-pass-battleground-state-historic-site.



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey Plan, Historic Resources Survey, and Historic Preservation Plan

Volume II - Historic Resources Survey Report

Prepared for the

Jefferson County Historical Commission





Prepared by HHM & Associates, Inc.

March 2024

Photos courtesy of University of North Texas Libraries and the Texas Historical Commission.

VOLUME II TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume II Historic Resources Survey Report II-1

Executive Summary II-1

Introduction II-4

Survey Methodology and Survey Plan Summary II-4

Stakeholder Input Summary II-6

Survey Findings II-7

General Trends II-8

Eligibility Recommendations II-10

Appendices .....

Appendix II-A: National Register Criteria for Evaluation A-1

Evaluating Significance A-2

Evaluating Integrity A-3

Appendix II-B: Survey Maps B-1

Historic District Maps B-190

Appendix II-C: Windshield-Level Survey Inventory C-1

Appendix II-D: Reconnaissance-Level Survey Inventory D-1

Appendix II-E: Desktop-Level Survey CSV E-1

Historic Resources Survey Report

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In March 2021, the Jefferson County Historical Commission (CHC) commissioned HHM & Associates, Inc. of Austin, Texas, to complete a historic resources survey plan, historic resources survey, and historic preservation plan for the county. This survey report presents the findings of the historic resources survey.

HHM completed survey efforts in Jefferson County between April and September 2022. Surveyors followed the Survey Methodology and Survey Plan approved at the outset of the project. Based on this guidance, HHM documented some historic-age resources as individual parcels of land and others (like postwar subdivisions) as collective groupings of parcels. Prior to field survey, HHM conducted a desktop survey using Jefferson Central Appraisal District (CAD) data and historic aerial photos to flag parcels/groupings likely to include extant resources built within the historic period (by 1978). During field survey in Jefferson County, HHM visited all flagged parcels/groupings. For 478 flagged parcels, no historic-age resources were visible, so no further documentation was gathered, and documentation stopped at the desktop level. If resources built by 1978 were visible, HHM collected windshield-level field documentation. Individual resources and collective groupings of resources were evaluated in the field for eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)—informed by the historic context and associated research completed by HHM in January 2022. Potentially eligible resources were surveyed at the reconnaissance level. HHM also made note of parcels where future right-of-entry (ROE) is needed to evaluate NRHP eligibility. In total, HHM documented **3,415 records** during fieldwork. Table i summarizes the survey level and scale of the documented resources. Among these resources, HHM **recommends NRHP eligibility for 90 individual resources and 14 historic districts**, as detailed in Table ii. Eligibility recommendations for every historic-age resource identified in the survey are presented in the Inventory in Appendix C. All survey work and evaluations were made by professionals meeting the *Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards* (36 CFR 61). The geographic boundaries of the survey included all of Jefferson County, exempting the municipalities of Beaumont and Port Arthur, as depicted in Figure i.

Table i. Counts of the number of records documented in the field for each of the survey levels and scales.

Survey Level	Individual Scale	Collective Scale	Total
Desktop*	478	0	478
Windshield (pre-1979 resource)	2,409	345	2,754
Reconnaissance (individually eligible pre-1979 resource)	90	0	90
Future Windshield**	93	0	93
Total	3,070	345	**3,415**

**Includes parcels with post-1978 resources, without buildings, or without visibility where ROE is not justified.*

***Includes parcels needing ROE where historic-age resources are likely but not accessible/visible from the right-of-way (ROW).*

Table ii. NRHP eligibility counts by survey scale for non-Desktop-level survey.

NRHP Eligibility Recommendation	Individual Scale	Collective Scale	Total
Not Eligible	2,324	324	2,648
Individually Eligible	89	0	89
Eligible as/Within Historic District	42	12	54
Individually Eligible and Within Eligible District	1	0	1
Intensive Survey Needed	43	9	52
ROE Needed	89	0	89
ROE and Intensive Survey Needed	4	0	4
Total	2,592	345	**2,937***

**This count does not include the 478 resources surveyed only at the desktop level in the field.*

Overall, the survey report aims to provide Jefferson County with information on their extant historic-age resources. This information also helped inform the Historic Preservation Plan that HHM developed for the county. Together, the two documents will provide guidance for future management and planning for the identified historic-age resources in Jefferson County.

Figure i. Map of Jefferson County showing survey areas and known historic areas and sites.



INTRODUCTION

This project is funded in part by a grant from the National Park Service's Emergency Supplemental Historic Preservation Fund and managed and administered by the Texas Historical Commission (THC). Through the grant, the THC aims to fund projects that promote preservation planning and the documentation and rehabilitation of historic resources in areas affected by Hurricane Harvey. As part of this effort, the THC awarded the Jefferson County Historical Commission a grant to prepare a historic resources survey plan, historic resources survey, and a historic preservation plan.

Jefferson County has a long history of damage from hurricanes and floods, including Hurricane Harvey in 2017 and Hurricanes Ike (2008) and Rita (2005). Hurricane Harvey alone caused an estimated $2.2 billion of damage, flooding over 15,000 homes and wiping out critical infrastructure across Jefferson County.[1] Future climate projections anticipate more frequent, stronger storms and floods in coming decades. Though hurricane damage in 2017 was widespread across the county, this project focuses on the areas outside of Beaumont and Port Arthur, where historic preservation efforts have been limited. Historically, much of the preservation work in the county has focused on Beaumont and Port Arthur, both designated Certified Local Governments. As a result, historic resources in the county's smaller cities and unincorporated and rural areas have largely gone undocumented, leaving them in danger of being lost. The goals of this project are to document as many above-ground historic-age properties in these areas of Jefferson County as possible, to assess the damage of past storms, and to integrate this information into a preservation plan that will help Jefferson County respond to future storms' impact on historic resources.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY AND SURVEY PLAN SUMMARY

Prior to any fieldwork, HHM completed a Survey Methodology and Survey Plan to ensure fieldwork was conducted efficiently and accurately. These documents laid out the survey boundaries (see Figure i) and parameters for determining survey scale – if a parcel should be surveyed individually or collectively. The parameters presented in Table 1 reflect the Survey Methodology and Survey Plan, as refined through consultation with the Jefferson CHC and THC after the first month of survey work to address issues encountered in the field.

Table 1. Parameters used for determining scale of survey - whether a parcel will be surveyed individually or as part of a collective grouping.

Individual Survey	Collective Survey
Cutoff date of 1978 Parcels with no CAD date included **Individually eligible parcels in residential subdivisions Agricultural complexes ≥ 10 acres with resources built by 1978 excluded Mobile and manufactured homes to be excluded	Cutoff date of 1978 Parcels with no CAD date included *All Postwar residential subdivisions **Subdivisions with mostly Postwar resources Agricultural complexes ≥ 10 acres with resources built by 1978 Mobile home parks included

**** As modified per May 3, 2022 meeting among HHM, JCHC, and the THC after first round of field survey. Prior to the meeting only postwar subdivisions with 10 or more parcels were surveyed collectively.***

***** As modified per May 26, 2022 email among HHM, JCHC, and the THC after second round of field survey.***

[1] Jefferson County Historical Commission, Request for Statements of Qualification RFQ 20-041/YS Historic Preservation Professional Services for Historic Resources Survey Plan, Historic Resources Survey, and Historic Preservation Plan, September 8, 2020, p. 21.

The Survey Methodology and Survey Plan also identified the following levels of survey and laid out the level of documentation to be recorded for each level. Table 2 presents the levels of survey and documentation level as presented in the documents and refined through survey work.

Table 2. Levels of survey and documentation level for different parcel types.

Survey Level	Survey Scale	Description	Documentation Data
Desktop	Individual	Parcels with post-1978 JCAD construction date	Fields of Data: • CAD parcel ID(s) • Address • Prior documentation/designations • Construction date(s) • History notes
	Individual	Parcels with no JCAD construction date; no improvement on parcels confirmed during desktop survey	

Windshield	Individual	Parcels with pre-1979 JCAD construction date	Fields of Data:
			• All desktop-level fields*
			• NRHP eligibility recommendation
			  ○ Individually Eligible/Eligible as a District
			  ○ Not eligible
			  ○ Within district eligible for NRHP
			• Justification for recommendation
			  ○ Intensive survey needed
			  ○ ROE needed
			  ○ Lacks integrity
			  ○ Lacks known significance
			  ○ Possesses integrity and significance
			Photography:
			• One photograph of each individual resource OR two typical photographs of collective survey area

	Individual	Parcels with no JCAD construction date; likely contain resources constructed pre-1979 identified during desktop survey	
	Collective	Pre-1979 agricultural parcels 10 acres or larger	
	Collective	Subdivisions	
Reconnaissance	Individual	Parcels eligible or potentially eligible for the NRHP	Fields of Data: • All desktop- and windshield-level fields • Historic use • Current use • Property type • Stylistic influences • Integrity • NR criteria • NR Area(s) of significance • NR Period(s) of significance Photography: • Two photographs of each individual resource, including outbuildings
Future Windshield	Individual	Parcels requiring ROE. Identified during desktop survey and fieldwork.	Fields of Data: • All desktop-level fields • Justification for recommendation** ○ ROE needed Photography: • No photographs

**For Windshield-level survey of collective groupings, a range of construction dates was documented. No addresses or CAD parcel ID numbers were documented for collective groupings.*

***For these resources, HHM made no NRHP eligibility recommendations since survey was not possible.*

The documents also established and outlined the tasks needed for survey preparation, fieldwork, and in support of this survey report. These steps are summarized below.

- **Data and Database Preparation** – HHM obtained and prepared data, including GIS-compatible data from the Jefferson Central Appraisal District (CAD) and data on previously identified and designated resources, in support of survey efforts. During this task, HHM:
    - Cropped CAD data to include only parcels within survey boundaries
    - Edited CAD data down to relevant fields, including parcel ID number, address, owner information, and construction date[2]
    - Linked CAD data to data about previously identified historic resources obtained from the Jefferson CHC, THC, TxDOT, public input, and the historic context prepared in January 2022
    - Uploaded the revised data set to HHM's GIS-compatible database
- **Desktop Survey –** The aim of the desktop survey was to ensure that all historic-age resources were flagged for survey. From a computer desktop using Google Street View, Google Earth aerials, and historic maps and aerials, HHM surveyed every entry in the database to verify if the parcel likely still contained a historic-age resource. This survey also identified and flagged parcels not included in the data obtained and prepared in the previous step for windshield survey. The survey also identified parcels that need right-of-entry.
- **Field Survey –** Using the prepopulated database, field teams documented the resources flagged for survey during the Desktop survey. All survey work was done from the right-of-way. HHM also surveyed historic-age resources that had not been flagged during the Desktop survey that were found during fieldwork. Resources prepopulated in the database appear as polygons in the maps in Appendix B. Individually eligible resources and resources identified in the field that were not flagged for survey, and therefore not prepopulated in the database, appear as points in the maps in Appendix B.
- **Data Analysis –** At the close of the field survey, HHM analyzed all survey data for completeness and consistency. The team also held several roundtable discussions to discuss eligibility recommendations.

The entire Survey Methodology can be downloaded via the following link:
https://dmoore.egnyte.com/dl/xPnYkGnHby

The entire Survey Plan can be downloaded via the following link:
https://dmoore.egnyte.com/dl/P6htueSZZN

STAKEHOLDER INPUT SUMMARY

The survey results compiled in this report reflect an ongoing effort to communicate with public stakeholders. Public input shaped HHM's survey efforts at all levels – from the survey methodology to the survey plan, field investigations, eligibility evaluations, and preservation planning investigations. Stakeholder input outreach efforts and responses are summarized below:

[2] HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed as Beaumont in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

- In the third quarter of 2021, HHM completed the Draft Research Design and Public Input Plan (Task 2, delivered on July 1, 2021), as well as the Final (Task 3, delivered on July 14, 2021). These deliverables set forth the methodology for all research, fieldwork, and public input to be completed in following tasks. Representatives from the Jefferson County Certified Local Government (CLG), County Historical Commission (CHC), and Texas Historical Commission (THC) reviewed and commented on the Draft, and their input was incorporated into the Final deliverable.
- As part of the Public Input Plan, HHM developed a shared online Google Form soliciting stakeholder contact information to help distribute project outreach and notifications for future tasks. The Jefferson County CLG helped distribute links to the form to public stakeholders including CHC members, historic property owners, and relevant municipal and county employees and officials.
    - In the fourth quarter of 2021, HHM conducted research and analysis to prepare the Draft Historic Context, completed in the first quarter of 2022 (January 14, 2022). The Draft was shared with the CLG, CHC, and THC for review and comment. The context then was revised to incorporate these comments.
- Also in the first quarter of 2021, HHM developed a Draft Survey Plan targeting specific parcels of land for field investigations based on the likelihood that they included extant historic resources. The Draft was delivered to the CLG, CHC, and THC for review and distribution in preparation for the First Stakeholder Meetings.
- Consistent with the Final Public Involvement Plan, HHM held the First Public Meetings during the second quarter of 2022 (April 12, 2022). This two-part series of meetings discussed revisions to the Draft Survey Plan as well as initial brainstorming for the Historic Preservation Plan. In response to comments during the meeting and via follow-up emails, HHM revised the Survey Plan and submitted a final version (May 2, 2022; further revised May 25, 2022).
- The Final Survey Plan, including all public feedback, informed all field survey efforts during the second and third quarters of 2022 (April 2022 through August 2022). At the outset of the survey, the CLG issued a press release and notified the sheriff and municipal police about the project. HHM routinely communicated with the CLG, CHC, and THC throughout the survey to ask questions and refine the survey methodology. HHM surveyors also routinely talked with property owners encountered in the field and incorporated their knowledge into survey notes.
- In the fourth quarter of 2022, the Draft Historic Resources Survey Report was shared with the CLG, CHC, and THC for review and comment (November 10, 2022). The survey report was revised to incorporate these comments.
- In the second quarter of 2023, HHM developed a Draft Historic Preservation Plan that integrated input from stakeholders received at the first public meeting (April 2022) and a second public meeting (April 2023). The Draft was shared with the CLG, CHC, and THC (July 17, 2023). The Historic Preservation Plan then was revised to incorporate and address these comments.

SURVEY FINDINGS

The field team recorded 3,415 records in the database between April and September 2022. This included individual parcels and collective groupings surveyed at the Desktop, Windshield, and Reconnaissance levels (see Table 3). An inventory of all resources surveyed at the windshield and reconnaissance level can be found in Appendices C and D. Appendix E contains the CSV file of the Desktop-level records. Maps in Appendix B show the location of all surveyed resources.

Table 3. Counts of the number of records documented in the field for each of the survey levels and scales.

Survey Level	Individual Scale	Collective Scale	Total
Desktop*	478	0	478
Windshield (pre-1979 resource)	2,409	345	2,754
Reconnaissance (individually eligible pre-1979 resource)	90	0	90
Future Windshield**	93	0	93
Total	3,070	345	**3,415**

**Includes parcels with pre-1978 resources, without buildings, or without visibility where ROE is not justified.*

***Includes parcels needing ROEy where historic-age resources are likely but not accessible/visible from the ROW.*

GENERAL TRENDS

The resources surveyed at the individual scale at the windshield and reconnaissance levels date from around 1850 to 1978. The majority of individual resources surveyed date to the 1960s. Figure 1 below summarizes the dates of construction of the surveyed individual resources. Based on field observations—as property type was not recorded at the windshield level—the majority of resources were residential. Surveyors also recorded commercial, industrial, agricultural, educational, and religious properties. Resources were located across the county—outside the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur—though the majority were documented in Mid-County, in the cities of Nederland, Port Neches, and Groves. Table 4 summarizes the locations of the surveyed resources, also illustrated in the Maps in Appendix B.

Figure 1. Chart of surveyed buildings by decade built.



Table 4. Counts by city/unincorporated area location/vicinity of the number of records surveyed individually at the windshield and reconnaissance levels.

City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity*	Counts
Nederland	573
Beaumont	365
Fannett	306
Port Neches	268
Hamshire	254
Winnie	212
Cheek	157
China	152
Groves	122
LaBelle	77
Nome	63
Bevil Oaks	21
Port Arthur	8
Taylor Landing	8
Viterbo	6
Total	**2,592**

** HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated areas are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.*

The majority of collectively surveyed resources include suburbs in Mid-County cities of Nederland, Port Neches, and Groves. Most of these subdivisions were platted during the post-World War II era. Several subdivisions were platted prior to World War II, though they were largely developed in the post-war period. Many of these subdivisions include a cohesive collection of similar houses, built over the same period of time, in the 1960s and 1970s. Other subdivisions, though, display a variety of house forms and styles, reflective of a longer period of development. This is particularly true of pre-1945 subdivisions in Nederland, Port Neches, and Groves. These subdivisions include a variety of houses ranging from the 1920s and 1930s through the 1960s and 1970s. Longer periods of development were also typical in the smaller cities outside Mid-County. In many instances, the period of development in these subdivisions extended into the 1990s and 2000s. In addition to the variety of house forms and styles in these subdivisions, lot sizes also varied greatly.

In addition to residential subdivisions, cemeteries, parks, golf courses, and large agricultural complexes were also surveyed at the collective scale and assessed as potential historic districts.

Table 5. Counts by city location of the number of records surveyed collectively at the windshield level.

City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity*	Counts
Nederland	110
Groves	101
Port Neches	78
Beaumont	16
China	7
Nome	6
Hamshire	5
Bevil Oaks	5
Viterbo	4
Fannett	4
Port Arthur	4
Cheek	2
Winnie	1
LaBelle	1
Taylor Landing	1
Total	**345**

** HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated areas are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.*

ELIGIBILITY RECOMMENDATIONS

This section provides a summary of National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations for individual resources and historic districts (Table 6). To be eligible for listing in the NRHP, a resource, either on an individual basis or collectively as a historic district, must be at least 50 years old, possess significance under at least one of the NRHP Criteria, and retain sufficient integrity to convey that significance. See Appendix A for more information on NRHP Criteria and Integrity Thresholds for eligibility.[3] Consultation with the Texas Historical Commission is highly recommended before proceeding with the NRHP nomination process.

Table 6. NRHP eligibility counts by survey scale.

NRHP Eligibility Recommendation	Individual Scale	Collective Scale	Total
Not Eligible	2,324	324	2,648
Individually Eligible	89	0	89
Eligible as/Within Historic District	42	12	54
Individually Eligible and Within Eligible District	1	0	1
Intensive Survey Needed	43	9	52
ROE Needed	89	0	89
ROE and Intensive Survey Needed	4	0	4
Total	2,592	345	**2,937**

Recommendations are based primarily on fieldwork observations, supported by post-fieldwork analysis. Because the priority of the project was to survey as many resources as possible, the scope of work developed by the THC and Jefferson County focused on survey, deferring property-specific research. Therefore, eligibility recommendations are based on known and easily identifiable significance, applying the historic context prepared for the project as a framework. Many resources are recommended eligible under only one Criteria – Criterion C for Architecture—though a number of them may meet other NR

[3] Because the survey cutoff date was 1978, HHM assessed all surveyed resources as historic-age. There are three resources built after 1973 that are recommended eligible for the NRHP. Because none of these resources meet Criteria Consideration G: Properties that Have Achieved Significance Within the Past 50 Years, they cannot be listed until they meet the 50-year mark.

Criteria than identified by HHM. Due to the minimal amount of property-specific research completed under this survey's scope, recommendations are subject to change if additional research reveals relevant information that identifies historical significance or impacts the integrity of a resource. Intensive survey and research are recommended if the physical characteristics of a property suggest a link to a significant historic theme, but additional research would be needed to substantiate the link.

Individually Eligible

Of the 2,592 individually surveyed resources, HHM identified **90** that are recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Single-family residences account for the majority of recommended eligible resources, though churches, stores, water towers, offices, rice dryers, and a train depot are among the various property types recommended eligible. Among the 90 recommended eligible resources, 13 are recommended eligible under a multiple property listing—a group of properties related to one or several historic contexts.[4] Under a Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson County historic context, HHM recommended public buildings—schools, a post office, a fire station, and a city hall—built between 1948 and 1966 as eligible. Table 7 breaks down the type and number of each resource recommended individually eligible for the NRHP.

Table 7. Counts by Property Type and Form of Recommended Eligible Resources.

Property Type/Form	Counts
Single-family house	41
School	13
Church	8
Water tower	6
Store	4
Agricultural complex	2
Rice dryer	2
Telephone exchange	1
Museum	1
Jail	1
Funeral home	1
Gymnasium	1
Post office	1
Cistern	1
Bank, City Hall	1
Office	1
Fire station	1
Gas station	1
Library	1
Train depot	1
Duplex house	1
Total	**90**

The recommended individually eligible resources date from around 1899 to 1978.[5] The majority of recommended eligible resources date to the 1920s and 1930s. Table 8 breaks down the dates of construction by decade for the recommended eligible resources.

[4] More information on Multiple Property NR nominations can be found online: https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB16B-Complete.pdf.

[5] Because the survey cutoff date was 1978, HHM assessed all surveyed resources as historic-age. There are three resources built between 1973 and 1978 that are recommended eligible for the NRHP. Because none of these resources meet Criteria Consideration G: Properties that Have Achieved Significance Within the Past 50 Years, they cannot be listed until they meet the 50-year mark.

Table 8. Counts by Decade of Construction of Recommended Eligible Resources.

Decade of Construction	Counts
1890-1899	1
1900-1909	4
1910-1919	8
1920-1929	22
1930-1939	20
1940-1949	7
1950-1959	12
1960-1969	12
1970-1978	4
Total	**90**

The recommended eligible resources are dispersed across the county, with a majority located in the Mid-County cities. Table 9 provides the number of recommended eligible resources in each city.

Table 9. Counts by Location of Recommended Eligible Resources.

City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	Counts
Nederland	21
Port Neches	17
Groves	17
China	10
Beaumont	8
Nome	5
Cheek	4
Hamshire	3
Viterbo	1
Taylor Landing	1
Winnie	1
Port Arthur	1
Fannett	1
Total	**90**

Survey forms in Appendix D provide additional detail on the recommended eligible properties, including property form, architectural styles, and historic and current uses. National Register criteria and integrity issues are also included in the forms.

Right-Of-Entry (ROE) Needed

As established in the project's scope of work, HHM conducted all fieldwork from the public right-of-way (ROW) and did not go onto private property. As a result, surveyors encountered various accessibility issues. In some instances, visibility was sufficient for surveyors to make NR-eligibility recommendations, but photographic documentation was impaired and/or restricted due to vegetation, distance of resource from the ROW, traffic on roadway and lack of shoulder, and aggressive dogs. HHM surveyed these resources at the windshield level, making NR-eligibility recommendations, but did not take photographs, making note in the "Identification notes" field in the database why no photograph was taken.[6] In some instances, though, accessibility and visibility issues entirely prevented survey of the resource and no eligibility recommendation or photographs were possible. Issues preventing survey included:

- Vegetation,
- Private roads and driveways,
- Impassible dirt roads,
- Large parcels with resources located far from the ROW,

[6] Note that this field is not included in the Inventory, but this data is included in the GIS/CSV exports provided.

- High security of property, such as petrochemical complexes, and
- Parcel accessible only by water.

When no historic-age resource was visible from the ROW, HHM did not provide an NR eligibility recommendation and noted in the "Justification for NRHP recommendation" field in the database that ROE was needed. During post-survey processing and analysis, HHM went through these records to determine if requesting ROE was justified based on the probability of the parcel containing a historic-age resource. Using historic and current aerial images, CAD dates, construction dates, and property type trends of adjacent and nearby properties, HHM analyzed these parcels for potential historic-age resources to determine whether requesting ROE was justified. After this review, HHM determined that ROE should be requested for **93** parcels. These parcels are included in the Inventory in Appendix C. Maps in Appendix B identify the location of these properties.

Survey of these parcels, along with the 190 parcels identified as needing ROE during Desktop survey efforts, have been included as a recommendation for future survey efforts in the historic preservation plan prepared under Tasks 10-12.

Eligible Historic Districts

In total, HHM identified and recommended **14** historic districts eligible for the National Register. They include residential subdivisions and neighborhoods, as well as cemeteries, parks, a golf course, and agricultural complexes. HHM assessed all 345 resources surveyed collectively, as well as clusters of individually surveyed resources for historic district eligibility. Of the 345 collective survey records, HHM recommends 12 historic districts. HHM also identified two eligible areas consisting of a cohesive collection of historic-age resources that were surveyed individually. For resources in these potential districts, NRHP recommendations are "Within district eligible for NRHP." HHM also provided Contributing and Noncontributing recommendations for these resources.[7] Table 10 lists all 14 recommended eligible historic districts. Maps in Appendix B show the locations of the eligible historic districts.

[7] Note that there are no resource or Contributing and Noncontributing counts for the recommended eligible historic districts surveyed at the collective scale due to the scope of the survey.

Table 10. Recommended Eligible Historic Districts.

District Name	City/Unincorporated Area/ Vicinity	Year(s) of Construction	Survey Scale/No. Resources		
Beaumont Country Club	Beaumont	1906 – 1965	Collective/NA		
Broussard Cemetery	Hamshire	1861 – 2021	Collective/NA		
College to Nederland	Nederland	1925 – 1935	Collective & Individually*	C	10
				NC	1
				Total	11
Collier's Ferry Park	Beaumont	1750 - 1980	Collective		
Country Club Park Estates	Taylor Landing		Collective		
Downtown Nederland	Nederland		Individually	C	28
				NC	2
				Total	30
Duplantis Farmstead	LaBelle	1886 - 1920	Individually	C	2
				NC	0
				Total	2
Greenlawn Memorial Park Cemetery	Groves	1898 - 2020	Collective/NA		
Old Bluff Memorial Park Cemetery	Port Neches	1868 - 2022	Collective/NA		
Pumping station	Beaumont	1935-1973	Collective/NA		
River Front Park	Port Neches	1920	Collective/NA		
River Oaks Ranchettes	Bevil Oaks	1955-1975	Collective/NA		
Texas A & M AgriLife Research and Extension Center	Beaumont	1930 - 1973	Collective/NA		
Wynnewood Estates	Groves	1965-1970	Collective/NA		

*Due to an internet accessibility issue, this subdivision was surveyed at both the individual and collective levels.

Intensive-Level Survey Needed

INDIVIDUAL RESOURCES

Due to the windshield-level focus established in the scope of work for this project, HHM did not perform in-depth property-specific research on individual resources. As a result, the historic significance of a property was not always easily identifiable. In cases where surveyors felt that a property may have significance but was not easily identifiable in the field, HHM recommended Intensive-Level Survey. Factors suggesting significance include the age of the resource, architectural style, property type and function, and/or location. Examples of resources recommended for future intensive-level survey include:

- Churches without architectural significance,
- Cemeteries lacking significance for design,
- Agricultural properties and resources suggesting association with trends in the historic context,
- Large properties with multiple buildings of unknown function and history, and
- Properties where public input suggested historical significance – either via public meetings and questionnaires or conversations with surveyors in the field.

For each of the properties identified in the field as needing Intensive-Level Survey, HHM performed rudimentary research using historic maps, aerials, and newspapers to try and establish significance. In some instances, significance was determined, though intensive-level survey with a focus on research is recommended in order to establish whether a property is eligible or not.

The **47 parcels** recommended for future intensive-level survey are included in the Inventory in Appendix C and shown in Maps in Appendix B. Intensive-level survey of these parcels were included as a recommendation for future survey efforts in the historic preservation plan prepared under Tasks 10-12.

HISTORIC DISTRICTS

The field survey also identified six areas where intensive-level survey is recommended to assess historic district eligibility. Windshield-level survey findings of three subdivisions suggest the potential for one, or several, smaller historic districts within the larger subdivision. Issues including integrity of historic-age resources and non-historic-age infill render the entire subdivision not eligible, but the windshield survey noted smaller areas within that subdivision retained integrity. An intensive-level survey would identify potential historic districts by surveying all resources within the subdivisions individually and assigning contributing and noncontributing recommendations. The following subdivisions need intensive survey to assess the potential for smaller eligible historic districts within:

- Hillcrest 1 in Port Neches
- Rachford and Dearing in Groves
- Pecan Groves to Port Arthur in Groves

The windshield survey also noted the potential for a larger historic district made up of several smaller subdivisions with shared property types, architectural styles, and years of development in Groves. Intensive-level survey would identify potential historic districts by surveying all resources within the subdivisions individually and assigning contributing and noncontributing recommendations. The following subdivisions need intensive survey to assess the potential for a potential Groves Mid-Century Historic District:

- Griffing Court
- Griffing Estates 1
- Telstar
- Sylvan Courts

Intensive-level survey is also recommended for two areas identified through individual survey to assess for historic district eligibility. The resources in these areas share similar property types, architectural styles, and years of construction. In each area, survey observations suggest historic significance, though significance was not confirmed with the project's limited research scope. An intensive-level survey would provide the in-depth level of research needed to confirm significance for NRHP eligibility. The following areas need intensive survey to assess historic district eligibility:

- West side of 2000-2400 North Major Drive, Beaumont – potential significance based on landscape groves of trees
- 300 block Pine Street, Port Neches – potential significance based on age and type of housing and proximity to several industrial complexes

APPENDIX A: NATIONAL REGISTER CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

APPENDIX A: NATIONAL REGISTER CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

To be eligible for the NRHP, a historic property, either on an individual basis or collectively as a historic district, must possess significance under at least one of the National Register Criteria and retain sufficient integrity to convey that significance. The NR Criteria and Integrity Thresholds are discussed below.

EVALUATING SIGNIFICANCE

National Register Criteria

The National Register Criteria for Evaluation states that a resource must meet a 50-year age threshold and must derive significance from at least one of the following Criteria to be eligible for the NRHP:

- **Criterion A. Association with Important Historical Events or Trends:** The resource must be associated with events, trends, or patterns that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history.
- **Criterion B. Association with Important Individuals of the Past**: The resource must be associated with the lives of significant persons who made important contributions to the history of a community, city, state, or the nation.
- **Criterion C. Physical Attributes, Design Qualities, Work of a Master:** The resource must embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represents the work of a master, or possess high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
- **Criterion D. Research Potential:** The resource must have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

National Register Criteria Considerations

The National Register Criteria for Evaluation states that certain kinds of resources typically are not considered for inclusion in the NRHP. Examples include churches, synagogues, and other religious properties; resources that have been moved or relocated; birthplaces and graves of famous persons; cemeteries, buildings, and structures that have been reconstructed; resources used to commemorate an event, trend, or individual of the past; and properties that do not meet the recommended 50-year age threshold. However, these properties can be eligible for listing if they meet certain conditions defined in the National Register Criteria for Evaluation as "Criteria Considerations." Resources that meet any of the Criteria Considerations must *also* meet at least one of the National Register Criteria (A, B, C, or D). The following is a list of normally excluded properties that may, under certain circumstances, be eligible for the NRHP:

- Criteria Consideration A: Religious Properties
- Criteria Consideration B: Moved Properties
- Criteria Consideration C: Birthplaces or Graves
- Criteria Consideration D: Cemeteries
- Criteria Consideration E: Reconstructed Properties
- Criteria Consideration F: Commemorative Properties
- Criteria Consideration G: Properties that Have Achieved Significance Within the Past 50 Years

EVALUATING INTEGRITY

"Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance."[1]

Physical integrity is the baseline for eligibility. If a building has too many alterations, it is not recognizable as historic, and it cannot convey its historic character. Additionally, altered historic buildings can confuse public perceptions about how buildings actually looked and functioned in the past. Inappropriate alterations may hamper a building's ability to accurately document our history. At the same time, though, some alterations are necessary for buildings to remain in use and for historic districts to remain vibrant.

How do we decide when alterations are so severe that they compromise a building's potential eligibility for historic designation?

Nationwide best practices for evaluation of integrity generally follow the framework established by *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*.[2]

The National Register bulletin presents seven aspects that define integrity in various combinations. These aspects of integrity are defined below.

Seven Aspects of Integrity as defined by the National Register

The National Register Criteria recognize seven aspects that define integrity, in various combinations. These aspects of integrity are defined below in Table A1. Examples of common alterations that affect each aspect of integrity are also listed in the table.

All alterations are not considered equally: compatibly designed alterations do not impair integrity, and alterations may gain significance in their own right when they become 50 years old.

***Table A1**. The seven aspects of integrity: definitions and common examples of alterations.*

Aspect	Definition	Individual Resource Examples	Historic District Examples
Location	The place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historical event occurred.	Relocation	Relocation of majority of resources within
Design	The combination of elements that creates the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.	Additions visible from public view	Altered layout of streets or overall subdivision plat
		Changed roof form or pitch	
		Enclosed or changed size of openings	
Materials	The physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.	Replacement or concealment of exterior wall materials	More than 50 percent of resources within lack majority of exterior materials
		Changed roof material type and pattern	
		Replacement of windows or doors	
		Replacement of porch/canopy supports	
		Severe disrepair	
Workmanship	The physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people	Removal of distinctive handmade architectural detailing	Removal of distinctive landscape or streetscape features

***Table A1**. The seven aspects of integrity: definitions and common examples of alterations.*			
Aspect	**Definition**	**Individual Resource Examples**	**Historic District Examples**
	during any given period in history or prehistory.		
Setting	The physical environment of a historic property.	Reorientation of building within landscape/street grid	Reorientation of majority of buildings within setting/street grid
		Removal of historic / introduction of new landscape features	Removal of historic / introduction of new landscape features
		Construction of non-historic resources on site	Construction of incompatible, non-historic resources
			Demolition or replacement of majority of resources
Feeling	The property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.	Accumulation of small changes that alter overall feel	Accumulation of small changes that alter overall feel
Association	The direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.	Historic function is no longer discernible	Overall district's historic function is no longer discernible
		Appearance during significant person's residence no longer discernible	Overall appearance during significant residence(s)' is no longer discernible
		Appearance during significant event no longer discernible	Overall appearance during significant event no longer discernible

Integrity Thresholds

All properties change over time. It is not necessary for a property to retain all its historic physical features or characteristics. The property must retain, however, the essential physical features that enable it to convey its historic identity.[3]

A resource need not retain all seven of these aspects of integrity to be eligible for historic designation. Some criteria carry more weight than others. For example, retaining integrity of location is essential for eligibility. According to *National Register Bulletin 15*, resources that have been moved ordinarily "shall not be considered eligible for the National Register."[4] Similarly, integrity of design typically is considered an essential aspect of integrity since it captures fundamental features like overall form and massing, without which a resource's historic appearance becomes unrecognizable. The other aspects of integrity are interrelated and flexible, and sometimes one aspect of integrity can counterbalance the loss of another. The hierarchical yet interrelated structure of the aspects of integrity is illustrated in Figure A1.



Figure A1. *Chart describing the hierarchy and interrelationships among the seven aspects of integrity. Location and Design stand alone at the top – typically a property cannot be eligible without these aspects. Materials and Workmanship are interrelated in the middle. Setting, Feeling, and Association support one another at the base because they often are interrelated.*

The threshold for alterations to overwhelm integrity varies from building to building. The building's age, architectural style, and building form all affect the character-defining features that should remain intact to protect a building's integrity.

Additionally, the National Register applies different thresholds of integrity to resources on an individual basis versus a grouping of resources within a historic district. An individual resource must convey its story on its own. To do so, an individual resource must retain a high degree of integrity. On the other hand, a historic district contains a collection of resources that each tell a small part of the overall story.

The overall site plan and landscape patterns within the district must retain a high degree of integrity, and the majority of the resources within the district must retain at least a medium degree of integrity. Table A2 below lists common alterations often considered to meet the minimum integrity threshold for individual eligibility, contrasted with alterations typically considered within the permissible integrity threshold for a contributing building in a historic district.

Keep in mind that a resource's integrity is not fixed. Integrity can be recovered by reversing inappropriate alterations or waiting until alterations are 50 years old.[5]

Table A2. *Integrity thresholds: common alterations for individual buildings versus contributing buildings in historic districts.*

Common alteration	Retains integrity at individual threshold?	Retains integrity at contributing threshold?
Alterations aged 50 years or older	✓	✓
Relocation to a different setting	×	×
Relocation to a setting similar to original	✓	✓
Interior alteration	✓	✓
Structural or systems alterations not visible from public view	✓	✓
Compatible addition not visible from public view	✓	✓
Compatible additions visible from public view but set back 15-feet or behind ridgeline	✓	✓
Incompatible addition visible from public view	×	×
Changed roof form or pitch	×	×
Enclosed or changed size of any openings on front façade(s)	×	✓
Ordinary maintenance like painting	✓	✓
Replacement of exterior wall materials matching profile, dimension, and finish of original (including use of synthetic replacement materials)	✓	✓
Replacement of exterior wall materials not matching original but reversible	×	✓
Concealment of original exterior wall materials with permanent masonry veneer	×	×
Replacement of windows or doors matching profile, dimension, and finish of original (including use of synthetic replacement materials)	✓	✓
Incompatible replacement of windows or doors	×	✓
Replacement of porch/canopy supports matching materials, profile, dimension, and finish of original	✓	✓
Incompatible replacement of porch/canopy supports	×	✓
Replacement in kind of architectural detailing matching original materials, profile, dimensions, and finish	✓	✓
Removal or incompatible replacement of architectural detailing	×	✓
Severe disrepair	✓	✓
Removal of historic / introduction of new landscape features	✓	✓
Construction of large-scale and incompatible non-historic resources on site	✓	✓
Accumulation of small changes that alter overall feel	×	×
Appearance during significant person's residence no longer discernible	×	✓
Appearance during significant event no longer discernible	×	✓

[1] National Park Service, "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation," *National Register Bulletin* 15 (Washington, D.C.: US Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1995), 44, from the National Park Service, https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB-15_web508.pdf.

[2] "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation," 44.

[3] "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation," 46.

[4] "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation," 2, 44. Note that exceptions are clarified under Criteria Consideration B.

[5] For guidance interpreting whether alterations are compatible, see the National Park Service's *Interpreting the Standards Bulletins* at https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/applying-rehabilitation/standards-bulletins.htm.

APPENDIX B: SURVEY MAPS

The resources identified in the field are presented in the following maps. Resources surveyed individually are identified by their CAD Parcel ID number. Resources surveyed collectively are identified by their Subdivision name. The map distinguishes resources by their Survey Scale, Survey Level, and NRHP eligibility recommendation. Note that resources prepopulated in the database appear as polygons and that resources identified in the field that were not flagged for survey, and therefore were not prepopulated in the database, appear as points in the maps. Individually eligible resources also appear as points.

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey Map Index





Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 1 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 395 790 1,580 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 2 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 395 790 1,580 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Black Creek
Otter Chase Rd
Saline Branch
Falcon Crst
Beaver Br
Timberwolf
Timberwolf
Timberwolf
Black Creek
Fox Chase
Beaver Br
136630
136589
136454
136433
136430
136435
100513

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 3 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 395 790 1,580 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 4 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 395 790 1,580 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 5 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 395 790 1,580 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 6 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 7 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 395 790 1,580 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 8 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 395 790 1,580 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 9 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 395 790 1,580 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 10 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 11 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 395 790 1,580 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 12 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 395 790 1,580 Feet

N

123600 Beaumont Country Club Historic District

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 13 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 395 790 1,580 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 14 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 395 790 1,580 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 15 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 395 790 1,580 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 16 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 395 790 1,580 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 17 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 395 790 1,580 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 18 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 395 790 1,580 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 19 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 395 790 1,580 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 20 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 395 790 1,580 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 21 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 22 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 23 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 24 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 25 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 435 870 1,740 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 26 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 27 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 28 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 29 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 30 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 31 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 32 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 33 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 34 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 35 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 36 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 37 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 38 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 39 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 40 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 41 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates


Jefferson County
Historic Resources Survey
Map: 42 of 187
Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI
LEGEND
Jefferson County Parcel
Excluded from the Survey Area
County Line
Existing Designations
Individually Listed in the NRHP
RTHL
OTHM
Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary
Survey Scale
Individually Surveyed
Collectively Surveyed
Recommendations
Individually Eigible for NRHP
Eligible Historic District
Contributing Resource
Noncontributing Resource
Boundary of Recommended NRHD
ROE Needed
Intensive-level Survey Needed
Not Eligible for NRHP
No Historic Resource Visible
MAP LOCATOR
Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS
HHM
& associates
Walden Rd
Jones
Felix St
Humble Rd
Casey Dr
Fig St
East Ln
S Major Dr
Wescalder Rd
Norris St
Holton St
Sandlin Rd
Willow Pl
Willoway Dr
Bonney Briar Pl
Willow Bend Dr
Quail Hollow Dr
Turnberry Cir
Torrey Pine Cir
Doral Dr
Seminole Dr
Willow Bend Dr
Merion
Myrtle Beach Dr
Inverness Dr
Pinehurst Dr
Willow Creek Dr
Innisbrook Dr
Ice Oaks Golf Club
Brentwood Country Club
111877
111872
111864
111865
111862
111887
137504
137507
244807
364
Esri, HERE, Garmin, INCREMENT P, NGA, USGS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 43 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 44 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Olin Rd
264057
Olin Rd
McKesson Dr
Hunter St
380
Jim Gilligan Way
TX-366 SPUR
TX-366 SPUR N
Ohio St
Kingsley Dr
Veatch St
US-287 N
287
69
US-96 S
US-287 S
E Cardinal Dr
Spindletop Rd
Spindletop Ave
Spindletop
380
Ohio St
Sulphur Plant Rd
TX-347 W
69
287
121682
121697
Amco Rd
239256
Beaumont
Sulphur Dr

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 45 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 46 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 47 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates


Jefferson County
Historic Resources Survey
Map: 48 of 187
Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI
LEGEND
Jefferson County Parcel
Excluded from the Survey Area
County Line
Existing Designations
Individually Listed in the NRHP
RTHL
OTHM
Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary
Survey Scale
Individually Surveyed
Collectively Surveyed
Recommendations
Individually Eigible for NRHP
Eligible Historic District
Contributing Resource
Noncontributing Resource
Boundary of Recommended NRHD
ROE Needed
Intensive-level Survey Needed
Not Eligible for NRHP
No Historic Resource Visible
MAP LOCATOR
Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
Pine Island Rd
Pine Island Rd
Pine Island Rd
Unterbrink
Eagle Ave
Elie Rd
Candelite Dr
139657
141455
141474
141487
Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
HHM
& associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 49 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 50 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 51 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 52 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 53 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 435 870 1,740 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 54 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 55 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 56 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 57 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 58 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 59 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 60 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 61 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 62 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 63 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 64 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 65 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 66 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 435 870 1,740 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 67 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 68 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 69 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 70 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

N

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 71 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 72 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 73 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 74 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 75 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 76 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 77 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 78 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates



Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 79 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 80 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates


Headquarters Rd
Private Road 1059
Private Road 1059
County Road 1010
County Road 1010
County Road 1010
Ebner Rd
Ebner Rd
Ebner Rd
143148
141609
Jefferson County
Historic Resources Survey
Map: 81 of 187
Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI
LEGEND
Jefferson County Parcel
Excluded from the Survey Area
County Line
Existing Designations
Individually Listed in the NRHP
RTHL
OTHM
Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary
Survey Scale
Individually Surveyed
Collectively Surveyed
Recommendations
Individually Eligible for NRHP
Eligible Historic District
Contributing Resource
Noncontributing Resource
Boundary of Recommended NRHD
ROE Needed
Intensive-level Survey Needed
Not Eligible for NRHP
No Historic Resource Visible
N
0
400
800
1,600 Feet
MAP LOCATOR
Beaumont
Port Arthur
Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
HHM
& associates



Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 82 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 83 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 84 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 85 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 86 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 87 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 88 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 89 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 90 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 91 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 92 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 93 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 94 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 95 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 96 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 97 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 98 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 99 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 100 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 101 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 102 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates





Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 103 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 104 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 105 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 106 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 107 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

HHM & associates



Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 108 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 109 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 110 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 111 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Highway 124

124

Wilber Rd

139276

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 112 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community


Jefferson County
Historic Resources Survey
Map: 113 of 187
Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI
LEGEND
Jefferson County Parcel
Excluded from the Survey Area
County Line
Existing Designations
Individually Listed in the NRHP
RTHL
OTHM
Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary
Survey Scale
Individually Surveyed
Collectively Surveyed
Recommendations
Individually Eigible for NRHP
Eligible Historic District
Contributing Resource
Noncontributing Resource
Boundary of Recommended NRHD
ROE Needed
Intensive-level Survey Needed
Not Eligible for NRHP
No Historic Resource Visible
MAP LOCATOR
Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
HHM & associates
126256
129102
129063
129090
129078
129067
134959
134757
135144
134962
135290
128584
263256
185023
185171
238872
Griffith Rd
Burrell-Garner Rd
Burrell Wingate Rd
Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 114 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 115 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 116 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 117 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 118 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 119 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 120 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 121 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 122 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 123 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 124 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 125 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 126 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 127 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 128 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 129 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 130 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 131 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 132 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 133 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 134 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 135 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 136 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 137 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 138 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



Big Hill Reservoir

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates


Reservoir
74506
Big Hill
Reservoir
264159
Big Hill
Reservoir
Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
Jefferson County
Historic Resources Survey
Map: 139 of 187
Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI
LEGEND
Jefferson County Parcel
Excluded from the Survey Area
County Line
Existing Designations
Individually Listed in the NRHP
RTHL
OTHM
Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary
Survey Scale
Individually Surveyed
Collectively Surveyed
Recommendations
Individually Eligible for NRHP
Eligible Historic District
Contributing Resource
Noncontributing Resource
Boundary of Recommended NRHD
ROE Needed
Intensive-level Survey Needed
Not Eligible for NRHP
No Historic Resource Visible
0
400
800
1,600 Feet
N
MAP LOCATOR
Beaumont
Port Arthur
Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
HHM
& associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 140 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 141 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 142 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 143 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 144 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 145 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates


386702
Jefferson County
Historic Resources Survey
Map: 146 of 187
Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI
LEGEND
Jefferson County Parcel
Excluded from the Survey Area
County Line
Existing Designations
Individually Listed in the NRHP
RTHL
OTHM
Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary
Survey Scale
Individually Surveyed
Collectively Surveyed
Recommendations
Individually Eligible for NRHP
Eligible Historic District
Contributing Resource
Noncontributing Resource
Boundary of Recommended NRHD
ROE Needed
Intensive-level Survey Needed
Not Eligible for NRHP
No Historic Resource Visible
0
400
800
1,600 Feet
N
MAP LOCATOR
Beaumont
Port Arthur
Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
HHM
& associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 147 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

N

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 148 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 149 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 150 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 151 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 152 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 153 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates


386702
142157
Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey
Map: 154 of 187
Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI
LEGEND
Jefferson County Parcel
Excluded from the Survey Area
County Line
Existing Designations
Individually Listed in the NRHP
RTHL
OTHM
Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary
Survey Scale
Individually Surveyed
Collectively Surveyed
Recommendations
Individually Eligible for NRHP
Eligible Historic District
Contributing Resource
Noncontributing Resource
Boundary of Recommended NRHD
ROE Needed
Intensive-level Survey Needed
Not Eligible for NRHP
No Historic Resource Visible
0
400
800
1,600 Feet
N
MAP LOCATOR
Beaumont
Port Arthur
Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
HHM
& associates

Big Hill Rd
Todd Rd
Todd Rd
Todd Rd
Englin Rd
Englin Rd
Chambers
E Fig Ridge Rd
N Fig Ridge Loop
7954
139939
139951, 139950

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 155 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Beaumont
Port Arthur

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 156 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 157 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 158 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 159 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 160 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 161 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 162 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 163 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 164 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 165 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

141055

141051

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 166 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 167 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 168 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 169 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates


142645
Clam Lake Rd
Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
Jefferson County
Historic Resources Survey
Map: 170 of 187
Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI
LEGEND
Jefferson County Parcel
Excluded from the Survey Area
County Line
Existing Designations
Individually Listed in the NRHP
RTHL
OTHM
Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary
Survey Scale
Individually Surveyed
Collectively Surveyed
Recommendations
Individually Eligible for NRHP
Eligible Historic District
Contributing Resource
Noncontributing Resource
Boundary of Recommended NRHD
ROE Needed
Intensive-level Survey Needed
Not Eligible for NRHP
No Historic Resource Visible
N
0
400
800
1,600 Feet
MAP LOCATOR
Beaumont
Port Arthur
Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
HHM
& associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 171 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

N

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates

412804

Backridge Rd

Port Arthur

Port Arthur

Gulfway Dr S

87

Gulfway Dr

Gulfway Dr S

87

Gulfway Dr S

Gulfway Dr S

The Parkards

The Parkards

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 172 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
- Contributing Resource
- Noncontributing Resource
- Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Beaumont

Port Arthur

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates


Little Reservoir
Little Reservoir
Spindeltop Reservoir
Spindeltop Reservoir
141109
Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey
Map: 173 of 187
Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI
LEGEND
Jefferson County Parcel
Excluded from the Survey Area
County Line
Existing Designations
Individually Listed in the NRHP
RTHL
OTHM
Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary
Survey Scale
Individually Surveyed
Collectively Surveyed
Recommendations
Individually Eligible for NRHP
Eligible Historic District
Contributing Resource
Noncontributing Resource
Boundary of Recommended NRHD
ROE Needed
Intensive-level Survey Needed
Not Eligible for NRHP
No Historic Resource Visible
0
400
800
1,600 Feet
N
MAP LOCATOR
Beaumont
Port Arthur
123
Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
HHM
& associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 174 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 175 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 176 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 177 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 178 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

HHM & associates


140366
140368
87
87
87
Sea Rim SP
Sea Rim State Park
Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey
Map: 179 of 187
Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI
LEGEND
Jefferson County Parcel
Excluded from the Survey Area
County Line
Existing Designations
Individually Listed in the NRHP
RTHL
OTHM
Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary
Survey Scale
Individually Surveyed
Collectively Surveyed
Recommendations
Individually Eligible for NRHP
Eligible Historic District
Contributing Resource
Noncontributing Resource
Boundary of Recommended NRHD
ROE Needed
Intensive-level Survey Needed
Not Eligible for NRHP
No Historic Resource Visible
0
400
800
1,600 Feet
N
MAP LOCATOR
Beaumont
Port Arthur
Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
HHM
& associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 180 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 181 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

McFaddin National Wildlife Refuge

140583

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 182 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates

139778

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 183 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N

MAP LOCATOR

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

HHM & associates


140583
Jefferson County
Historic Resources Survey
Map: 184 of 187
Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI
LEGEND
Jefferson County Parcel
Excluded from the Survey Area
County Line
Existing Designations
Individually Listed in the NRHP
RTHL
OTHM
Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary
Survey Scale
Individually Surveyed
Collectively Surveyed
Recommendations
Individually Eligible for NRHP
Eligible Historic District
Contributing Resource
Noncontributing Resource
Boundary of Recommended NRHD
ROE Needed
Intensive-level Survey Needed
Not Eligible for NRHP
No Historic Resource Visible
0
400
800
1,600 Feet
N
MAP LOCATOR
Beaumont
Port Arthur
Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
HHM
& associates

139778

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 185 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

N

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

MAP LOCATOR



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 186 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

0 400 800 1,600 Feet

N



HHM & associates



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey

Map: 187 of 187

Data sources - Parcel data: JCAD, Existing designations: TxDOT and THC, Survey results/recommendations: HHM, Base map: ESRI

LEGEND

- Jefferson County Parcel
- Excluded from the Survey Area
- County Line

Existing Designations

- Individually Listed in the NRHP
- RTHL
- OTHM
- Existing NRHP Historic District Boundary

Survey Scale

- Individually Surveyed
- Collectively Surveyed

Recommendations

- Individually Eligible for NRHP
- Eligible Historic District
  - Contributing Resource
  - Noncontributing Resource
  - Boundary of Recommended NRHD
- ROE Needed
- Intensive-level Survey Needed
- Not Eligible for NRHP
- No Historic Resource Visible

N

0 400 800 1,600 Feet



HHM & associates


N Twin City Hwy
347
Helena Ave
1110
899
799
N 11th S
Gary Av
1100
Gary Ave
N 12th St
Franklin Ave
699
1200
22820
22819
22825
22827
22818
22827
22828
22815
22829
22830
22831
LEGEND
Contributing Resource
Noncontributing Resource
Boundary of Recommended NRHD
0
40
80
160 Feet
N
Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community


N 12th St
N 13th St
N 14th St
15th St
Chicago Ave
Detroit Ave
Boston Ave
Atlanta Ave
14th St
N 15th St
Nederland Ave
67181
67182
67247
67246
67185
67186
67245
67244
67243
249588
67240
67241
67239
67238
67198
67196
67195
67194
67231
67229
67230
67228
67227
67226
67206
67205
67214
67213
75390
75379
LEGEND
Contributing Resource
Noncontributing Resource
Boundary of Recommended NRHD
0
80
160
320 Feet
N
Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

APPENDIX C: WINDSHIELD-LEVEL SURVEY INVENTORY

Appendix C presents the inventory of all resources surveyed at the windshield and reconnaissance level. The inventory is sorted by: City, Street name, Street number, Subdivision.

Note that Jefferson Central Appraisal District Property Identification Numbers (CAD PIDN) are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	826 A&M ST	114 JOHN DOUTHIT	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121830	BEAUMONT	136778	Appraisal district				
	800 BLOCK A&M ST	114 JOHN DOUTHIT	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121829	BEAUMONT	136800	Appraisal district				
	1266 AGGIE DR	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125491	BEAUMONT	129780	In field estimate				
	1340 AGGIE DR	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125490	BEAUMONT	129761	In field estimate				
	1380 AGGIE DR	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125489	BEAUMONT	129852	In field estimate				
	1416 AGGIE DR	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125488	BEAUMONT	129779	Appraisal district				
	1509 AGGIE DR	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1930 - 1980		Eligible as a district (Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Extension Center)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 125487	BEAUMONT	129828	Aerial images				
	5627 ALFORD DR	111 JOS. DYCHES	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124366	BEAUMONT	136424	Appraisal district				
	5335 ALFORD OAKS DR	111 JOS. DYCHES	1850			ROE needed, Intensive survey needed	Limited visibility from ROW
HHM ID: 124158	BEAUMONT	136445	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	5597 ALFORD OAKS DR	111 JOS. DYCHES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124367	BEAUMONT	136423	Appraisal district				
	5681 ALFORD OAKS DR	111 JOS. DYCHES	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124364	BEAUMONT	136426	In field estimate				
	5709 ALFORD OAKS DR	111 JOS. DYCHES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No photo due to vegetation
HHM ID: 124356	BEAUMONT	136427	Appraisal district				
	5911 ALFORD OAKS DR	111 JOS. DYCHES	1972		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124326	BEAUMONT	136430	Appraisal district				
	6086 ALFORD OAKS DR	111 JOS. DYCHES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124325	BEAUMONT	136433	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	6187 ALFORD OAKS DR	111 JOS. DYCHES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124323	BEAUMONT	136454	In field estimate				
	5229-5436 ALFORD OAKS DR	111 JOS. DYCHES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124155	BEAUMONT	136436, etc.	Appraisal district				
	AMCO RD EXTN	B-22 55 J. A. VEATCH				ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 128630	BEAUMONT	121513					
	9280 BAKER RD	WESCALDER FIG ACRES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125330	BEAUMONT	111695	Appraisal district				
	272 BERTRAND RD	44 A. RAINS	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125640	BEAUMONT	132749	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	357 BERTRAND RD	44 A. RAINS	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125639	BEAUMONT	132741	In field estimate				
	136 BOUTWELL RD	44 A. RAINS	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125542	BEAUMONT	132850	In field estimate				
	9876 BROOKS RD	576 T. F. SMITH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125441	BEAUMONT	141568	Appraisal district				
	9908 BROOKS RD	576 T. F. SMITH	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125437	BEAUMONT	141557	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9968 BROOKS RD	576 T. F. SMITH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125445	BEAUMONT	141558	Appraisal district				
	10247 BROOKS RD	147 H T & B	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126180	BEAUMONT	137678	Appraisal district				
	10261 BROOKS RD	147 H T & B	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126182	BEAUMONT	137673	Appraisal district				
	10307 BROOKS RD	147 H T & B	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126169	BEAUMONT	137690	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	10777 BROOKS RD	561 G. T. CAYLOR	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126196	BEAUMONT	141374	Appraisal district				
	8565 BROUSSARD RD	20 D. EASLEY	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124236	BEAUMONT	128837	Appraisal district				
	8575 BROUSSARD RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	Limited visibility due to vegetation
HHM ID: 124241	BEAUMONT	136556	Appraisal district				
	8579 BROUSSARD RD	20 D. EASLEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124239	BEAUMONT	128838	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	8608 BROUSSARD RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124272	BEAUMONT	136527	Appraisal district				
	8615 BROUSSARD RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124242	BEAUMONT	136536	In field estimate				
	8665 BROUSSARD RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	Address is 8675 on gate
HHM ID: 124286	BEAUMONT	136541	Appraisal district				
	8680 BROUSSARD RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1850-1962			ROE needed	Limited visibility from ROW
HHM ID: 124271	BEAUMONT	136530	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	8685 BROUSSARD RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124269	BEAUMONT	136542	Appraisal district				
	8500 BLOCK BROUSSARD RD	20 D. EASLEY	1977		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124240	BEAUMONT	403289	Appraisal district				
	1400 BLOCK BUFORD ST	NECHES RIVER PARK	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	Limited visibility from ROW
HHM ID: 131211	BEAUMONT	66954, 124834	In field estimate				
	5006 CALLAIS RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124176	BEAUMONT	136476	Appraisal district				
	11309 CARPENTER RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1930-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124295	BEAUMONT	136515	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	11310 CARPENTER RD BLDG A	111 JOS. DYCHES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124296	BEAUMONT	136512	Appraisal district				
	11310 CARPENTER RD BLDG B		1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124305	BEAUMONT	136513	In field estimate				
	11311 CARPENTER RD A	111 JOS. DYCHES	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 124297	BEAUMONT	136533	Appraisal district				
	11311 CARPENTER RD B	111 JOS. DYCHES	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 124298	BEAUMONT	136534	Appraisal district				
	11311 CARPENTER RD C	111 JOS. DYCHES	1968			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 124299	BEAUMONT	136531	Appraisal district				
	11313 CARPENTER RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124313	BEAUMONT	136523	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	11315 CARPENTER RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1910-1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124317	BEAUMONT	136522	In field estimate				
	COLLIER RANCH RD	11 D. CHOATE	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	Associated with 2875 Reins Rd
HHM ID: 124590	BEAUMONT	361130	In field estimate				
	4375 DENLEY RD	147 H T & B	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126176	BEAUMONT	137670	In field estimate				
	4445 EASTLAKE AVE	WELLSPRING THE	1957		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129245	BEAUMONT	111261	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	6155 ERIE ST	B-20 55 J. A. VEATCH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121785	BEAUMONT	120360	Appraisal district				
	7868 FM 365	ORANGE FARMS	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128139	BEAUMONT	72417	Appraisal district				
	7922 FM 365	ORANGE FARMS	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128141	BEAUMONT	72408	In field estimate				
	8197 FM 365	3 B. BLACKMAN	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128144	BEAUMONT	124537	Appraisal district				
	8357 FM 365	3 B. BLACKMAN	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 128145	BEAUMONT	124532	Appraisal district				
	8489 FM 365	3 B. BLACKMAN	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128166	BEAUMONT	124605	Appraisal district				
	8493 FM 365	3 B. BLACKMAN	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128164	BEAUMONT	124548	Appraisal district				
	8535 FM 365	3 B. BLACKMAN	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128165	BEAUMONT	124523	Appraisal district				
	8951 FM 365	3 B. BLACKMAN	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128169	BEAUMONT	124551	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	8993 FM 365	3 B. BLACKMAN	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128173	BEAUMONT	124525	Appraisal district				
	9211 FM 365	3 B. BLACKMAN	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128211	BEAUMONT	124478	In field estimate				
	9451 FM 365	3 B. BLACKMAN	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128239	BEAUMONT	124583	In field estimate				
	9608 FM 365	453 J. J. F. GILLILAND	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128333	BEAUMONT	140525	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9924 FM 365	453 J. J. F. GILLILAND	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128360	BEAUMONT	140540	Appraisal district				
	10134 FM 365	453 J. J. F. GILLILAND	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128344	BEAUMONT	140533	Appraisal district				
	7135 FRINT RD	14 S. CORZINE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122918	BEAUMONT	127256	Appraisal district				
	7345 FRINT DR	14 S. CORZINE	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122917	BEAUMONT	127273	Appraisal district				
	5709 FULLBRIGHT RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 124216	BEAUMONT	136403	Appraisal district				
	6093 FULLBRIGHT RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124223	BEAUMONT	136544	Appraisal district				
	140 GALLIER RD	859 C. B. DANIEL	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125517	BEAUMONT	143089	In field estimate				
	405 GALLIER RD	11 D. CHOATE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125514	BEAUMONT	127096	Appraisal district				
	12300 BLOCK GENTRY RD	44 A. RAINS	1969		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	Associated with 12337 Gentry Rd
HHM ID: 124698	BEAUMONT	132863	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2975 GULF STATES RD	5 D. BROWN	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131215	BEAUMONT	125328	Appraisal district				
	2125 HEBERT RD	48 WM. SIGLER	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121858	BEAUMONT	133143	Appraisal district				
	2202 HEBERT RD	15 D. CUNNINGHAM	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121862	BEAUMONT	127328	Appraisal district				
	2223 HEBERT RD	48 WM. SIGLER	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121863	BEAUMONT	133147	Appraisal district				
	2249 HEBERT RD	LAUGHLIN PLACE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 121864	BEAUMONT	344516	Appraisal district				
	2285 HEBERT RD	LAUGHLIN PLACE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121865	BEAUMONT	344515	Appraisal district				
	3140 HEBERT RD	104 ED CHENNETH	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121889	BEAUMONT	136289	In field estimate				
	HELBIG RD	50 THOS. SPEAR				ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 124002	BEAUMONT	133488					
	5860 HIGHLAND AVE		1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128625	BEAUMONT	120967	In field estimate				
	6001 HIGHLAND AVE	B-21 55 J. A. VEATCH	1972		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128628	BEAUMONT	120976	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	10285 HIGHWAY 105	44 A. RAINS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No photo due to vegetation
HHM ID: 124104	BEAUMONT	132676	Appraisal district				
	10295 HIGHWAY 105	44 A. RAINS	1940-1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124113	BEAUMONT	132752	In field estimate				
	10305 HIGHWAY 105	44 A. RAINS	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124114	BEAUMONT	132577	In field estimate				
	11465 HIGHWAY 105	44 A. RAINS	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124403	BEAUMONT	132674	In field estimate				
	9035-10185 HIGHWAY 105	42 S. MORRIS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124081	BEAUMONT	132343, etc.	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	6425 HIGHWAY 347	32 P. HUMPHRIES	1977		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128642	BEAUMONT	130542	Appraisal district				
	9845 HIGHWAY 90	WESCALDER FIG ACRES	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125282	BEAUMONT	111548	In field estimate				
	11633 HIGHWAY 90	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125387	BEAUMONT	129446	Appraisal district				
	11887 HIGHWAY 90	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125376	BEAUMONT	129329	Appraisal district				
	11985 HIGHWAY 90	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125377	BEAUMONT	129419	Appraisal district				
	12331 HIGHWAY 90	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125345	BEAUMONT	129378	Appraisal district				
	12493 HIGHWAY 90	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125201	BEAUMONT	129357	Appraisal district				
	12785 HIGHWAY 90	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1900		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 125175	BEAUMONT	129558	In field estimate				
	12841 HIGHWAY 90	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125158	BEAUMONT	129614	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13557 HIGHWAY 90	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125139	BEAUMONT	129404	In field estimate				
	13581 HIGHWAY 90	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125133	BEAUMONT	129432	Appraisal district				
	13635 HIGHWAY 90	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125128	BEAUMONT	129392	In field estimate				
	13851 HIGHWAY 90	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1965-2022	Hillcrest Memorial Gardens/Claybar Haven of Rest Cemetery		Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 124550	BEAUMONT	129863	Oldest grave per FindAGrave.com				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	14317 HIGHWAY 90	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125103	BEAUMONT	240617	Appraisal district				
	14768 HIGHWAY 90	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125096	BEAUMONT	129734	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	11523 HIGHWAY 90 W	GARDEN VILLAS	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125407	BEAUMONT	35584	Appraisal district				
	529 HILLEBRANDT RD	114 JOHN DOUTHIT	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121805	BEAUMONT	244771	Appraisal district				
	867 HILLEBRANDT RD	114 JOHN DOUTHIT	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121813	BEAUMONT	136785	Appraisal district				
	951 HILLEBRANDT RD	114 JOHN DOUTHIT	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121820	BEAUMONT	136770	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1025 HILLEBRANDT RD	114 JOHN DOUTHIT	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121821	BEAUMONT	136774	Appraisal district				
	1237 HILLEBRANDT RD	114 JOHN DOUTHIT	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121837	BEAUMONT	263312	In field estimate				
	1402 HILLEBRANDT RD	B-20 55 J. A. VEATCH	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 121840	BEAUMONT	120643	In field estimate				
	6401 HILLEBRANDT RD	26 M. GRANGE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128240	BEAUMONT	264229	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	827 HILLEBRANDT ACRES	HILLEBRANDT ACRES UNRECORDED	1945		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 128304	BEAUMONT	47193	In field estimate				
	10200 BLOCK HWY 105	44 A. RAINS	1935		Eligible as a district (Pumping station)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 124102	BEAUMONT	132627	In field estimate				
	10200 BLOCK HWY 105	44 A. RAINS	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124101	BEAUMONT	132587	In field estimate				
	455 KEITH RD	BEAUMONT MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	1937 (airport), 1978 (terminal)		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 125555	BEAUMONT	267001	https://beaumontte xas.gov/beaumont-municipal-airport/				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	11139 KEITH RD	42 S. MORRIS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124078	BEAUMONT	132328	Appraisal district				
	11303 KEITH RD	42 S. MORRIS	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124080	BEAUMONT	132348	In field estimate				
	11181 KEITH N RD	42 S. MORRIS	1960			Intensive survey needed	11223 per CAD
HHM ID: 124079	BEAUMONT	132346	Aerial images				
	217 KOLANDER RD	11 D. CHOATE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124982	BEAUMONT	126951	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	235 KOLANDER RD	11 D. CHOATE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124983	BEAUMONT	126884	Appraisal district				
	251 KOLANDER RD	11 D. CHOATE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124984	BEAUMONT	127124	Appraisal district				
	323 KOLANDER RD	11 D. CHOATE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124985	BEAUMONT	126942	Appraisal district				
	376 KOLANDER RD BLDG A	11 D. CHOATE	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124986	BEAUMONT	127155	In field estimate				
	469 KOLANDER RD	11 D. CHOATE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125050	BEAUMONT	126881	Appraisal district				
	517 KOLANDER RD	11 D. CHOATE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125043	BEAUMONT	126966	Appraisal district				
	545 KOLANDER RD	11 D. CHOATE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125039	BEAUMONT	126882	Appraisal district				
	595 KOLANDER RD	11 D. CHOATE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125036	BEAUMONT	126820	Appraisal district				
	704 KOLANDER RD	11 D. CHOATE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125033	BEAUMONT	126851	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	804 KOLANDER RD	11 D. CHOATE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125030	BEAUMONT	126835	Appraisal district				
	934 KOLANDER RD	11 D. CHOATE	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125027	BEAUMONT	126842	Appraisal district				
	1130 KOLANDER RD	11 D. CHOATE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125023	BEAUMONT	127075	Appraisal district				
	1461 KOLANDER RD	60 T. D. YOAKUM	1972		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125015	BEAUMONT	134597	Appraisal district				
	5820 LABELLE RD	14 S. CORZINE	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 122919	BEAUMONT	127306	Appraisal district				
	5988 LABELLE RD	14 S. CORZINE	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122921	BEAUMONT	263104	In field estimate				
	5990 LABELLE RD	14 S. CORZINE	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122920	BEAUMONT	263103	In field estimate				
	6040 LABELLE RD	14 S. CORZINE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 122922	BEAUMONT	127270	Appraisal district				
	8505 LABELLE RD	14 S. CORZINE	1910		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 126070	BEAUMONT	127289	In field estimate				
	8537 LABELLE RD		1959	Bayou Din Golf Club		ROE needed	No building visible from ROW

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126081	BEAUMONT	126081	https://bayoudin.com/golf-course/				
	6100 BLOCK LABELLE RD			Tex Ritter		ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 126080	BEAUMONT	127251					
	8294 LATTA RD	28 C. HILLEBRANDT	1950			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 126442	BEAUMONT	130304	Appears on 1960 aerial				
	8434 LATTA RD	28 C. HILLEBRANDT	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126446	BEAUMONT	130262	Appraisal district				
	763 LITTLE ACRES RD	OAK PARK	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126435	BEAUMONT	70093	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	528 LOMBARDO DR	26 M. GRANGE	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128266	BEAUMONT	129963	Appraisal district				
	6010 M L KING JR S PKY	B-22 55 J. A. VEATCH	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128638	BEAUMONT	121697	Appraisal district				
	2115 MAJOR DR	33 A. HOUSTON	1960			Intensive survey needed - within possible historic district (North Major Drive)	
HHM ID: 124030	BEAUMONT	130773	In field estimate				
	2205 MAJOR DR	33 A. HOUSTON	1968			Intensive survey needed - within possible historic district (North Major Drive)	
HHM ID: 124035	BEAUMONT	130774	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2035 MAJOR N DR	33 A. HOUSTON	1940			Intensive survey needed - within possible historic district (North Major Drive)	
HHM ID: 124026	BEAUMONT	130777	In field estimate				
	2225 MAJOR N DR	33 A. HOUSTON	1950			Intensive survey needed - within possible historic district (North Major Drive)	
HHM ID: 124040	BEAUMONT	130775	In field estimate				
	2350 MAJOR N DR		1970			Intensive survey needed - within possible historic district (North Major Drive)	
HHM ID: 124053	BEAUMONT	134218	In field estimate				
	3655 MAJOR N DR	33 A. HOUSTON	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124041	BEAUMONT	398574	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	442 MEEKER RD	N/A	1930		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 125750	BEAUMONT	132920	Aerial images				
	624 MEEKER RD	859 C. B. DANIEL	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125784	BEAUMONT	143059	In field estimate				
	654 MEEKER RD	859 C. B. DANIEL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125785	BEAUMONT	143052	Appraisal district				
	658 MEEKER RD		1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125789	BEAUMONT	143081	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	668 MEEKER RD	859 C. B. DANIEL	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125786	BEAUMONT	143079	In field estimate				
	758 MEEKER RD	859 C. B. DANIEL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125795	BEAUMONT	143042	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	792 MEEKER RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125915	BEAUMONT	129389	Appraisal district				
	1044 MEEKER RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125908	BEAUMONT	129382	In field estimate				
	2033 MEEKER RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125070	BEAUMONT	129475	Appraisal district				
	2051 MEEKER RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125073	BEAUMONT	129405	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2065 MEEKER RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125078	BEAUMONT	129448	In field estimate				
	2078 MEEKER RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No photo due to dogs
HHM ID: 125289	BEAUMONT	129441	In field estimate				
	2115 MEEKER RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 125286	BEAUMONT	129437	In field estimate				
	2116 MEEKER RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 125287	BEAUMONT	129451	In field estimate				
	2136 MEEKER RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125288	BEAUMONT	129433	In field estimate				
	2195 MEEKER RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	No photo due to dogs
HHM ID: 125436	BEAUMONT	129445	In field estimate				
	2270 MEEKER RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 125118	BEAUMONT	129553	In field estimate				
	279 MEEKER N RD	44 A. RAINS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125643	BEAUMONT	132865	Appraisal district				
	324 MEEKER N RD	44 A. RAINS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125645	BEAUMONT	132690	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	354 MEEKER N RD	44 A. RAINS	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125688	BEAUMONT	132689	In field estimate				
	370 MEEKER N RD	44 A. RAINS	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125690	BEAUMONT	132688	In field estimate				
	386 MEEKER N RD	44 A. RAINS	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125696	BEAUMONT	132687	In field estimate				
	478 MEEKER N RD	44 A. RAINS	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125697	BEAUMONT	132684	In field estimate				
	498 MEEKER N RD	44 A. RAINS	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125699	BEAUMONT	132683	In field estimate				
	514 MEEKER N RD	859 C. B. DANIEL	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125720	BEAUMONT	143061	In field estimate				
	526 MEEKER N RD	859 C. B. DANIEL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125723	BEAUMONT	143056	Appraisal district				
	536 MEEKER N RD	859 C. B. DANIEL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125725	BEAUMONT	143035	Appraisal district				
	541 MEEKER N RD	44 A. RAINS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125727	BEAUMONT	132706	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	556 MEEKER N RD	859 C. B. DANIEL	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125731	BEAUMONT	143050	In field estimate				
	620 MEEKER N RD	859 C. B. DANIEL	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125772	BEAUMONT	143082	In field estimate				
	713 MEEKER N RD	44 A. RAINS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125787	BEAUMONT	132699	Appraisal district				
	718 MEEKER N RD	859 C. B. DANIEL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125788	BEAUMONT	143085	Appraisal district				
	785 MEEKER N RD	44 A. RAINS	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125918	BEAUMONT	132694	In field estimate				
	830 MEEKER N RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125912	BEAUMONT	129403	In field estimate				
	942 MEEKER N RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 125911	BEAUMONT	129355	Appraisal district				
	1336 MEEKER N RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125905	BEAUMONT	129457	Appraisal district				
	1630 MEEKER N RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125900	BEAUMONT	129479	In field estimate				
	149 MICHAEL LN	44 A. RAINS	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125544	BEAUMONT	132822	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	159 MICHAEL LN	44 A. RAINS	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125545	BEAUMONT	132815	In field estimate				
	277 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124930	BEAUMONT	126889	In field estimate				
	389 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124924	BEAUMONT	126959	Appraisal district				
	407 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124896	BEAUMONT	126796	Appraisal district				
	553 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 124894	BEAUMONT	126943	Appraisal district				
	635 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124892	BEAUMONT	126967	In field estimate				
	832 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	Address is 836 on gate
HHM ID: 124891	BEAUMONT	126782	Appraisal district				
	1025 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124856	BEAUMONT	126921	Appraisal district				
	1129 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124854	BEAUMONT	127051	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1739 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1976		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124849	BEAUMONT	127036	Appraisal district				
	1779 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124846	BEAUMONT	329533	Appraisal district				
	2058 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124823	BEAUMONT	126972	Appraisal district				
	2535 MOORE RD BLDG A	11 D. CHOATE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124807	BEAUMONT	126997	Appraisal district				
	2535 MOORE RD BLDG B	11 D. CHOATE	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 124808	BEAUMONT	126996	In field estimate				
	2589 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124806	BEAUMONT	126992	Appraisal district				
	2636 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124801	BEAUMONT	126957	Appraisal district				
	2639 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124804	BEAUMONT	126998	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2716 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1964		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124783	BEAUMONT	126954	Appraisal district				
	2807 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124735	BEAUMONT	127028	Appraisal district				
	2859 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124734	BEAUMONT	127030	Appraisal district				
	2890 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124733	BEAUMONT	126775	Appraisal district				
	2991 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 124730	BEAUMONT	126973	Appraisal district				
	3030 MOORE RD		1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124728	BEAUMONT	126977	In field estimate				
	431-437 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1930-1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124895	BEAUMONT	126934	In field estimate				
	585-593 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1920-1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124893	BEAUMONT	126891	In field estimate				
	873-877 MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124857	BEAUMONT	328139	In field estimate				
	MOORE RD	11 D. CHOATE				ROE needed	No building visible from ROW

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 124850	BEAUMONT	126770					
	4400 - 4800 BLOCK NOBLES AND GEHEB RD	147 H T & B				ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 125419	BEAUMONT	137712, 137657, 137722, 137687, 240602					
	12326 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	44 A. RAINS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125560	BEAUMONT	132748	Appraisal district				
	12346 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	44 A. RAINS	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 125603	BEAUMONT	132670	In field estimate				
	12384 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	44 A. RAINS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125606	BEAUMONT	132679	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	12442 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	44 A. RAINS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125610	BEAUMONT	132703	Appraisal district				
	12470 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	44 A. RAINS	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125611	BEAUMONT	132704	Appraisal district				
	12510 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	44 A. RAINS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125613	BEAUMONT	132709	Appraisal district				
	12588 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	44 A. RAINS	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125630	BEAUMONT	132646	In field estimate				
	12664 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	44 A. RAINS	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125637	BEAUMONT	132648	In field estimate				
	12902 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	44 A. RAINS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125538	BEAUMONT	132827	Appraisal district				
	13024 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	859 C. B. DANIEL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125535	BEAUMONT	143039	Appraisal district				
	13230 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	859 C. B. DANIEL	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125529	BEAUMONT	143083	Appraisal district				
	13300 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	859 C. B. DANIEL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125521	BEAUMONT	143073	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13342 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	859 C. B. DANIEL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125520	BEAUMONT	143072	Appraisal district				
	13664 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125513	BEAUMONT	129803	Appraisal district				
	13754 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125511	BEAUMONT	129840	Appraisal district				
	13790 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125510	BEAUMONT	129802	Appraisal district				
	13868 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125509	BEAUMONT	129823	In field estimate				
	15114 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125054	BEAUMONT	126817	Appraisal district				
	15150 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	11 D. CHOATE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125055	BEAUMONT	126821	Appraisal district				
	15452 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	60 T. D. YOAKUM	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125082	BEAUMONT	134578	Appraisal district				
	15528 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	60 T. D. YOAKUM	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125085	BEAUMONT	134548	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	15546 OLD SOUR LAKE RD BLDG A	60 T. D. YOAKUM	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125091	BEAUMONT	134563	Appraisal district				
	15565 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125094	BEAUMONT	129745	Appraisal district				
	15639 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125095	BEAUMONT	129719	Appraisal district				
	15986 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	60 T. D. YOAKUM	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125117	BEAUMONT	134598	Appraisal district				
	16214 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	60 T. D. YOAKUM	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125126	BEAUMONT	134590	Appraisal district				
	16325 OLD SOUR LAKE RD BLDG A	60 T. D. YOAKUM	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125129	BEAUMONT	134584	Appraisal district				
	16435 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	60 T. D. YOAKUM	1965		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 125131	BEAUMONT	134587	In field estimate				
	16750 OLD SOUR LAKE RD A	107 S. COTTON	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125146	BEAUMONT	136325	In field estimate				
	16944 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	744 N. F. CHAMBERS	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125189	BEAUMONT	142413	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	17070 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	744 N. F. CHAMBERS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125180	BEAUMONT	142390	Appraisal district				
	17442 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	744 N. F. CHAMBERS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125164	BEAUMONT	142414	Appraisal district				
	17468 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	744 N. F. CHAMBERS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125161	BEAUMONT	142384	Appraisal district				
	17554 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	744 N. F. CHAMBERS	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125160	BEAUMONT	142383	Appraisal district				
	17580 OLD SOUR LAKE RD A	744 N. F. CHAMBERS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125193	BEAUMONT	142387	Appraisal district				
	17580 OLD SOUR LAKE RD B	744 N. F. CHAMBERS	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125192	BEAUMONT	142381	In field estimate				
	17756 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	744 N. F. CHAMBERS	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125194	BEAUMONT	249979	Appraisal district				
	17828 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	744 N. F. CHAMBERS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125195	BEAUMONT	142397	Appraisal district				
	17962 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	550 MRS. P. J. CHILES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125196	BEAUMONT	141175	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	18198 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	550 MRS. P. J. CHILES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125205	BEAUMONT	141180	Appraisal district				
	18591 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	550 MRS. P. J. CHILES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125206	BEAUMONT	141183	Appraisal district				
	16000 BLOCK OLD SOUR LAKE RD	60 T. D. YOAKUM	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	Associated with 16044 Old Sour Lake Rd
HHM ID: 125122	BEAUMONT	134557	In field estimate				
	OLIN RD	EXXON MOBIL				ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 128641	BEAUMONT	264057					
	4875 PARKER DR	13 WM. CARROLL	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129140	BEAUMONT	400804	Appraisal district				
	162 PATNA DR	MEEKER WEST	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124964	BEAUMONT	63532	Appraisal district				
	451 PATNA DR	MEEKER WEST	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124951	BEAUMONT	63585	Appraisal district				
	563 PATNA DR	MEEKER WEST	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124952	BEAUMONT	63567	In field estimate				
	622 PATNA DR	MEEKER WEST	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124958	BEAUMONT	63554	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	10385 PHELAN BLVD	46 S. SAVERY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125557	BEAUMONT	133002	Appraisal district				
	10395 PHELAN BLVD	46 S. SAVERY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125558	BEAUMONT	133005	Appraisal district				
	850 PINE ST	131 W. H. HODGES	1940 - 1980			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 131212	BEAUMONT	137437	In field estimate				
	5355 PINE ST	D-28 57 H. WILLIAMS	1906 (course), 1965 (club house)	Alex Findlay designed original course; redesigned 2004 by Baxter Spann https://www.golfcourseranking.com/courses/texas/beaumont/usa/beaumont-country-club/13648/	Eligible as a district (Beaumont Country Club)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 124000	BEAUMONT	123600	Research				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	5390 PINE ST	D-28 57 H. WILLIAMS	1750-1980		Eligible as a district (Collier's Ferry Park)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 124001	BEAUMONT	123606	In field estimate				
	2190 PINE ISLAND S RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125153	BEAUMONT	129560	Appraisal district				
	2248 PINE ISLAND S RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125152	BEAUMONT	129388	Appraisal district				
	2414 PINE ISLAND S RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125136	BEAUMONT	129657	In field estimate				
	2514 PINE ISLAND S RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125294	BEAUMONT	129594	Appraisal district				
	3011 PINE ISLAND S RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125297	BEAUMONT	129557	Appraisal district				
	3079 PINE ISLAND S RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125333	BEAUMONT	129582	Appraisal district				
	1510 REINS RD	44 A. RAINS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124726	BEAUMONT	132734	Appraisal district				
	1806 REINS RD	44 A. RAINS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124697	BEAUMONT	132751	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1845 REINS RD		1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124706	BEAUMONT	126745	In field estimate				
	1973 REINS RD	11 D. CHOATE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124696	BEAUMONT	126963	Appraisal district				
	1998 REINS RD	44 A. RAINS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124693	BEAUMONT	132726	Appraisal district				
	2015 REINS RD	11 D. CHOATE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124667	BEAUMONT	126965	Appraisal district				
	2029 REINS RD	RIVER RANCH SEC 1	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 124664	BEAUMONT	408185	In field estimate				
	2050 REINS RD	44 A. RAINS	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124663	BEAUMONT	132844	Appraisal district				
	2068 REINS RD	44 A. RAINS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124662	BEAUMONT	132750	Appraisal district				
	2216 REINS RD	44 A. RAINS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124660	BEAUMONT	132767	Appraisal district				
	2316 REINS RD	44 A. RAINS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124635	BEAUMONT	132700	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2502 REINS RD		1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124634	BEAUMONT	132764	In field estimate				
	2572 REINS RD	44 A. RAINS	1968-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124633	BEAUMONT	132735	Appraisal district				
	2622 REINS RD	44 A. RAINS	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124632	BEAUMONT	132662	In field estimate				
	2628 REINS RD	44 A. RAINS	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124631	BEAUMONT	132842	In field estimate				
	2670 REINS RD	44 A. RAINS	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 124628	BEAUMONT	132776	In field estimate				
	2706 REINS RD	44 A. RAINS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124589	BEAUMONT	132707	Appraisal district				
	2758 REINS RD	44 A. RAINS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124588	BEAUMONT	132681	Appraisal district				
	3124 REINS RD	44 A. RAINS	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124585	BEAUMONT	132575	In field estimate				
	2126-2156 REINS RD	44 A. RAINS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	No photo due to vegetation
HHM ID: 124661	BEAUMONT	132721	Appraisal district				
	2780-2812 REINS RD	44 A. RAINS	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124587	BEAUMONT	132658	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2804-2824 REINS RD	44 A. RAINS	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124586	BEAUMONT	132664	In field estimate				
	1720 REYNOLDS RD	WESCALDER FIG ACRES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125273	BEAUMONT	111540	Appraisal district				
	1820 REYNOLDS RD	WESCALDER FIG ACRES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125276	BEAUMONT	111544	Appraisal district				
	1870 REYNOLDS RD	WESCALDER FIG ACRES	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125279	BEAUMONT	111543	In field estimate				
	8112 RITA RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 124362	BEAUMONT	136451	Appraisal district				
	8120 RITA LN	111 JOS. DYCHES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124361	BEAUMONT	136448	Appraisal district				
	8125 RITA RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124363	BEAUMONT	136446	Appraisal district				
	1252 ROLL RD	11 D. CHOATE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124809	BEAUMONT	127076	Appraisal district				
	1890 ROSE LN	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125386	BEAUMONT	129371	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	7679 SHADY LN	GARDEN VILLAS	1930		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 125217	BEAUMONT	35611	In field estimate				
	SHADY LN	GARDEN VILLAS				ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 125226	BEAUMONT	35587					
	12589 SHERMAN RD	60 T. D. YOAKUM	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125077	BEAUMONT	134586	Appraisal district				
	12667 SHERMAN RD		1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125081	BEAUMONT	134583	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	4501 SMITH RD	147 H T & B	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126166	BEAUMONT	137661	Appraisal district				
	3800 BLOCK SMITH RD	576 T. F. SMITH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126172	BEAUMONT	141576	Appraisal district				
	1440 SPINDLETOP RD	B-22 55 J. A. VEATCH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128632	BEAUMONT	239256	Appraisal district				
	1660 SPINDLETOP RD	B-22 55 J. A. VEATCH	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128635	BEAUMONT	121682	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	3668 STEINHAGEN RD	28 C. HILLEBRANDT	1945			ROE needed, Intensive survey needed	Large complex with minimal visibility and security issues
HHM ID: 126422	BEAUMONT	130278	In field estimate				
	6268 STEINHAGEN RD		1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126409	BEAUMONT	127240	In field estimate				
	2100 BLOCK STEINHAGEN RD		1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126427	BEAUMONT	70118	In field estimate				
	2200 BLOCK STEINHAGEN RD	OAK PARK ACRES	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126449	BEAUMONT	410917	In field estimate				
	STEINHAGEN RD					ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 126416	BEAUMONT	130278, 130231, 130230					

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	10965 THELISMA LN	11 D. CHOATE	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124925	BEAUMONT	127068	In field estimate				
	790 TODD ST	GULF TERRACE	1930		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 125548	BEAUMONT	42243	In field estimate				
	4053 TOLIVAR CANAL RD	42 S. MORRIS	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124122	BEAUMONT	249544	In field estimate				
	4400 TOLIVAR CANAL RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124134	BEAUMONT	136501	In field estimate				
	4700 BLOCK TOLIVAR CANAL RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 124136	BEAUMONT	136495	In field estimate				
	4066 TOLIVER CANAL RD	42 S. MORRIS	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124121	BEAUMONT	132355	In field estimate				
	4342 TOLIVER CANAL RD		1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124140	BEAUMONT	132320	Aerial images				
	8550 TRAM RD	20 D. EASLEY	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124202	BEAUMONT	128544	In field estimate				
	8783 TRAM RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 124201	BEAUMONT	136507	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	8962 TRAM RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124197	BEAUMONT	136396	In field estimate				
	9041 TRAM RD		1910		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124184	BEAUMONT	136562	In field estimate				
	9463 TRAM RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124177	BEAUMONT	136478	In field estimate				
	9602 TRAM RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124169	BEAUMONT	136483	Appraisal district				
	9743 TRAM RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 124152	BEAUMONT	136467	In field estimate				
	9869 TRAM RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124137	BEAUMONT	136465	In field estimate				
	9870 TRAM RD	111 JOS. DYCHES	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124138	BEAUMONT	136417	In field estimate				
	11800 BLOCK US 90	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125181	BEAUMONT	386953	Appraisal district				
	9909 VERNALL LN	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	Limited visibility due to private drive (Vernall Ln)
HHM ID: 125115	BEAUMONT	129490	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9480 WALDEN RD	WESCALDER FIG ACRES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125327	BEAUMONT	111887	Appraisal district				
	9500 WALDEN RD	138 H T & B	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 125321	BEAUMONT	137504	In field estimate				
	9555 WALDEN RD	138 H T & B	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125316	BEAUMONT	137507	In field estimate				
	9580 WALDEN RD	WESCALDER FIG ACRES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125324	BEAUMONT	111862	Appraisal district				
	9800 WALDEN RD	WESCALDER FIG ACRES	1976		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125313	BEAUMONT	111872	Appraisal district				
	9815 WALDEN RD	138 H T & B	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 125310	BEAUMONT	244807	Appraisal district				
	9950 WALDEN RD	WESCALDER FIG ACRES	1910		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 125301	BEAUMONT	111877	In field estimate				
	12919 WALDEN RD	809 H T & B	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125298	BEAUMONT	142745	Appraisal district				
	4091 WELLS RD	576 T. F. SMITH	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125429	BEAUMONT	141560	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	4151 WELLS RD	576 T. F. SMITH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125433	BEAUMONT	141556	Appraisal district				
	525 WESPINE DR	PINE ISLAND PLACE	1968			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 125363	BEAUMONT	83970	Appraisal district				
	2259 WESPINE DR	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125344	BEAUMONT	129626	In field estimate				
	2432 WESPINE DR	PINE ISLAND PLACE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125346	BEAUMONT	83981	Appraisal district				
	2529 WESPINE DR	PINE ISLAND PLACE	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125360	BEAUMONT	83972	In field estimate				
	2599 WESPINE DR	PINE ISLAND PLACE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125357	BEAUMONT	83974	Appraisal district				
	495 WEST RD	60 T. D. YOAKUM	1930		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 125060	BEAUMONT	134625	In field estimate				
	552 WEST RD	11 D. CHOATE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125061	BEAUMONT	127080	Appraisal district				
	700 WEST RD	11 D. CHOATE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125062	BEAUMONT	127103	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	6164 WEST PORT ARTHUR RD	B-20 55 J. A. VEATCH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121790	BEAUMONT	120314	Appraisal district				
	6200 WEST PORT ARTHUR RD	B-20 55 J. A. VEATCH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121784	BEAUMONT	120311	Appraisal district				
	6330 WEST PORT ARTHUR RD	B-20 55 J. A. VEATCH	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121789	BEAUMONT	120820	In field estimate				
	6446 WEST PORT ARTHUR RD	B-20 55 J. A. VEATCH	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121802	BEAUMONT	120646	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	731 YORKSHIRE RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125861	BEAUMONT	129562	In field estimate				
	796 YORKSHIRE RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125870	BEAUMONT	129541	Appraisal district				
	881 YORKSHIRE RD		1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125867	BEAUMONT	129605	In field estimate				
	998 YORKSHIRE RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125873	BEAUMONT	129529	In field estimate				
	1080 YORKSHIRE RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125803	BEAUMONT	129515	In field estimate				
	1139 YORKSHIRE RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125878	BEAUMONT	129508	In field estimate				
	1195 YORKSHIRE RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125884	BEAUMONT	129510	Appraisal district				
	1406 YORKSHIRE RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125888	BEAUMONT	129482	In field estimate				
	1492 YORKSHIRE DR	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125891	BEAUMONT	129480	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1636 YORKSHIRE RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125892	BEAUMONT	129524	In field estimate				
	1854 YORKSHIRE RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125897	BEAUMONT	129520	Appraisal district				
	2000 BLOCK YORKSHIRE RD	24 JAS. GERISH SR.	1920		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 125858	BEAUMONT	409351	In field estimate				
	723-728 YORKSHIRE RD		1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125864	BEAUMONT	129533	In field estimate				
	453 J. J. F. GILLILAND (1100 block Nona Dr)	453 J. J. F. GILLILAND (1100 block Nona Dr)	1960s		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 128339	BEAUMONT		In field estimate				
	CARDINAL MEADOWS 1 & 2	CARDINAL MEADOWS 1 & 2	1940 - 1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 121848	BEAUMONT		In field estimate				
	GARDEN VILLAS	GARDEN VILLAS	1960 - 1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125214	BEAUMONT		In field estimate				
	HILLEBRANDT ACRES UNRECORDED	HILLEBRANDT ACRES UNRECORDED	1930-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128248	BEAUMONT		In field estimate				
	NORTHWEST FOREST 1 & 2 & 5	NORTHWEST FOREST 1 & 2 & 5	1975-1995		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124386	BEAUMONT		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	OAK PARK ACRES	OAK PARK ACRES	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128243	BEAUMONT		In field estimate				
	OAK PARK TERRACE	OAK PARK TERRACE	1960-1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128242	BEAUMONT		In field estimate				
	Orange Acres	Orange Acres	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126338	BEAUMONT		In field estimate				
	ORANGE FARMS	ORANGE FARMS	1960-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128322	BEAUMONT		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	VILLA DE ORO ESTATES	VILLA DE ORO ESTATES	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125227	BEAUMONT		In field estimate				
	WESCALDER FIG ACRES	WESCALDER FIG ACRES	1955 - 1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125234	BEAUMONT		In field estimate				
	13315 BLACKGUM AVE	SAVE-MOR-CON - SAVAGE MORRICAL & CONROY-	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124435	BEVIL OAKS	100533	Appraisal district				
	13520 HIGHWAY 105	112 W. C. DYCHES	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124534	BEVIL OAKS	136709	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13550 HIGHWAY 105	112 W. C. DYCHES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124533	BEVIL OAKS	136684	Appraisal district				
	13570 HIGHWAY 105	112 W. C. DYCHES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124532	BEVIL OAKS	136678	Appraisal district				
	13580 HIGHWAY 105	112 W. C. DYCHES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124531	BEVIL OAKS	136672	Appraisal district				
	13520 NIAGARA DR	112 W. C. DYCHES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124528	BEVIL OAKS	136683	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13540 NIAGARA DR	112 W. C. DYCHES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124527	BEVIL OAKS	136677	Appraisal district				
	7120 RIVER BEND DR	112 W. C. DYCHES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124513	BEVIL OAKS	136670	Appraisal district				
	7130 RIVER BEND DR	112 W. C. DYCHES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124512	BEVIL OAKS	136668	Appraisal district				
	7140 RIVER BEND DR	112 W. C. DYCHES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124511	BEVIL OAKS	136673	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	7350 RIVER BEND DR	112 W. C. DYCHES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124507	BEVIL OAKS	136667	Appraisal district				
	7380 RIVER BEND DR	112 W. C. DYCHES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124502	BEVIL OAKS	136666	Appraisal district				
	7495 RIVER BEND DR	112 W. C. DYCHES	1971		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124494	BEVIL OAKS	136687	Appraisal district				
	7515 RIVER BEND DR	112 W. C. DYCHES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124492	BEVIL OAKS	136690	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	7325 SWEETGUM RD	112 W. C. DYCHES	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124582	BEVIL OAKS	136719	In field estimate				
	7335 SWEETGUM RD	112 W. C. DYCHES	1969		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124579	BEVIL OAKS	136713	Appraisal district				
	7365 SWEETGUM RD	112 W. C. DYCHES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124575	BEVIL OAKS	136717	Appraisal district				
	7375 SWEETGUM RD	112 W. C. DYCHES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124572	BEVIL OAKS	136711	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	7390 SWEETGUM RD	112 W. C. DYCHES	1974		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124565	BEVIL OAKS	136723	Appraisal district				
	7425 SWEETGUM RD	112 W. C. DYCHES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124569	BEVIL OAKS	136624	Appraisal district				
	7725 SWEETGUM RD		1964 - 1985	First Baptist Church Bevil Oaks	Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124464	BEVIL OAKS	96778	Plaque, Aerial images				
	BEVIL ACRES	BEVIL ACRES	1950-2022		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124429	BEVIL OAKS		Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	HALL HEIGHTS	HALL HEIGHTS	1975-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124438	BEVIL OAKS		In field estimate				
	LOWERY PLACE (7000-7100 Carroll Ln)	LOWERY PLACE (7000-7100 Carroll Ln)	1978-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124406	BEVIL OAKS	58834, etc.	In field estimate				
	RIVER OAKS ESTATES	RIVER OAKS ESTATES	1965-2022		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124455	BEVIL OAKS		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	RIVER OAKS RANCHETTES	RIVER OAKS RANCHETTES	1955-1975		Eligible as a district (RIVER OAKS RANCHETTES)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 124489	BEVIL OAKS		In field estimate				
	7445 BLEWETT RD	OIL CITY 1ST	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125923	CHEEK	72019	Appraisal district				
	7571 BLEWETT RD	OIL CITY 1ST	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125924	CHEEK	72025	In field estimate				
	7625 BLEWETT RD	OIL CITY 1ST	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125925	CHEEK	72023	Appraisal district				
	7701 BLEWETT RD	OIL CITY 1ST	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125926	CHEEK	72022	Appraisal district				
	8307 BLEWETT RD	OIL CITY 1ST	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125928	CHEEK	71987	Appraisal district				
	8401 BLEWETT RD	OIL CITY 1ST	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125929	CHEEK	72002	Appraisal district				
	8712 BLEWETT RD	REPPEN, WILLIAM	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126002	CHEEK	95197	In field estimate				
	BOSSOM RD	173 SARAH MILES	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125938	CHEEK	138462	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	4428 BOYT RD	BROOKWOOD	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125457	CHEEK	13224	In field estimate				
	4858 BOYT RD	148 H T & B	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 125460	CHEEK	137727	In field estimate				
	4875 BOYT RD	148 H T & B	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125461	CHEEK	137737	Appraisal district				
	5080 BOYT RD	148 H T & B	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125465	CHEEK	137758	Appraisal district				
	5164 BOYT RD	148 H T & B	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125474	CHEEK	137738	Appraisal district				
	6376 BOYT RD	MILES, SARAH	1978			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 125805	CHEEK	64289	Appraisal district				
	6380 BOYT RD	MILES, SARAH	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125612	CHEEK	64287	Appraisal district				
	6424 BOYT RD	MILES, SARAH	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125807	CHEEK	64286	Appraisal district				
	6456 BOYT RD	MILES, SARAH	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125810	CHEEK	64295	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	6500 BOYT RD	MILES, SARAH	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125813	CHEEK	64290	Appraisal district				
	6558 BOYT RD	MILES, SARAH	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125816	CHEEK	64319	Appraisal district				
	6602 BOYT RD	MILES, SARAH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125819	CHEEK	64317	Appraisal district				
	6608 BOYT RD	MILES, SARAH	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125823	CHEEK	64316	Appraisal district				
	6652 BOYT RD		1955			Intensive survey needed	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125826	CHEEK	64315	In field estimate				
	6810 BOYT RD	MILES, SARAH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125829	CHEEK	64130	Appraisal district				
	6920 BOYT RD	MILES, SARAH	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125836	CHEEK	64123	In field estimate				
	6920 BOYT RD	MILES, SARAH	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	Address is Lawhon Rd in CAD
HHM ID: 125834	CHEEK	64133	In field estimate				
	7139 BOYT RD	173 SARAH MILES	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126093	CHEEK	138357	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	7174 BOYT RD	MILES, SARAH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126102	CHEEK	64141	Appraisal district				
	7185 BOYT RD		1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126098	CHEEK	138522	In field estimate				
	7187 BOYT RD	173 SARAH MILES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126163	CHEEK	138388	Appraisal district				
	7315 BOYT RD	173 SARAH MILES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126159	CHEEK	138423	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	7333 BOYT RD	173 SARAH MILES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126150	CHEEK	138405	Appraisal district				
	7336 BOYT RD A	MILES, SARAH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126160	CHEEK	64162	Appraisal district				
	7336 BOYT B		1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126090	CHEEK	138416	In field estimate				
	7369 BOYT RD	173 SARAH MILES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126147	CHEEK	138443	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	7378 BOYT RD	MILES, SARAH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126149	CHEEK	64163	Appraisal district				
	7391 BOYT RD	173 SARAH MILES	1948		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126131	CHEEK	138528	Appraisal district				
	7400 BOYT RD	MILES, SARAH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126129	CHEEK	64168	Appraisal district				
	7606 BOYT RD	MILES, SARAH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125975	CHEEK	64191	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	7685 BOYT RD	173 SARAH MILES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125972	CHEEK	138440	Appraisal district				
	7849 BOYT RD	173 SARAH MILES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125962	CHEEK	138397	Appraisal district				
	7964 BOYT RD	MILES, SARAH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125943	CHEEK	64363	Appraisal district				
	8033 BOYT RD	173 SARAH MILES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125936	CHEEK	138452	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9404 BOYT RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125933	CHEEK	131051	Appraisal district				
	9889 BOYT RD	562 CHAISON & OGDEN	1930 - 1960		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 125838	CHEEK	326078, 326050	Aerial images, In field estimate				
	10819 BOYT RD	562 CHAISON & OGDEN	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123114	CHEEK	141392	In field estimate				
	10000 BLOCK BOYT RD	562 CHAISON & OGDEN	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125848	CHEEK	326050	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	7500 BLOCK BOYT RD	MILES, SARAH	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 125978	CHEEK	264225	In field estimate				
	7900 BLOCK BOYT RD	MILES, SARAH	1935 - 1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125946	CHEEK	64357	In field estimate				
	BOYT RD	173 SARAH MILES	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 126075	CHEEK	138427	Appraisal district				
	CLINTON DR	MILES, SARAH	1974			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW - impassible road
HHM ID: 125951	CHEEK	64362	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	157 GARTH RD	GARTH INDUSTRIAL PARK	1972		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123039	CHEEK	35749	Appraisal district				
	7218 GARTH ST		1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123061	CHEEK	35738	In field estimate				
	7495 GARTH RD	GARTH INDUSTRIAL PARK	1958		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123038	CHEEK	35747	Appraisal district				
	7100 BLOCK GARTH RD	GARTH INDUSTRIAL PARK	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123037	CHEEK	35736	Appraisal district				
	9661 GUMS ST	570 J. R. LANDRUM	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125664	CHEEK	141487	Appraisal district				
	9677 GUMS ST	570 J. R. LANDRUM	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125662	CHEEK	141489	Appraisal district				
	7711 HIGHWAY 124	145 H T & B	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122957	CHEEK	137595	Appraisal district				
	7809 HIGHWAY 124	145 H T & B	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122958	CHEEK	137583	Appraisal district				
	8189 HIGHWAY 124	145 H T & B	1950 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122960	CHEEK	263502	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	8255 HIGHWAY 124	145 H T & B	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122961	CHEEK	137584	Appraisal district				
	8727 HIGHWAY 124	564 J. M. EASTHAM	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123041	CHEEK	141395	Appraisal district				
	9045 HIGHWAY 124	569 L. J. KOPKE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123040	CHEEK	141442	Appraisal district				
	9781 HIGHWAY 124	569 L. J. KOPKE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123036	CHEEK	141424	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9956 HIGHWAY 124	261 T & NO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123013	CHEEK	139699	Appraisal district				
	10369 HIGHWAY 124	SOUTHWESTERN ACRES	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123077	CHEEK	103539	In field estimate				
	12895 HIGHWAY 124	81 BBB & C RY.	1925-1955		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 123112	CHEEK	135537	Aerial images				
	1100 BLOCK HIGHWAY 124	650 E. R. OSTROM	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123091	CHEEK	141928	Appraisal district				
	1100 BLOCK HWY 124	650 E. R. OSTROM	1978			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 123095	CHEEK	255923	Appraisal district				
	6233 INDUSTRIAL RD	INDUSTRIAL SITES OF INDUST CITY	1973		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122980	CHEEK	49287	Appraisal district				
	6305 INDUSTRIAL RD	INDUSTRIAL SITES OF INDUST CITY	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122981	CHEEK	49286	Appraisal district				
	6900 BLOCK INDUSTRIAL RD	261 T & NO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123011	CHEEK	139690	Appraisal district				
	5702 INDUSTRY RD	INDUSTRIAL SITES OF INDUST CITY	1968		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 122978	CHEEK	49280	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	5898 INDUSTRY RD	INDUSTRIAL SITES OF INDUST CITY	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 122979	CHEEK	49279	In field estimate				
	6800 BLOCK INDUSTRY RD	INDUSTRIAL SITES OF INDUST CITY	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123005	CHEEK	49281	In field estimate				
	INDUSTRY RD	INDUSTRIAL SITES OF INDUST CITY	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122982	CHEEK	49285	In field estimate				
	11357 INTERSTATE 10 A	143 H T & B RY	1961	Goodyear Tire Co. rubber plant		ROE needed	Large complex with minimal visibility and security issues
HHM ID: 123110	CHEEK	137568	Research				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	11357 INTERSTATE 10 B	761 GEO. KIDD	1961	Goodyear Tire Co. rubber plant		ROE needed	Large complex with minimal visibility
HHM ID: 123078	CHEEK	142570	Research				
	7388 KIDD RD	146 H T & B	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126119	CHEEK	137616	Appraisal district				
	8476 KIDD RD	173 SARAH MILES	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126112	CHEEK	263347	In field estimate				
	8618 KIDD RD	173 SARAH MILES	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126109	CHEEK	138403	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	8687 KIDD RD	173 SARAH MILES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126077	CHEEK	138407	Appraisal district				
	8711 KIDD		1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126076	CHEEK	138358	In field estimate				
	7300 BLOCK KIDD RD	146 H T & B	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126125	CHEEK	137603	In field estimate				
	8600 BLOCK KIDD RD	260 T & NO	1975		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 126117	CHEEK	139688	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	8461 LANDRY LN	173 SARAH MILES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125959	CHEEK	138493	Appraisal district				
	8567 LANDRY LN	173 SARAH MILES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125955	CHEEK	138455	Appraisal district				
	9415 LAWHON RD	MILES, SARAH	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125575	CHEEK	64282	Appraisal district				
	9443 LAWHON RD	MILES, SARAH	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125580	CHEEK	241600	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9457 LAWHON RD	MILES, SARAH	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125583	CHEEK	64274	Appraisal district				
	9487 LAWHON RD	MILES, SARAH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125586	CHEEK	64273	Appraisal district				
	9505 LAWHON RD	MILES, SARAH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125589	CHEEK	64276	Appraisal district				
	9524 LAWHON RD	570 J. R. LANDRUM	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125618	CHEEK	141513	Appraisal district				
	9537 LAWHON RD	MILES, SARAH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125598	CHEEK	64265	Appraisal district				
	9553 LAWHON RD	MILES, SARAH	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125616	CHEEK	64267	In field estimate				
	9618 LAWHON RD	570 J. R. LANDRUM	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125619	CHEEK	141459	Appraisal district				
	9658 LAWHON RD	570 J. R. LANDRUM	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125620	CHEEK	141460	Appraisal district				
	9690 LAWHON RD	570 J. R. LANDRUM	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125657	CHEEK	141469	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9727 LAWHON RD	MILES, SARAH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125668	CHEEK	64252	Appraisal district				
	9750 LAWHON RD	570 J. R. LANDRUM	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125672	CHEEK	141515	Appraisal district				
	9777 LAWHON RD	MILES, SARAH	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125676	CHEEK	64215	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9819 LAWHON RD	MILES, SARAH	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125681	CHEEK	64229	Appraisal district				
	9833 LAWHON RD	MILES, SARAH	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125685	CHEEK	64218	Appraisal district				
	9853 LAWHON RD	MILES, SARAH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125689	CHEEK	64247	Appraisal district				
	9914 LAWHON RD	259 T & NO	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125705	CHEEK	139662	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9937 LAWHON RD	173 SARAH MILES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125709	CHEEK	138396	Appraisal district				
	9955 LAWHON RD	173 SARAH MILES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125712	CHEEK	138425	Appraisal district				
	9977 LAWHON RD	173 SARAH MILES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125715	CHEEK	138512	Appraisal district				
	10039 LAWHON RD A	173 SARAH MILES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125719	CHEEK	138420	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	10039 LAWHON RD B	173 SARAH MILES	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125724	CHEEK	138372	In field estimate				
	10083 LAWHON RD	173 SARAH MILES	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 125760	CHEEK	138375	In field estimate				
	10163 LAWHON RD	173 SARAH MILES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125751	CHEEK	138356	Appraisal district				
	10179 LAWHON RD	173 SARAH MILES	1900		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 125767	CHEEK	138428	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	10225 LAWHON RD	173 SARAH MILES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125779	CHEEK	138378	Appraisal district				
	10424 LAWHON RD		1965			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 125570	CHEEK	61786	Aerial images				
	LAWHON RD	173 SARAH MILES	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125771	CHEEK	138382	In field estimate				
	8766 M L KING JR DR	MILES, SARAH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125965	CHEEK	64195	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9124 M L KING JR DR	MILES, SARAH	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125968	CHEEK	64199	Appraisal district				
	8610 MACK		1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125930	CHEEK	131190	In field estimate				
	8638 MACK RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125855	CHEEK	131055	In field estimate				
	8664 MACK RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125852	CHEEK	131170	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	8642 PHILLIPS ST	MILES, SARAH	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125981	CHEEK	64192	In field estimate				
	8684 PHILLIPS ST	MILES, SARAH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125984	CHEEK	64190	Appraisal district				
	8701 PHILLIPS ST	MILES, SARAH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125986	CHEEK	64188	Appraisal district				
	8524 PLEASANT DR	173 SARAH MILES	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126145	CHEEK	138524	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	PLEASANT DR	173 SARAH MILES	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126134	CHEEK	414519	In field estimate				
	5825 ROBERTS LN	570 J. R. LANDRUM	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125644	CHEEK	141485	In field estimate				
	5884 ROBERTS LN	570 J. R. LANDRUM	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125629	CHEEK	141461	Appraisal district				
	7237 SENSAT LN	650 E. R. OSTROM	1968			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 123080	CHEEK	141941	Appraisal district				
	7287 SENSAT LN	650 E. R. OSTROM	1968			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 123082	CHEEK	141936	Appraisal district				
	SENSAT LANE	650 E. R. OSTROM				ROE needed	No building visible from ROW

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 123081	CHEEK	141937					
	6823 SMITH RD	261 T & NO	1976		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126120	CHEEK	139702	Appraisal district				
	8100 BLOCK SMITH RD	261 T & NO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123012	CHEEK	139689	Appraisal district				
	5986 TRAHAN RD	173 SARAH MILES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125698	CHEEK	138387	Appraisal district				
	6005 TRAHAN RD	MILES, SARAH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125693	CHEEK	64216	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9605 WINGATE ST	570 J. R. LANDRUM	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125638	CHEEK	141467	In field estimate				
	9718 WINGATE ST	570 J. R. LANDRUM	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125650	CHEEK	141464	Appraisal district				
	9730 WINGATE ST	570 J. R. LANDRUM	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125653	CHEEK	141474	Appraisal district				
	8350 WINZER RD	REPPEN, WILLIAM	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126004	CHEEK	95201	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	8475 WINZER RD	REPPEN, WILLIAM	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126008	CHEEK	95212	Appraisal district				
	8580 WINZER RD	REPPEN, WILLIAM	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126009	CHEEK	95208	In field estimate				
	8641 WINZER RD	REPPEN, WILLIAM	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126011	CHEEK	95237	In field estimate				
	8672 WINZER RD		1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126021	CHEEK	95229	In field estimate				
	8734 WINZER RD A	REPPEN, WILLIAM	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126012	CHEEK	95230	Appraisal district				
	8734 WINZER RD B	REPPEN, WILLIAM	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126013	CHEEK	95231	In field estimate				
	8995 WINZER RD	REPPEN, WILLIAM	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126027	CHEEK	95245	In field estimate				
	9110 WINZER RD		1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126038	CHEEK	95253	In field estimate				
	9320 WINZER RD	REPPEN, WILLIAM	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126029	CHEEK	95263	In field estimate				
	9590 WINZER RD	43 M. PIVETOT	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126030	CHEEK	132481	In field estimate				
	9605 WINZER RD	43 M. PIVETOT	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126046	CHEEK	132507	In field estimate				
	9640 WINZER RD	43 M. PIVETOT	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126031	CHEEK	132497	Appraisal district				
	9685 WINZER RD	43 M. PIVETOT	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126049	CHEEK	132493	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9699 WINZER RD	43 M. PIVETOT	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126050	CHEEK	132494	Appraisal district				
	9767 WINZER RD	43 M. PIVETOT	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126051	CHEEK	132496	Appraisal district				
	9807 WINZER RD	43 M. PIVETOT	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126053	CHEEK	132492	Appraisal district				
	9900 WINZER RD	43 M. PIVETOT	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126056	CHEEK	132503	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9913 WINZER RD	43 M. PIVETOT	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126055	CHEEK	245800	Appraisal district				
	9200 BLOCK WINZER RD	REPPEN, WILLIAM	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126028	CHEEK	246146	In field estimate				
	CHEEK	CHEEK	1940 - 1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123035	CHEEK		In field estimate				
	Martel Heights	Martel Heights	1960 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125561	CHEEK		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	112 AVENUE C	36 M. F. LAZARIN	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124469	CHINA	131424	In field estimate				
	220 BARNETT RD	16 S. DEAN	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125401	CHINA	127774	Appraisal district				
	429 BARNETT RD	16 S. DEAN	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125397	CHINA	127622	Appraisal district				
	450 BARNETT RD	16 S. DEAN	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125400	CHINA	127609	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	708 BEAUMONT N ST	16 S. DEAN	1953		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124673	CHINA	359904	Appraisal district				
	730 BEAUMONT N ST	16 S. DEAN	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124668	CHINA	127601	Appraisal district				
	824 BEAUMONT N ST	16 S. DEAN	1952		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124651	CHINA	127467	Appraisal district				
	110 BENOIT AVE	16 S. DEAN	1905		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 124320	CHINA	127560	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	151 BLANCH RD	16 S. DEAN	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125007	CHINA	127555	In field estimate				
	203 BLANCH RD	16 S. DEAN	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124994	CHINA	127479	In field estimate				
	215 BLANCH RD	16 S. DEAN	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124993	CHINA	127581	In field estimate				
	305 BLANCH RD	16 S. DEAN	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124992	CHINA	127882	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	425 BLANCH RD	16 S. DEAN	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124991	CHINA	127384	In field estimate				
	525 BLANCH RD	16 S. DEAN	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124410	CHINA	127481	In field estimate				
	600 BLANCH RD	16 S. DEAN	1899	Blanch Estate	Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 124328	CHINA	127502, 127500	Owner				
	1111 BLANCH RD	16 S. DEAN	1969		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124421	CHINA	127460	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1211 BLANCH RD	16 S. DEAN	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124418	CHINA	259912	In field estimate				
	1349 BLANCH RD	16 S. DEAN	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124428	CHINA	347261	Appraisal district				
	1647 BLANCH RD	16 S. DEAN	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124971	CHINA	127635	Appraisal district				
	1835 BLANCH RD	16 S. DEAN	1964		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124970	CHINA	127878	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1845 BLANCH RD	16 S. DEAN	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124405	CHINA	127390	In field estimate				
	2001 BLANCH RD	16 S. DEAN	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124395	CHINA	127595, 131486	In field estimate				
	101 BROADWAY ST	NASHLAND	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124853	CHINA	66778	Appraisal district				
	200 BROADWAY ST	NASHLAND	1905	Old Southern Pacific Railroad depot	Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 124350	CHINA	66779	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	221 BROADWAY ST	NASHLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124833	CHINA	66777	Appraisal district				
	229 BROADWAY ST	NASHLAND	1938		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124832	CHINA	66776	Appraisal district				
	250 BROADWAY		1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124776	CHINA	66788	In field estimate				
	305 BROADWAY ST	NASHLAND	1960		Individually eligible for NRHP (Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 124988	CHINA	66810	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	325 BROADWAY ST	NASHLAND	1938		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124461	CHINA	66809	Appraisal district				
	328 BROADWAY ST	NASHLAND	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124769	CHINA	66801	In field estimate				
	332 BROADWAY ST	NASHLAND	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124766	CHINA	66800	In field estimate				
	415 BROADWAY ST	NASHLAND	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124860	CHINA	66821	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	507 BROADWAY ST	NASHLAND	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124863	CHINA	66839	In field estimate				
	514 BROADWAY ST	16 S. DEAN	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124756	CHINA	127519	Appraisal district				
	520 BROADWAY ST	16 S. DEAN	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124755	CHINA	127509	In field estimate				
	523 BROADWAY ST	NASHLAND	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124866	CHINA	66837	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	607 S BROADWAY		1974	St. Paul Missionary Baptist Church		Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 124465	CHINA	131320	Cornerstone				
	607 BROADWAY		1975			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 124752	CHINA	66856	In field estimate				
	622 BROADWAY ST	16 S. DEAN	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124746	CHINA	127647	Appraisal district				
	628 BROADWAY ST	16 S. DEAN	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124745	CHINA	127506	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	629 BROADWAY		1920			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 124488	CHINA	66855	In field estimate				
	717 N BROADWAY ST	NASHLAND	1920		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 124300	CHINA	66872	In field estimate				
	806 BROADWAY ST	NASHLAND	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124592	CHINA	66876	In field estimate				
	915 BROADWAY ST	16 S. DEAN	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124593	CHINA	127649	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	925 BROADWAY ST	16 S. DEAN	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124643	CHINA	127412	In field estimate				
	1518 N BROADWAY		1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124519	CHINA	127381	In field estimate				
	400 BLOCK N BROADWAY ST	NASHLAND	1978		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 124757	CHINA	66820	Aerial images				
	CEMETERY RD		1889-2022			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 124347	CHINA	12764, 127707	Oldest burial per FindAGrave.com				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1606 CHINA N RD	16 S. DEAN	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124518	CHINA	127883	In field estimate				
	1736 CHINA N RD	16 S. DEAN	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125404	CHINA	127454	In field estimate				
	1808 CHINA N RD	16 S. DEAN	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125405	CHINA	127441	In field estimate				
	1850 CHINA N RD	16 S. DEAN	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125406	CHINA	127490	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2010 CHINA N RD	16 S. DEAN	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125270	CHINA	127507	Appraisal district				
	2028 CHINA N RD	16 S. DEAN	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125267	CHINA	127498	Appraisal district				
	2784 CHINA N RD	550 MRS. P. J. CHILES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125264	CHINA	141156	Appraisal district				
	2790 CHINA N RD	550 MRS. P. J. CHILES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125261	CHINA	141171	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	3345 CHINA N RD	444 W. H. PRATER	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125257	CHINA	140480	Appraisal district				
	3647 CHINA N RD	444 W. H. PRATER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125252	CHINA	140476	Appraisal district				
	3661 CHINA N RD	550 MRS. P. J. CHILES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125249	CHINA	141178	Appraisal district				
	3735 CHINA N RD	550 MRS. P. J. CHILES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125246	CHINA	141163	Appraisal district				
	3781 CHINA N RD	550 MRS. P. J. CHILES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 125243	CHINA	141151	Appraisal district				
	3855 CHINA N RD	E & M ESTATES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125237	CHINA	412882	Appraisal district				
	4017 CHINA N RD	550 MRS. P. J. CHILES	1910		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 125220	CHINA	141158	In field estimate				
	4179 CHINA N RD A	550 MRS. P. J. CHILES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125218	CHINA	141153	Appraisal district				
	1700 BLOCK CHINA N RD	16 S. DEAN	1965	WWII POW Camp Site	Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 125402	CHINA	401034	Aerial images				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	3300 BLOCK CHINA S RD	870 T & NO	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126208	CHINA	143125	In field estimate				
	211 DALLAS		1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124792	CHINA	22182	In field estimate				
	1031 DALLAS ST	NASH, C. L.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125430	CHINA	66772	Appraisal district				
	607 GALVESTON ST	NASHLAND	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124713	CHINA	66865	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	809 GALVESTON ST	NASHLAND	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124727	CHINA	66889	Appraisal district				
	825 GALVESTON ST	NASHLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124731	CHINA	66887	Appraisal district				
	914 GALVESTON ST	16 S. DEAN	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124607	CHINA	127603	In field estimate				
	917 GALVESTON ST	FONTAINE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124616	CHINA	239098	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	920 GALVESTON ST	16 S. DEAN	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124610	CHINA	127532	In field estimate				
	245 HIGHWAY 90	36 M. F. LAZARIN	1935	Our Lady of Sorrows Church	Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 124243	CHINA	131276	Cornerstone				
	831 HIGHWAY 90	16 S. DEAN	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124535	CHINA	127672	Appraisal district				
	915 HIGHWAY 90	16 S. DEAN	1974		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124538	CHINA	127621	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	951 HIGHWAY 90	16 S. DEAN	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124541	CHINA	127432	Appraisal district				
	1030 HIGHWAY 90	36 M. F. LAZARIN	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124231	CHINA	131314	In field estimate				
	1141 HIGHWAY 90	36 M. F. LAZARIN	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124228	CHINA	131606	Appraisal district				
	1405 HIGHWAY 90	36 M. F. LAZARIN	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124544	CHINA	131478	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	16933 HIGHWAY 90	36 M. F. LAZARIN	1962			ROE needed	Limited visibility from ROW
HHM ID: 124547	CHINA	131595, 404712	Appraisal district				
	20245 HIGHWAY 90	36 M. F. LAZARIN				ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 124225	CHINA	131609					
	20345 HIGHWAY 90	36 M. F. LAZARIN	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124215	CHINA	131354	Appraisal district				
	20437 HIGHWAY 90	36 M. F. LAZARIN	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124214	CHINA	131359	Appraisal district				
	20921 HIGHWAY 90	36 M. F. LAZARIN	1915		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 124191	CHINA	131291	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	20959 HIGHWAY 90	36 M. F. LAZARIN	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124190	CHINA	131585	In field estimate				
	21085 HIGHWAY 90	30 S. HORTON	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124194	CHINA	130443	Appraisal district				
	230 HOUSTON ST	NASHLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124825	CHINA	66781	Appraisal district				
	627 HOUSTON ST	NASHLAND	1925			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 124701	CHINA	66859	In field estimate				
	1005 HOUSTON ST	TERRY	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 124637	CHINA	106947	In field estimate				
	14002 JAGNEAUX LN	16 S. DEAN	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125337	CHINA	412062	In field estimate				
	127 LEE E ST	16 S. DEAN	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124880	CHINA	127631	Appraisal district				
	133 MAIN W AVE	NASHLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124931	CHINA	66822	Appraisal district				
	208 MAIN W AVE	NASHLAND	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124933	CHINA	66834	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	230 MAIN W AVE	NASHLAND	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124934	CHINA	66831	In field estimate				
	500 W MAINE		1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124921	CHINA	113704	In field estimate				
	500 BLOCK MAINE W AVE	NASHLAND	1925		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 124926	CHINA	66848	In field estimate				
	1108 OLD NOME RD	36 M. F. LAZARIN	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124432	CHINA	131426	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2350 OLD NOME RD	30 S. HORTON	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124451	CHINA	130422, 130423	In field estimate				
	15870 OLD NOME RD	36 M. F. LAZARIN	1964		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124437	CHINA	131323	Appraisal district				
	16012 OLD NOME RD	30 S. HORTON	1930			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 124446	CHINA	130384	Aerial images				
	1100 BLOCK OLD NOME RD	36 M. F. LAZARIN	1910			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 124394	CHINA	131353	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	300 W RAILROAD		1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124805	CHINA	22207	In field estimate				
	217 RAILROAD W AVE	NASHLAND	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 124790	CHINA	66894	In field estimate				
	229 RAILROAD W AVE	NASHLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124791	CHINA	66893	Appraisal district				
	411 RAILROAD W AVE	16 S. DEAN	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124799	CHINA	263763	Appraisal district				
	448 RAILROAD W AVE	16 S. DEAN	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 124370	CHINA	127837	Appraisal district				
	530 RAILROAD W AVE	16 S. DEAN	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124376	CHINA	127510	In field estimate				
	550 RAILROAD W AVE	16 S. DEAN	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124381	CHINA	127433	In field estimate				
	125 SOUTH AVE	16 S. DEAN	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124640	CHINA	127545	In field estimate				
	219 SOUTH AVE	16 S. DEAN	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124636	CHINA	127636	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	443 SOUTH AVE	16 S. DEAN	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124619	CHINA	263765	In field estimate				
	118 STEWART AVE	NASHLAND	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124676	CHINA	66884	In field estimate				
	299 TED ROLL LN	106 S. COTTON	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	Address is 1793 Westbury on building
HHM ID: 125311	CHINA	136305	In field estimate				
	124 TEXAS AVE	NASHLAND	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124829	CHINA	66813	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	250 TEXAS AVE	NASHLAND	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124816	CHINA	66816	In field estimate				
	300 TURNER RD	25 JAS. GERISH JR.				ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 125016	CHINA	129764					
	909 TURNER RD	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125485	CHINA	129830	In field estimate				
	1550 TURNER RD	16 S. DEAN	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125455	CHINA	127715	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1694 TURNER RD	16 S. DEAN	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125453	CHINA	127565	Appraisal district				
	1705 TURNER RD BLDG A	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125444	CHINA	129742	Appraisal district				
	1705 TURNER RD BLDG B	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1965			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 125446	CHINA	129742	In field estimate				
	1783 TURNER RD		1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125438	CHINA	129791	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1855 TURNER RD	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125427	CHINA	129772	Appraisal district				
	2371 TURNER RD	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1910		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 125018	CHINA	129705	In field estimate				
	2418 TURNER RD	16 S. DEAN	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125058	CHINA	127428	In field estimate				
	1500 BLOCK TURNER RD	25 JAS. GERISH JR.	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125484	CHINA	129715	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	125 VERA E AVE	NASHLAND	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124645	CHINA	66877	In field estimate				
	224 VERA E AVE	16 S. DEAN	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	No photo due to dogs
HHM ID: 124744	CHINA	127783	Appraisal district				
	126 VERA W AVE	16 S. DEAN	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124598	CHINA	127872	In field estimate				
	216 VERA W AVE	16 S. DEAN	1972		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124601	CHINA	127604	Appraisal district				
	232 VERA W AVE	16 S. DEAN	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124602	CHINA	127409	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	334 VERA W AVE	16 S. DEAN	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124738	CHINA	127613	In field estimate				
	424 VERA W AVE	16 S. DEAN	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124740	CHINA	127624	Appraisal district				
	123 WASHINGTON E AVE	NASHLAND	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124909	CHINA	66845	In field estimate				
	124 WASHINGTON E AVE	NASHLAND	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124903	CHINA	66854	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	132 WASHINGTON E AVE	NASHLAND	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124900	CHINA	66853	In field estimate				
	133 WASHINGTON E AVE	NASHLAND	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124906	CHINA	66847	Appraisal district				
	105 WASHINGTON W AVE	NASHLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124867	CHINA	66835	Appraisal district				
	129 WASHINGTON W AVE	NASHLAND	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124872	CHINA	66840	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	131 WASHINGTON W AVE	NASHLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124875	CHINA	66841	Appraisal district				
	208 WASHINGTON W AVE	NASHLAND	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124705	CHINA	66862	Appraisal district				
	408 WASHINGTON W AVE	16 S. DEAN	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124961	CHINA	127535	In field estimate				
	444 WASHINGTON W AVE	16 S. DEAN	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124963	CHINA	127513	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	17028 WESTBURY RD	106 S. COTTON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125308	CHINA	255946	Appraisal district				
	17060 WESTBURY RD	106 S. COTTON	1973		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125307	CHINA	136311	Appraisal district				
	17484 WESTBURY RD	16 S. DEAN	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125312	CHINA	127709	Appraisal district				
	17610 WESTBURY RD	16 S. DEAN	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125364	CHINA	127731	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	17998 WESTBURY RD	16 S. DEAN	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125365	CHINA	264224	Appraisal district				
	18094 WESTBURY RD	16 S. DEAN	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125370	CHINA	127911	Appraisal district				
	18230 WESTBURY RD	16 S. DEAN	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125371	CHINA	127692	Appraisal district				
	18245 WESTBURY RD	16 S. DEAN	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125372	CHINA	127561	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	16 S. DEAN	16 S. DEAN	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124334	CHINA		In field estimate				
	36 M. F. LAZARIN	36 M. F. LAZARIN	1945 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124273	CHINA		In field estimate				
	CHINA TERRACE	CHINA TERRACE	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124365	CHINA		In field estimate				
	TERRY	TERRY	1950 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124493	CHINA		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	TURNER ROAD	TURNER ROAD	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 125040	CHINA		In field estimate				
	Western Acres	Western Acres	1950 - 1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124472	CHINA		In field estimate				
	8801 BLANCO RD A	489 J. DUGAT JR	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123660	FANNETT	140883	Appraisal district				
	8801 BLANCO RD B	489 J. DUGAT JR	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	Address is Dugat Rd in CAD
HHM ID: 123661	FANNETT	140882	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	22324 BURRELL RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123691	FANNETT	126349	Appraisal district				
	22842 BURRELL RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123609	FANNETT	126365	Appraisal district				
	18362 BURRELL WINGATE RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128560	FANNETT	134962	Appraisal district				
	18588 BURRELL WINGATE RD	68 D. BURRELL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128598	FANNETT	134969	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	18599 BURRELL WINGATE RD	68 D. BURRELL	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128599	FANNETT	135023	In field estimate				
	18636 BURRELL WINGATE RD	68 D. BURRELL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128601	FANNETT	134959	Appraisal district				
	18793 BURRELL WINGATE RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128610	FANNETT	238872	Appraisal district				
	18977 BURRELL WINGATE RD	68 D. BURRELL	1972		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128611	FANNETT	250876	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	19138 BURRELL WINGATE RD	68 D. BURRELL	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128614	FANNETT	135262	Appraisal district				
	19323 BURRELL WINGATE RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123254	FANNETT	134913	Appraisal district				
	19352 BURRELL WINGATE RD	68 D. BURRELL	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128619	FANNETT	134957	In field estimate				
	19476 BURRELL WINGATE RD	68 D. BURRELL	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131017	FANNETT	135119	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	19479 BURRELL WINGATE RD	68 D. BURRELL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131020	FANNETT	135284	Appraisal district				
	20197 BURRELL WINGATE RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131029	FANNETT	134905	Appraisal district				
	20314 BURRELL WINGATE RD	68 D. BURRELL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131023	FANNETT	135080	Appraisal district				
	20397 BURRELL WINGATE RD	68 D. BURRELL	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131033	FANNETT	135131	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	20438 BURRELL WINGATE RD	68 D. BURRELL	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131036	FANNETT	134916	In field estimate				
	20536 BURRELL WINGATE RD	68 D. BURRELL	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131195	FANNETT	135379	In field estimate				
	20705 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131200	FANNETT	126322	In field estimate				
	20803 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1963		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131203	FANNETT	126542	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	21005 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130523	FANNETT	126362	Appraisal district				
	21181 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130511	FANNETT	126308	Appraisal district				
	21372 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131218	FANNETT	126560	Appraisal district				
	21442 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131221	FANNETT	126562, 126575	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	21451 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131222	FANNETT	126341	Appraisal district				
	21563 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131228	FANNETT	126373	Appraisal district				
	21637 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131026	FANNETT	126319	Appraisal district				
	21735 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130520	FANNETT	126695	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	21759 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130513	FANNETT	245646	Appraisal district				
	21855 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130512	FANNETT	126644	Appraisal district				
	21883 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130510	FANNETT	126376	Appraisal district				
	21957 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130507	FANNETT	126604	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	22359 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123690	FANNETT	126421	Appraisal district				
	22445 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123689	FANNETT	126413	Appraisal district				
	22508 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 123671	FANNETT	126354	Appraisal district				
	22619 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123685	FANNETT	126436	Appraisal district				
	22703 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 123648	FANNETT	126371	Appraisal district				
	22756 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123646	FANNETT	126367	Appraisal district				
	22796 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123644	FANNETT	126451	Appraisal district				
	22825 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123606	FANNETT	126450	Appraisal district				
	22843 BURRELL WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123603	FANNETT	126510	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	22917 BURRELL WINGATE RD	489 J. DUGAT JR	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123591	FANNETT	140889	Appraisal district				
	23228 BURRELL WINGATE RD	130 JOS. GALLIER	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123565	FANNETT	261318	Appraisal district				
	23260 BURRELL WINGATE RD	130 JOS. GALLIER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123562	FANNETT	137351	Appraisal district				
	23446 BURRELL WINGATE RD	130 JOS. GALLIER	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123555	FANNETT	137368	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	23469 BURRELL WINGATE RD	130 JOS. GALLIER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123583	FANNETT	137362	Appraisal district				
	23485 BURRELL WINGATE RD	130 JOS. GALLIER	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123586	FANNETT	137411	In field estimate				
	23507 BURRELL WINGATE RD	130 JOS. GALLIER	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123589	FANNETT	137380	Appraisal district				
	18509 BURRELL-WINGATE RD		1950			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 128584	FANNETT	128584	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	22400 BLOCK BURRELL-WINGATE RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	Address is Burrell Rd in CAD
HHM ID: 123688	FANNETT	126380	In field estimate				
	7401 CHRISTY LN	10 M. CHIRINO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123533	FANNETT	126509	Appraisal district				
	7400 BLOCK CHRISTY LN	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123553	FANNETT	126496	Appraisal district				
	10459 CHURCH RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126335	FANNETT	131153	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	10521 CHURCH RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126332	FANNETT	131152	Appraisal district				
	10553 CHURCH RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126329	FANNETT	131242	Appraisal district				
	10655 CHURCH RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123364	FANNETT	131218	Appraisal district				
	10679 CHURCH RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 123362	FANNETT	131125	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	8700 CLUBB W RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126353	FANNETT	131093	Appraisal district				
	8762 CLUBB W RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126356	FANNETT	131127	Appraisal district				
	9804 CLUBB W RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1958		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126359	FANNETT	130958	Appraisal district				
	10110 CLUBB W RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126363	FANNETT	131059	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	10142 CLUBB W RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126364	FANNETT	131086	Appraisal district				
	10296 CLUBB W RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126368	FANNETT	131140	Appraisal district				
	10382 CLUBB W RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126374	FANNETT	131095	Appraisal district				
	10416 CLUBB W RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126377	FANNETT	130960	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	10484 CLUBB W RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126402	FANNETT	131114	In field estimate				
	10528 CLUBB W RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126399	FANNETT	131069	In field estimate				
	10546 CLUBB W RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126396	FANNETT	131071	Appraisal district				
	10596 CLUBB W RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126390	FANNETT	131192	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	10766 CLUBB W RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126388	FANNETT	131080	Appraisal district				
	11042 CLUBB W RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126385	FANNETT	131119	Appraisal district				
	11154 CLUBB W RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1925			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 126382	FANNETT	246236	In field estimate				
	10200 BLOCK CLUBB W RD		1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126386	FANNETT	131115	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	11854 CRAIGEN RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123701	FANNETT	126361	Appraisal district				
	12152 CRAIGEN RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123703	FANNETT	126566	Appraisal district				
	12195 CRAIGEN RD A	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123705	FANNETT	126312	Appraisal district				
	12246 CRAIGEN RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123706	FANNETT	126533	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	12309 CRAIGEN RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123718	FANNETT	126315	Appraisal district				
	12369 CRAIGEN RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123719	FANNETT	126316	Appraisal district				
	12455 CRAIGEN RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123720	FANNETT	126317	In field estimate				
	12465 CRAIGEN RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123721	FANNETT	126330	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13058 CRAIGEN RD	464 A. LINSCOMB	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123730	FANNETT	140751	Appraisal district				
	13086 CRAIGEN RD	464 A. LINSCOMB	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123731	FANNETT	140744	Appraisal district				
	13097 CRAIGEN RD	68 D. BURRELL	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123732	FANNETT	135044	Appraisal district				
	13179 CRAIGEN RD	68 D. BURRELL	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123733	FANNETT	135104	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13180 CRAIGEN RD	464 A. LINSCOMB	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123735	FANNETT	140754	Appraisal district				
	13215 CRAIGEN RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123734	FANNETT	134979	Appraisal district				
	13216 CRAIGEN RD	464 A. LINSCOMB	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123736	FANNETT	140745	Appraisal district				
	13285 CRAIGEN RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123752	FANNETT	134961	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13317 CRAIGEN RD	68 D. BURRELL	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123753	FANNETT	134948	Appraisal district				
	13411 CRAIGEN RD		1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123757	FANNETT	135109	In field estimate				
	13414 CRAIGEN RD	464 A. LINSCOMB	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123755	FANNETT	140741	Appraisal district				
	13489 CRAIGEN RD	68 D. BURRELL	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123764	FANNETT	135033	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13532 CRAIGEN RD	464 A. LINSCOMB	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123765	FANNETT	140746	Appraisal district				
	13575 CRAIGEN RD BLDG A	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123767	FANNETT	135052	Appraisal district				
	13575 CRAIGEN RD BLDG B	464 A. LINSCOMB	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123766	FANNETT	140738	Appraisal district				
	13657 CRAIGEN RD	68 D. BURRELL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123769	FANNETT	134953	Appraisal district				
	13737 CRAIGEN RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123783	FANNETT	135142	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13743 CRAIGEN RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123784	FANNETT	134947	Appraisal district				
	13817 CRAIGEN RD	68 D. BURRELL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123788	FANNETT	134970	Appraisal district				
	13874 CRAIGEN RD	463 L. HAYES SR	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123796	FANNETT	140726	Appraisal district				
	13934 CRAIGEN RD	463 L. HAYES SR	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123802	FANNETT	140725	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13935 CRAIGEN RD	463 L. HAYES SR	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123799	FANNETT	134984	Appraisal district				
	14117 CRAIGEN RD	68 D. BURRELL	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123807	FANNETT	135282	Appraisal district				
	14122 CRAIGEN RD	69 B. BLACKMON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131167	FANNETT	135388	Appraisal district				
	14139 CRAIGEN RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123808	FANNETT	135373	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	14144 CRAIGEN RD	463 L. HAYES SR	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123806	FANNETT	140709	In field estimate				
	14300 CRAIGEN RD	463 L. HAYES SR	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123809	FANNETT	140717	Appraisal district				
	14324 CRAIGEN RD	463 L. HAYES SR	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123811	FANNETT	140718	Appraisal district				
	14339 CRAIGEN RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123810	FANNETT	135228	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	14492 CRAIGEN RD	463 L. HAYES SR	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123341	FANNETT	140719	Appraisal district				
	14597 CRAIGEN RD	198 W. H. SMITH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123332	FANNETT	139006	Appraisal district				
	14616 CRAIGEN RD	463 L. HAYES SR	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123333	FANNETT	140722	Appraisal district				
	14647 CRAIGEN RD	198 W. H. SMITH	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123331	FANNETT	139051	In field estimate				
	14775 CRAIGEN RD	198 W. H. SMITH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 131180	FANNETT	139034	Appraisal district				
	15041 CRAIGEN RD	69 B. BLACKMON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131166	FANNETT	135392	Appraisal district				
	11900 BLOCK CRAIGEN RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123702	FANNETT	126454	Appraisal district				
	14700 BLOCK CRAIGEN RD	463 L. HAYES SR	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131182	FANNETT	140704	In field estimate				
	10448 DOGWOOD DR	35 J. C. LAWHON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130496	FANNETT	131106	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	10476 DOGWOOD DR	35 J. C. LAWHON	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130499	FANNETT	131176	Appraisal district				
	14211 DUBOIS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123309	FANNETT	400258	Appraisal district				
	14247 DUBOIS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123311	FANNETT	135139	Appraisal district				
	14252 DUBOIS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123314	FANNETT	135115	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	14290 DUBOIS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123318	FANNETT	395148	Appraisal district				
	14329 DUBOIS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123320	FANNETT	135159	Appraisal district				
	14397 DUBOIS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123321	FANNETT	135160	Appraisal district				
	14429 DUBOIS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131235	FANNETT	135149	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	14509 DUBOIS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131236	FANNETT	135150	Appraisal district				
	14568 DUBOIS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131231	FANNETT	135110	Appraisal district				
	11778 DUGAT RD	187 S. R. PERKINS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123664	FANNETT	405103	Appraisal district				
	11840 DUGAT RD	187 S. R. PERKINS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123663	FANNETT	344475	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	11186 EAST LN	130 JOS. GALLIER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123525	FANNETT	137360	Appraisal district				
	11200 EAST LN	130 JOS. GALLIER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123532	FANNETT	345409	Appraisal district				
	16805 FM 365		1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123595	FANNETT	126476	In field estimate				
	16861 FM 365		1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123581	FANNETT	126251	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	16923 FM 365	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123579	FANNETT	126292	Appraisal district				
	16985 FM 365	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123578	FANNETT	126287	Appraisal district				
	17200 FM 365	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123577	FANNETT	126261	Appraisal district				
	17236 FM 365	10 M. CHIRINO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123277	FANNETT	126268	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	17315 FM 365	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123275	FANNETT	256252	Appraisal district				
	17454 FM 365	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123273	FANNETT	126374	Appraisal district				
	17498 FM 365	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123272	FANNETT	126423	Appraisal district				
	17705 FM 365	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123253	FANNETT	126515	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	17727 FM 365	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123252	FANNETT	126444	Appraisal district				
	17827 FM 365	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123250	FANNETT	126449	Appraisal district				
	18070 FM 365	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123227	FANNETT	126512	Appraisal district				
	18164 FM 365	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123225	FANNETT	251121	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	18320 FM 365	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123223	FANNETT	126480	Appraisal district				
	18572 FM 365	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123222	FANNETT	126465	Appraisal district				
	18693 FM 365	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123219	FANNETT	126245	Appraisal district				
	18919 FM 365	130 JOS. GALLIER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123178	FANNETT	137370	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	19035 FM 365	130 JOS. GALLIER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123176	FANNETT	137379	Appraisal district				
	19043 FM 365	130 JOS. GALLIER	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123175	FANNETT	137407	Appraisal district				
	19071 FM 365	130 JOS. GALLIER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123173	FANNETT	137384	Appraisal district				
	19371 FM 365	130 JOS. GALLIER	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123438	FANNETT	137403	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	19445 FM 365	130 JOS. GALLIER	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123478	FANNETT	137400	Appraisal district				
	19485 FM 365	130 JOS. GALLIER	1964		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123472	FANNETT	137386	Appraisal district				
	19527 FM 365	130 JOS. GALLIER	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123464	FANNETT	137402	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	19545 FM 365	130 JOS. GALLIER	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123490	FANNETT	137383	Appraisal district				
	19842 FM 365	559 JNO. TUCKER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123380	FANNETT	141289	Appraisal district				
	20190 FM 365	559 JNO. TUCKER	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123372	FANNETT	141275	Appraisal district				
	20246 FM 365	559 JNO. TUCKER	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123358	FANNETT	141342	Appraisal district				
	20271 FM 365	559 JNO. TUCKER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123355	FANNETT	141296	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	20347 FM 365	38 THOS. MCFARLAND	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 123366	FANNETT	131818	Appraisal district				
	20467 FM 365	38 THOS. MCFARLAND	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123369	FANNETT	131794	Appraisal district				
	20499 FM 365	38 THOS. MCFARLAND	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123375	FANNETT	131795	Appraisal district				
	21282 FM 365	35 J. C. LAWHON	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130503	FANNETT	131138	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	21498 FM 365	35 J. C. LAWHON	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131039	FANNETT	131061	Appraisal district				
	21533 FM 365	38 THOS. MCFARLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131151	FANNETT	131749	Appraisal district				
	21620 FM 365	35 J. C. LAWHON	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131041	FANNETT	130981	In field estimate				
	22072 FM 365	172 SARAH MILES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131154	FANNETT	138289	Appraisal district				
	22756 FM 365	172 SARAH MILES	1978			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 126304	FANNETT	138293	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	17700 BLOCK FM 365	10 M. CHIRINO	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123251	FANNETT	126528	In field estimate				
	18900 BLOCK FM 365	130 JOS. GALLIER	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123177	FANNETT	137397	Appraisal district				
	19000 BLOCK FM 365	130 JOS. GALLIER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123174	FANNETT	137392	Appraisal district				
	22700 BLOCK FM 365	172 SARAH MILES	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126302	FANNETT	238874	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	10424 GAUDLIN RD		1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123465	FANNETT	39135	In field estimate				
	10035 GAULDING RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123409	FANNETT	126184	Appraisal district				
	10065 GAULDING RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123410	FANNETT	126272	Appraisal district				
	10087 GAULDING RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123411	FANNETT	126271	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	10364 GAULDING RD	GARCIA ADDITION	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123466	FANNETT	395139	Appraisal district				
	11126 GAULDING RD	LANDRY PLACE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123500	FANNETT	249753	Appraisal district				
	11166 GAULDING RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123501	FANNETT	126335	Appraisal district				
	11303 GAULDING RD A	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123504	FANNETT	126602	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	11303 GAULDING RD B	10 M. CHIRINO	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123503	FANNETT	126655	In field estimate				
	11330 GAULDING RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123505	FANNETT	126339	Appraisal district				
	11339 GAULDING RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123506	FANNETT	126416	Appraisal district				
	11362 GAULDING RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123526	FANNETT	126368	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	11369 GAULDING RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123519	FANNETT	126353	Appraisal district				
	11411 GAULDING RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123527	FANNETT	126289	In field estimate				
	11446 GAULDING RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123531	FANNETT	126426	Appraisal district				
	11451 GAULDING RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1900		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123528	FANNETT	126295	CAD date 1968; per owner, oldest part ca. 1910, side addition ca. 1945, rear addition ca. 1968				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	11515 GAULDING RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123550	FANNETT	126262	Appraisal district				
	11530 GAULDING RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123303	FANNETT	263076	In field estimate				
	11537 GAULDING RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123554	FANNETT	126301	Appraisal district				
	11557 GAULDING RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123556	FANNETT	126280	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	11566 GAULDING RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123299	FANNETT	126447	Appraisal district				
	11573 GAULDING RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123279	FANNETT	126303	Appraisal district				
	11601 GAULDING RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123278	FANNETT	126284	Appraisal district				
	9500 BLOCK GAULDING RD	82 BBB & C RY.	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	Associated with 9551 Gaulding Rd
HHM ID: 123408	FANNETT	251960	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9800 BLOCK GAULDING RD		1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123426	FANNETT	135569	In field estimate				
	9510 GILBERT RD	559 JNO. TUCKER	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123377	FANNETT	141357	Appraisal district				
	9529 GILBERT RD	559 JNO. TUCKER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123352	FANNETT	141255	Appraisal district				
	9574 GILBERT RD	559 JNO. TUCKER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123348	FANNETT	141269	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9621 GILBERT RD	38 THOS. MCFARLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123346	FANNETT	131788	Appraisal district				
	9633 GILBERT RD	38 THOS. MCFARLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123344	FANNETT	131787	Appraisal district				
	11034 GREENWOOD PL	GILBERT LAKE ESTATES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126305	FANNETT	35826	Appraisal district				
	13019 GRIFFITH RD	21 S. EATON	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128572	FANNETT	129090	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13046 GRIFFITH RD	21 S. EATON	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128570	FANNETT	129102	In field estimate				
	13072 GRIFFITH RD	21 S. EATON	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128571	FANNETT	129063	In field estimate				
	13117 GRIFFITH RD	21 S. EATON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128567	FANNETT	129078	Appraisal district				
	13891 GRIFFITH RD	49 WM. SMITH	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128557	FANNETT	133370	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9750 HARGRAVES LN	559 JNO. TUCKER	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 123507	FANNETT	263400	In field estimate				
	9779 HARGRAVES LN	559 JNO. TUCKER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123502	FANNETT	141314	Appraisal district				
	9900 HARGRAVES LN	559 JNO. TUCKER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123404	FANNETT	141299	Appraisal district				
	8750 HATCHER LN	199 E. STONE	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123782	FANNETT	139276	In field estimate				
	8770 HATCHER LN	199 E. STONE	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 123781	FANNETT	139264	Appraisal district				
	8810 HATCHER LN	199 E. STONE	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123779	FANNETT	245636	In field estimate				
	12259 HEISIG RD	594 T & NO	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 131338	FANNETT	141605	Appraisal district				
	13795 HIGHWAY 124	82 BBB & C RY.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123116	FANNETT	135549	In field estimate				
	14280 HIGHWAY 124	82 BBB & C RY.	1960			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 123118	FANNETT	135570	Aerial images				
	15355 HIGHWAY 124	GREEN ACRES NORTH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 123130	FANNETT	38977	Appraisal district				
	17116 HIGHWAY 124	130 JOS. GALLIER	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123536	FANNETT	137339	Appraisal district				
	17507 HIGHWAY 124	187 S. R. PERKINS	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123613	FANNETT	138688	Appraisal district				
	17520 HIGHWAY 124	187 S. R. PERKINS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123610	FANNETT	138680	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	17549 HIGHWAY 124	BOONE ACRES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123614	FANNETT	404222	Appraisal district				
	17691 HIGHWAY 124	187 S. R. PERKINS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123616	FANNETT	138684	Appraisal district				
	17795 HIGHWAY 124	187 S. R. PERKINS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123636	FANNETT	249535	Appraisal district				
	18075 HIGHWAY 124	187 S. R. PERKINS	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 123642	FANNETT	138667	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	18143 HIGHWAY 124	187 S. R. PERKINS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123643	FANNETT	138663	Appraisal district				
	14183 HWY 124	82 BBB & C RY.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123117	FANNETT	135550	Appraisal district				
	10745 JOHNSON RD	211 T & NO	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 131049	FANNETT	139353	Appraisal district				
	14248 LETTIE LN	198 W. H. SMITH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131243	FANNETT	259542	Appraisal district				
	14276 LETTIE LN	198 W. H. SMITH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131244	FANNETT	139112	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	14553 LETTIE LN	BRIGGS ESTATES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131172	FANNETT	416262	Appraisal district				
	8333 LONGHORN DR	68 D. BURRELL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123805	FANNETT	135315	Appraisal district				
	10937 LULUE LN	38 THOS. MCFARLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131047	FANNETT	131832	Appraisal district				
	10866 MAHON RD	559 JNO. TUCKER	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123414	FANNETT	141345	Appraisal district				
	10879 MAHON RD	130 JOS. GALLIER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123435	FANNETT	137363	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	10910 MAHON RD	559 JNO. TUCKER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123416	FANNETT	141246	Appraisal district				
	11061 MAHON RD	130 JOS. GALLIER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123461	FANNETT	137331	Appraisal district				
	11100 MAHON RD	130 JOS. GALLIER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123457	FANNETT	137332	Appraisal district				
	11142 MAHON RD	130 JOS. GALLIER	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123452	FANNETT	137367	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	11143 MAHON RD	130 JOS. GALLIER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123488	FANNETT	137398	Appraisal district				
	11168 MAHON RD	130 JOS. GALLIER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123442	FANNETT	137334	Appraisal district				
	8640 MANDY LN	MANDY LANE	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123208	FANNETT	415312	In field estimate				
	8770 MANDY LN	130 JOS. GALLIER	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123203	FANNETT	344714	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	8772 MANDY LN	130 JOS. GALLIER	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123205	FANNETT	267614	Appraisal district				
	8786 MANDY LN	130 JOS. GALLIER	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123207	FANNETT	137353	In field estimate				
	8700 BLOCK MANDY LN	130 JOS. GALLIER	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123206	FANNETT	386674	In field estimate				
	8703 MCGEE LN	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123413	FANNETT	126296	Appraisal district				
	8744 MCGEE LN	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 123473	FANNETT	126502	Appraisal district				
	8790 MCGEE LN	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123476	FANNETT	126300	Appraisal district				
	8920 MCGEE LN	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123481	FANNETT	126306	Appraisal district				
	8943 MCGEE LN		1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123458	FANNETT	126569	In field estimate				
	8983 MCGEE LN	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123485	FANNETT	126557	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	11757 OLD FANNETT RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123667	FANNETT	126440	In field estimate				
	11764 OLD FANNETT RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123662	FANNETT	126351	Appraisal district				
	11840 OLD FANNETT RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123658	FANNETT	126342	Appraisal district				
	11855 OLD FANNETT RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 123669	FANNETT	263068	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	11910 OLD FANNETT RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123650	FANNETT	126438	Appraisal district				
	11900 BLOCK OLD FANNETT RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 123675	FANNETT	126417	In field estimate				
	9025 OLD GILBERT RD	130 JOS. GALLIER	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123495	FANNETT	137348	Appraisal district				
	9046 OLD GILBERT RD	559 JNO. TUCKER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123497	FANNETT	141229	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9159 OLD GILBERT RD	130 JOS. GALLIER	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123427	FANNETT	137359	Appraisal district				
	9174 OLD GILBERT RD	559 JNO. TUCKER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123424	FANNETT	141344	Appraisal district				
	9182 OLD GILBERT RD	559 JNO. TUCKER	1945			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 123422	FANNETT	141231	In field estimate				
	9216 OLD GILBERT RD	559 JNO. TUCKER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123420	FANNETT	141232	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9275 OLD GILBERT RD	559 JNO. TUCKER	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123398	FANNETT	141238	Appraisal district				
	9321 OLD GILBERT RD	559 JNO. TUCKER	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123384	FANNETT	141249	In field estimate				
	9354 OLD GILBERT RD	559 JNO. TUCKER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123382	FANNETT	141294	Appraisal district				
	9378 OLD GILBERT RD	559 JNO. TUCKER	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123396	FANNETT	263817	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9398 OLD GILBERT RD	559 JNO. TUCKER	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123394	FANNETT	141244	Appraisal district				
	9414 OLD GILBERT RD	559 JNO. TUCKER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123392	FANNETT	141325	Appraisal district				
	9432 OLD GILBERT RD	559 JNO. TUCKER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123390	FANNETT	141331	Appraisal district				
	9452 OLD GILBERT RD	559 JNO. TUCKER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123387	FANNETT	141337	Appraisal district				
	9478 OLD GILBERT RD	559 JNO. TUCKER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 123400	FANNETT	141359	Appraisal district				
	9492 OLD GILBERT RD	559 JNO. TUCKER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123402	FANNETT	141273	Appraisal district				
	9894 OLD GILBERT RD	35 J. C. LAWHON	1965		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 126316	FANNETT	131099	In field estimate				
	7385 PATTERSON RD	68 D. BURRELL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	Limited visibility from ROW
HHM ID: 123300	FANNETT	134960	Appraisal district				
	7548 PATTERSON RD	PATTERSON ROAD ESTATES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123305	FANNETT	80363	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	7645 PATTERSON RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123306	FANNETT	135137	Appraisal district				
	7905 PATTERSON RD	68 D. BURRELL	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123325	FANNETT	135050	Appraisal district				
	7916 PATTERSON RD	PATTERSON ROAD ESTATES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123326	FANNETT	80333	Appraisal district				
	8074 PATTERSON RD	PATTERSON ROAD ESTATES	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131247	FANNETT	80324	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	8124 PATTERSON RD	PATTERSON ROAD ESTATES	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131188	FANNETT	262724	In field estimate				
	8241 PATTERSON RD A	68 D. BURRELL	1940			ROE needed	Limited visibility from ROW
HHM ID: 131249	FANNETT	135045	In field estimate				
	8322 PATTERSON RD	68 D. BURRELL	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131177	FANNETT	135230	In field estimate				
	8000 BLOCK PATTERSON RD	68 D. BURRELL	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131175	FANNETT	263272	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	10839 SANDY LN	38 THOS. MCFARLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126291	FANNETT	131802	Appraisal district				
	10913 SANDY LN	38 THOS. MCFARLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126295	FANNETT	131800	Appraisal district				
	10961 SANDY LN	38 THOS. MCFARLAND	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126298	FANNETT	131804	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	11135 SANDY LN		1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126309	FANNETT	131805	In field estimate				
	11683 SHADY OAKS LN	187 S. R. PERKINS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123617	FANNETT	138679	Appraisal district				
	13034 THORNTON DR	68 D. BURRELL	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 131353	FANNETT	134897	Appraisal district				
	13142 THORNTON DR	68 D. BURRELL	1908			ROE needed	Limited visibility from ROW - private road
HHM ID: 131354	FANNETT	361382	Appraisal district				
	8561 TIMMS LN	10 M. CHIRINO	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123615	FANNETT	126593	In field estimate				
	8737 TIMMS LN	489 J. DUGAT JR	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123625	FANNETT	140890	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	8841 TIMMS LN	489 J. DUGAT JR	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123639	FANNETT	140897	Appraisal district				
	8856 TIMMS LN	489 J. DUGAT JR	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123621	FANNETT	140887	Appraisal district				
	VICTORY LN	68 D. BURRELL	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123768	FANNETT	250988	In field estimate				
	11105 WIGGINS RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123187	FANNETT	126278	Appraisal district				
	11193 WIGGINS RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 123220	FANNETT	126468	Appraisal district				
	11363 WIGGINS RD	10 M. CHIRINO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123594	FANNETT	263064	Appraisal district				
	850 WILLIS BARROW SUBDIVISION	850 WILLIS BARROW SUBDIVISION	1960 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123188	FANNETT		In field estimate				
	GREEN ACRES	GREEN ACRES	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123159	FANNETT		In field estimate				
	GREEN ACRES NORTH SUBDIVISION	GREEN ACRES NORTH SUBDIVISION	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123149	FANNETT		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	GREEN ACRES SOUTH SUBDIVISION	GREEN ACRES SOUTH SUBDIVISION	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123166	FANNETT		In field estimate				
	5021 25TH ST	SYLVAN CTS.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126830	GROVES	106028	Appraisal district				
	5027 25TH ST	SYLVAN CTS.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126829	GROVES	106034	Appraisal district				
	5035 25TH ST	SYLVAN CTS.	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126828	GROVES	106033	In field estimate				
	5041 25TH ST	SYLVAN CTS.	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126827	GROVES	106035	In field estimate				
	5500 25TH ST	PALCO - P.A.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126741	GROVES	72912	In field estimate				
	5505 25TH ST	PALCO - P.A.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126811	GROVES	72918	In field estimate				
	5540 25TH ST	PALCO - P.A.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126804	GROVES	72915	In field estimate				
	5549 25TH ST	PALCO - P.A.	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126810	GROVES	72920	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	6267 25TH ST	PALCO - P.N.	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126689	GROVES	76299	In field estimate				
	6299 25TH ST	PALCO - P.N.	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126690	GROVES	76300	In field estimate				
	6301 25TH ST	PALCO - P.N.	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126691	GROVES	76301	In field estimate				
	6775 25TH ST	PALCO - P.N.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126628	GROVES	76246	Appraisal district				
	6800 BLOCK 25TH ST	WHITES ACRES	1960-2010		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126501	GROVES	115091	In field estimate				
	5030 32ND ST	PALCO - P.A.	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126892	GROVES	72992	Appraisal district				
	5236 32ND ST	PALCO - P.A.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126895	GROVES	73003	Appraisal district				
	5427 32ND ST	PALCO - P.A.	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127052	GROVES	72921	In field estimate				
	5801 32ND ST	PALCO - P.N.	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127042	GROVES	76461	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	5101 39TH ST	GLASIER	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127241	GROVES	36319	In field estimate				
	5109 39TH ST	GLASIER	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127240	GROVES	36320	In field estimate				
	5225 39TH ST	PALCO - P.A.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127239	GROVES	73021	Appraisal district				
	5500 39TH ST	PALCO - P.A.	1966		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127145	GROVES	72924	Appraisal district				
	5601 39TH ST	PALCO - P.N.	1958	Levingston Funeral Home	Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 127490	GROVES	76467	Appraisal district				
	5631 39TH ST	PALCO - P.N.	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127481	GROVES	76470	In field estimate				
	5711 39TH ST	PALCO - P.N.	1959		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127480	GROVES	76468	Appraisal district				
	6039 39TH ST	MAIN AVE. BUSINESS CENTER	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127400	GROVES	60190	In field estimate				
	6110 39TH ST	SOUTH MAIN	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127438	GROVES	103301	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	6120 39TH ST	SOUTH MAIN	1963		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127437	GROVES	103312	Appraisal district				
	3020 ALLISON AVE	PALCO - P.A.	1978			Intensive survey needed - within possible larger district: Groves Mid-Century Subdivisions (Palco - PA, Griffing Estates 1, Telstar, Sylvan Cts., Griffing Court)	
HHM ID: 126826	GROVES	72987	Appraisal district				
	4910 ATLANTIC RD	RIVER OAKS	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	CAD incorrectly lists as on Pure Atlantic Rd
HHM ID: 127941	GROVES	96648	Appraisal district				
	4914 ATLANTIC RD	RIVER OAKS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127942	GROVES	96647	Appraisal district				
	4721 BOYD AVE	PALCO - P.N.	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 127622	GROVES	76483	In field estimate				
	4749 BOYD AVE	PALCO - P.N.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127623	GROVES	76484	In field estimate				
	4301 CANAL AVE	PALCO - P.A.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127595	GROVES	73086	In field estimate				
	3901 CLEVELAND AVE	GROVES PRIMARY CAMPUS	1948	Groves Elementary School	Individually eligible for NRHP (Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 127429	GROVES	422269	https://www.pngisd.org/domain/637				
	4548 CLEVELAND AVE		1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127803	GROVES	81511	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	4800 CLEVELAND AVE	LEE TO GROVES	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127992	GROVES	57574	In field estimate				
	2729 FIRST AVE		1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126831	GROVES	59277	In field estimate				
	4020 GLAZER AVE	GLASIER	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127245	GROVES	36322	Appraisal district				
	5031 GRIFFING CT	COBBLESTONE COURTS	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126869	GROVES	22776	In field estimate				
	5305 GULFWAY DR BLDG A	PALCO - P.A.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126461	GROVES	72909	Appraisal district				
	5305 GULFWAY DR BLDG B	PALCO - P.A.	1973	Beverly Place Apartments	Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126460	GROVES	72908	Appraisal district				
	5401 GULFWAY DR	PALCO - P.A.	1976		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126454	GROVES	72910	Appraisal district				
	6246 JEFFERSON BLVD	PECAN GROVES	1920		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 130219	GROVES	81625	In field estimate				
	6301 JEFFERSON BLVD	PECAN GROVES	1920		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 130170	GROVES	81420	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	6498 JEFFERSON BLVD	PECAN GROVES	1930		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 127800	GROVES	81685	In field estimate				
	6523 JEFFERSON BLVD	PECAN GROVES	1920		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 130169	GROVES	81484	In field estimate				
	5285 JEFFERSON W BLVD	PALCO - P.A.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127599	GROVES	73087	Appraisal district				
	5301 JEFFERSON W BLVD	PALCO - P.A.	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127594	GROVES	73081	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	5801 JEFFERSON W BLVD	THE GROVES	1970	Peace Lutheran Church	Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 127753	GROVES	41230	In field estimate				
	4549 LAWNDALE AVE	PALCO - P.A.	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	Limited visibility from ROW
HHM ID: 127600	GROVES	73071	In field estimate				
	4722 LAWNDALE AVE	PALCO - P.N.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127602	GROVES	76582	In field estimate				
	3947 LINCOLN AVE	C C ESTATES	1950		Individually eligible for NRHP (Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 127868	GROVES	24137	In field estimate				
	3115 MAIN AVE	PALCO - P.N.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126704	GROVES	76452, 76456	Appraisal district				
	3515 MAIN AVE	MAIN AVE.	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127264	GROVES	60178	Appraisal district				
	3840 MAIN AVE	SOUTH MAIN	1950-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127436	GROVES	103313	Appraisal district				
	3944 MAIN AVE	SOUTH MAIN	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127439	GROVES	103300	Appraisal district				
	5000 MAIN AVE	PECAN GROVES	1930		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 127426	GROVES	81144	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	4000 BLOCK MAIN AVE	MAIN AVE. BUSINESS CENTER	1950-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127398	GROVES	60192	In field estimate				
	2630 MAPLE AVE	WHITES ACRES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126644	GROVES	115092	Appraisal district				
	4830 MC KINLEY AVE	27 JOS. GRIGSBY	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127918	GROVES	130064	In field estimate				
	4840 MC KINLEY AVE	NEWSOME PH 2	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127921	GROVES	67975	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	5011 MONROE BLVD	PALCO - P.N.	1973		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128016	GROVES	76588	Appraisal district				
	5031 MONROE BLVD	PALCO - P.N.	1966		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128015	GROVES	76589	Appraisal district				
	5035 MONROE BLVD	PALCO - P.N.	1973		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128014	GROVES	76590	Appraisal district				
	5190 MONROE BLVD	PALCO - P.A.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127551	GROVES	73088	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	5312 MONROE BLVD	PALCO - P.N.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127601	GROVES	76581	In field estimate				
	5500 MONROE BLVD	PALCO - P.N.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127624	GROVES	76481	In field estimate				
	5600 MONROE BLVD	PALCO - P.N.	1935		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 127625	GROVES	76487	In field estimate				
	5628 MONROE BLVD	PALCO - P.N.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127626	GROVES	76485	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	5648 MONROE BLVD	PALCO - P.N.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127684	GROVES	76492	In field estimate				
	5700 MONROE BLVD	PALCO - P.N.	1935		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 127680	GROVES	76491	In field estimate				
	5720 MONROE BLVD	PALCO - P.N.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127673	GROVES	76489	In field estimate				
	5730 MONROE BLVD	PALCO - P.N.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127666	GROVES	76490	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	5849 MONROE BLVD	FLOYD	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127635	GROVES	33444	In field estimate				
	5901 MONROE BLVD	FLOYD	1948		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127747	GROVES	33445	Appraisal district				
	5200 BLOCK MONROE BLVD	PALCO - P.A.	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127579	GROVES	409091	In field estimate				
	2420 OWENS AVE		1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126730	GROVES	393998	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	5509 PARKWAY ST	PALCO - P.N.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127492	GROVES	76473	Appraisal district				
	3500 PARKWAY E ST	PALCO - P.N.	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127265	GROVES	76459	Appraisal district				
	5101 PARKWAY E ST	PALCO - P.A.	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127539	GROVES	73033	Appraisal district				
	5121 PARKWAY E ST	PALCO - P.A.	1977		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127538	GROVES	73031	Appraisal district				
	5140 PARKWAY E ST	PALCO - P.A.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 127244	GROVES	73030	Appraisal district				
	5239 PARKWAY E ST	PALCO - P.A.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127537	GROVES	73014	Appraisal district				
	5449 PARKWAY E ST	PALCO - P.N.	1973		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127495	GROVES	76471	Appraisal district				
	5601 PARKWAY E ST	PALCO - P.N.	1967		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127491	GROVES	76474	Appraisal district				
	2201 PARKWAY W ST	PALCO - P.N.	1977		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126489	GROVES	76229	Appraisal district				
	3301 PARKWAY W ST	MAIN AVE.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 127031	GROVES	60174	Appraisal district				
	5148 PARKWAY W ST	GLASIER	1976		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127246	GROVES	36323	Appraisal district				
	5200 PARKWAY W ST	PALCO - P.A.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127247	GROVES	73009	Appraisal district				
	3548 PURE ATLANTIC RD	PALCO - P.N.	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127937	GROVES	76112	In field estimate				
	3762 PURE ATLANTIC RD	PALCO - P.N.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127935	GROVES	76132	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	3778 PURE ATLANTIC RD	PALCO - P.N.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127934	GROVES	76130	Appraisal district				
	3780 PURE ATLANTIC RD	PALCO - P.N.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127932	GROVES	76128	Appraisal district				
	3900 PURE ATLANTIC RD	PALCO - P.N.	1948		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127931	GROVES	76124	Appraisal district				
	2921 RUBY DR	PALCO - P.N.	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127021	GROVES	76441	In field estimate				
	6150 SHORT ST	C C ESTATES	1950	Groves Central Fire Station	Individually eligible for NRHP (Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property -)	Possesses integrity and significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 127441	GROVES	24132	In field estimate				
	5200 SIMPSON AVE	PALCO - P.N.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128074	GROVES	76600	In field estimate				
	5500 SONNIER LN	PALCO - P.N.	1950		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 128088	GROVES	76495	In field estimate				
	6010 MARTIN ST		1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126716	GROVES	403364	In field estimate				
	2610 TWIN CITY HWY	SYLVAN CTS.	1955			Intensive survey needed - within possible larger district: Groves Mid-Century Subdivisions (Palco - PA, Griffing Estates 1, Telstar, Sylvan Cts., Griffing Court)	
HHM ID: 126871	GROVES	106027	In field estimate				
	2800 TWIN CITY HWY	PALCO - P.A.	1962			Intensive survey needed - within possible larger district: Groves Mid-Century Subdivisions (Palco - PA,	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126872	GROVES	72988	Appraisal district			Griffing Estates 1, Telstar, Sylvan Cts., Griffing Court)	
	2828 TWIN CITY HWY	PALCO - P.A.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126880	GROVES	72989	Appraisal district				
	4700 TWIN CITY HWY	PALCO - P.A.	1971		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127544	GROVES	73037	Appraisal district				
	4830 TWIN CITY HWY	PALCO - P.N.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128010	GROVES	76591	Appraisal district				
	5000 TWIN CITY HWY	PALCO - P.N.	1973		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128009	GROVES	76583	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	5252 TWIN CITY HWY	PALCO - P.N.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128098	GROVES	76593	Appraisal district				
	5336 TWIN CITY HWY	KINARD D	1971		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	Address is 5332 on building
HHM ID: 128099	GROVES	51589	Appraisal district				
	3900 TWIN CITY HWY	GREENLAWN MEMORIAL PARK	1898-2020		Eligible as a district (Greenlawn Memorial Park -)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 127141	GROVES		Marker				
	5249 VAN BUREN BLVD	PALCO - P.N.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128052	GROVES	76601	Appraisal district				
	6400 VAN BUREN ST	JOSEPH GRIGSBY VAN BUREN ELEM & GROVES MIDDLE	1955	Van Buren Elementary	Individually eligible for NRHP (Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property -)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 127787	GROVES	130026	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	VINCENT DR	PALCO - P.A.	1938		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 126739	GROVES	72913	On 1938 aerial				
	6170 WASHINGTON ST	PECAN GROVES	1925		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 130161	GROVES	81865	In field estimate				
	7045 WASHINGTON ST	27 JOS. GRIGSBY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127862	GROVES	130042	Appraisal district				
	5501 WASHINGTON W ST	PALCO - P.N.	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127530	GROVES	76472	In field estimate				
	4200 WILSON AVE	27 JOS. GRIGSBY	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127860	GROVES	130041	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	4700 WILSON AVE	27 JOS. GRIGSBY	1940	empty in 1938, trees and house by 1956	Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127910	GROVES	130066	In field estimate				
	4800 WILSON AVE	27 JOS. GRIGSBY	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127915	GROVES	130057	In field estimate				
	4849 WILSON ST	LEE TO GROVES	1930		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 127821	GROVES	57476	In field estimate				
	4948 WILSON AVE	27 JOS. GRIGSBY	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127837	GROVES	130050	In field estimate				
	4956 WILSON AVE	27 JOS. GRIGSBY	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127840	GROVES	130088	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	5010 WILSON AVE	27 JOS. GRIGSBY	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127848	GROVES	130115	In field estimate				
	5200 WILSON AVE	27 JOS. GRIGSBY	1920			ROE needed	Limited visibility from ROW
HHM ID: 127813	GROVES	130017	In field estimate				
	4960-4970 WILSON AVE	27 JOS. GRIGSBY	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127845	GROVES	130053, 130055	In field estimate				
	27 JOS. GRIGSBY (4655-4701 ROOSEVELT AVE)	27 JOS. GRIGSBY (4655-4701 ROOSEVELT AVE)	1940-1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127925	GROVES		In field estimate				
	27 JOS. GRIGSBY	27 JOS. GRIGSBY	1950 - 1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127795	GROVES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	ALFORD PLACE	ALFORD PLACE	1930-1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127386	GROVES		In field estimate				
	ATLANTIC GARDENS	ATLANTIC GARDENS	1930-1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127061	GROVES		In field estimate				
	ATLANTIC HEIGHTS 1	ATLANTIC HEIGHTS 1	1940-2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127371	GROVES		In field estimate				
	ATLANTIC HEIGHTS 2	ATLANTIC HEIGHTS 2	1960 - 1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127368	GROVES		In field estimate				
	AZWELL	AZWELL	1920-1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127859	GROVES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	BON AIR (5024-5048 Monroe Blvd)	BON AIR (5024-5048 Monroe Blvd)	1945 - 1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127545	GROVES		In field estimate				
	BOYD	BOYD	1935-1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126940	GROVES		In field estimate				
	BREAUX ACRE (5500-5599 WHITAKER ST)	BREAUX ACRE (5500-5599 WHITAKER ST)	1950-1973		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128096	GROVES		In field estimate				
	BUSHMAN	BUSHMAN	1945-1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127390	GROVES		In field estimate				
	CEDAR CREST	CEDAR CREST	1945-2022		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126554	GROVES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	COUNTRY CLUB ESTATES	COUNTRY CLUB ESTATES	1930-1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127286	GROVES		In field estimate				
	CRESENT	CRESENT	1965-1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126736	GROVES		In field estimate				
	DIXIE GARDENS TO PORT ARTHUR	DIXIE GARDENS TO PORT ARTHUR	1940-2022		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 128100	GROVES		In field estimate				
	EAST PORT ARTHUR	EAST PORT ARTHUR	1945-1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126679	GROVES		In field estimate				
	EMBLER	EMBLER	1956-1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126897	GROVES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	EXPRESSWAY	EXPRESSWAY	1950 - 1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127032	GROVES		In field estimate				
	FAIRHAVEN	FAIRHAVEN	1930-1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126825	GROVES		In field estimate				
	FERNDALE	FERNDALE	1945-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126500	GROVES		In field estimate				
	FOSTER HEIGHTS 1	FOSTER HEIGHTS 1	1950-1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128033	GROVES		In field estimate				
	FOSTER HEIGHTS 2	FOSTER HEIGHTS 2	1950-1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128029	GROVES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	FOSTER HEIGHTS 3	FOSTER HEIGHTS 3	1960 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128008	GROVES		In field estimate				
	GARDEN FARMS	GARDEN FARMS	1945-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126692	GROVES		In field estimate				
	GLEN COVE	GLEN COVE	1940-2029		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126758	GROVES		In field estimate				
	GLENHAVEN MANOR	GLENHAVEN MANOR	1975-1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126498	GROVES		In field estimate				
	GOLF TERRACE	GOLF TERRACE	1965 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127714	GROVES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	GOLFCREST 1	GOLFCREST 1	1950-2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127751	GROVES		In field estimate				
	GOLFCREST 2	GOLFCREST 2	1950-2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127621	GROVES		In field estimate				
	GONZALES ESTATES	GONZALES ESTATES	1960 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127327	GROVES		In field estimate				
	GRAVES ESTATES	GRAVES ESTATES	1950-1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127049	GROVES		In field estimate				
	GRIFFING COURT	GRIFFING COURT	1965-1975			Intensive survey needed - possible larger district: Groves Mid-Century Subdivisions (Palco - PA, Griffing Estates 1, Telstar, Sylvan Cts., Griffing Court)	
HHM ID: 126882	GROVES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	GRIFFING ESTATES 1	GRIFFING ESTATES 1	1950-1965			Intensive survey needed - possible larger district: Groves Mid-Century Subdivisions (Palco - PA, Griffing Estates 1, Telstar, Sylvan Cts., Griffing Court)	
HHM ID: 126893	GROVES		In field estimate				
	GRIFFING ESTATES 2	GRIFFING ESTATES 2	1965-1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126937	GROVES		In field estimate				
	GROVES ACRE	GROVES ACRE	1920-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127984	GROVES		In field estimate				
	GROVES S. D.	GROVES S. D.	1950-2010		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127749	GROVES		In field estimate				
	GROVES S. D.	GROVES S. D.	1950-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127474	GROVES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	GROVESDALE	GROVESDALE	1945-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127326	GROVES		In field estimate				
	GROVESVIEW	GROVESVIEW	1940-1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127354	GROVES		In field estimate				
	HIGHLINE	HIGHLINE	1945-1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127053	GROVES		In field estimate				
	HOLLIER HEIGHTS	HOLLIER HEIGHTS	1965-1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126732	GROVES		In field estimate				
	JACKSON PLACE	JACKSON PLACE	1945-1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126456	GROVES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	JEFFERSON GARDENS	JEFFERSON GARDENS	1950-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128097	GROVES		In field estimate				
	JOUBERT PLACE	JOUBERT PLACE	1960-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127362	GROVES		In field estimate				
	KEENEY	KEENEY	1950-2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127720	GROVES		In field estimate				
	KENSINGTON PLACE 1	KENSINGTON PLACE 1	1978 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126502	GROVES		In field estimate				
	KENTWOOD REVISED	KENTWOOD REVISED	1950 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126948	GROVES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	LAY	LAY	1940-1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127122	GROVES		In field estimate				
	LEE ACRES	LEE ACRES	1920-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127857	GROVES		In field estimate				
	LEE TO GROVES	LEE TO GROVES	1940-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127851	GROVES		In field estimate				
	LILLIE	LILLIE	1920-1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128094	GROVES		In field estimate				
	LINCOLN AVE EXTENSION	LINCOLN AVE EXTENSION	1950 - 1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 127752	GROVES		In field estimate				
	LUCKYWOOD	LUCKYWOOD	1970 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127861	GROVES		In field estimate				
	LYNDALE	LYNDALE	1945-1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126822	GROVES		In field estimate				
	MAIN AVE.	MAIN AVE.	1950 - 1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127036	GROVES		In field estimate				
	MELROSE	MELROSE	1945-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126499	GROVES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	NETTLES, WALTER	NETTLES, WALTER	1950-2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127347	GROVES		In field estimate				
	NORTH GROVES 2	NORTH GROVES 2	1950 - 1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127798	GROVES		In field estimate				
	NORTH GROVES 2 EXT	NORTH GROVES 2 EXT	1940 - 1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127799	GROVES		In field estimate				
	ORANGE ACRES (Orange Acres Dr)	ORANGE ACRES (Orange Acres Dr)	1950 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126455	GROVES		In field estimate				
	OSBORNE PLACE	OSBORNE PLACE	1950-1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 127146	GROVES		In field estimate				
	OSBORNE, P. L.	OSBORNE, P. L.	1950 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127258	GROVES		In field estimate				
	PALCO - P.N. (2735-2945 Ruby Dr)	PALCO - P.N. (2735-2945 Ruby Dr)	1950-1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127027	GROVES		In field estimate				
	PALCO - P.N. (3317-3325 Berry Ave.)	PALCO - P.N. (3317-3325 Berry Ave.)	1950 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127046	GROVES		In field estimate				
	PEARL GARDENS	PEARL GARDENS	1940-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126708	GROVES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	PECAN GROVES TO PORT ARTHUR	PECAN GROVES TO PORT ARTHUR	1920-2020			Intensive survey needed - possible smaller districts	
HHM ID: 127395	GROVES		In field estimate				
	PLAZA TERRACE 1	PLAZA TERRACE 1	1965-2010		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126563	GROVES		In field estimate				
	PLAZA TERRACE 2	PLAZA TERRACE 2	1965-2010		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126561	GROVES		In field estimate				
	POST OAK MANOR	POST OAK MANOR	1970-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126678	GROVES		In field estimate				
	RAINBOW	RAINBOW	1970-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126567	GROVES		In field estimate				
	RHODES TRAHAN IN P. N.	RHODES TRAHAN IN P. N.	1965-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126485	GROVES		In field estimate				
	RICHARD, C. H. IN P. N.	RICHARD, C. H. IN P. N.	1950-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127322	GROVES		In field estimate				
	RIDGE	RIDGE	1940-2010		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127735	GROVES		In field estimate				
	RIDGELAWN	RIDGELAWN	1940-1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127051	GROVES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	RIDGELAWN	RIDGELAWN	1950 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127144	GROVES		In field estimate				
	ROSELAWN IN P. A.	ROSELAWN IN P. A.	1945-1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126729	GROVES		In field estimate				
	SASSINE HEIGHTS	SASSINE HEIGHTS	1945-1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126894	GROVES		In field estimate				
	SMITH D S 1	SMITH D S 1	1945-1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126709	GROVES		In field estimate				
	SMITH D S 2	SMITH D S 2	1945-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126627	GROVES		In field estimate				
	SOUTH GROVES	SOUTH GROVES	1940 - 1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127289	GROVES		In field estimate				
	SOUTH TAFT	SOUTH TAFT	1950-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127358	GROVES		In field estimate				
	SPENCE IN P. A.	SPENCE IN P. A.	1945-1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126950	GROVES		In field estimate				
	SPENCE IN P. N.	SPENCE IN P. N.	1945 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126959	GROVES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	SUNCREST	SUNCREST	1950-2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127345	GROVES		In field estimate				
	TELSTAR	TELSTAR	1965-1975			Intensive survey needed - possible larger district: Groves Mid-Century Subdivisions (Palco - PA, Griffing Estates 1, Telstar, Sylvan Cts., Griffing Court)	
HHM ID: 126886	GROVES		In field estimate				
	TERRELL HEIGHTS	TERRELL HEIGHTS	1930 - 1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127277	GROVES		In field estimate				
	TORMEY ESTATES	TORMEY ESTATES	1955-1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126896	GROVES		In field estimate				
	TWIN OAKS	TWIN OAKS	1945-1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126945	GROVES		In field estimate				
	VAL VERDE GARDENS	VAL VERDE GARDENS	1945-2022		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126598	GROVES		In field estimate				
	VAUGHN 1	VAUGHN 1	1940-1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127263	GROVES		In field estimate				
	VAUGHN 2	VAUGHN 2	1955 - 1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127050	GROVES		In field estimate				
	WARREN 1	WARREN 1	1950-1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126457	GROVES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	WARREN 2	WARREN 2	1950-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126488	GROVES		In field estimate				
	WESTGROVE 1	WESTGROVE 1	1950 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127620	GROVES		In field estimate				
	WESTGROVE 2	WESTGROVE 2	1950 - 1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127582	GROVES		In field estimate				
	WESTGROVE CIRCLE	WESTGROVE CIRCLE	1955 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127534	GROVES		In field estimate				
	WILLA 1	WILLA 1	1945-1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 127142	GROVES		In field estimate				
	WILLA 2	WILLA 2	1935-1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127143	GROVES		In field estimate				
	WILLIAMS, WM. E. JR.	WILLIAMS, WM. E. JR.	1950-2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126964	GROVES		In field estimate				
	WYNNEWOOD ESTATES	WYNNEWOOD ESTATES	1965-1970		Eligible as a district (Wynnewood Estates)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 127863	GROVES		In field estimate				
	12336 2ND ST	620 T & NO	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 122199	HAMSHIRE	141697	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	12431 2ND ST	620 T & NO	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122186	HAMSHIRE	141736	Aerial images				
	12490 2ND ST	HAMSHIRE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122205	HAMSHIRE	43202	Appraisal district				
	12702 2ND ST	HAMSHIRE	1966		Individually eligible for NRHP (Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 121903	HAMSHIRE	43201	Appraisal district				
	12761 2ND ST	620 T & NO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121928	HAMSHIRE	141672	Appraisal district				
	12700 BLOCK 2ND ST	620 T & NO	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 121915	HAMSHIRE	385893	Appraisal district				
	12700 BLOCK 2ND	HAMSHIRE	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	Address is Beaumont Ave in CAD
HHM ID: 121917	HAMSHIRE	43216	In field estimate				
	15521 ALAMO ST	HAMSHIRE	1958		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122208	HAMSHIRE	43207	Appraisal district				
	15541 ALAMO ST	HAMSHIRE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122212	HAMSHIRE	43206	Appraisal district				
	15579 ALAMO ST	HAMSHIRE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122217	HAMSHIRE	43203	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	15670 ALAMO STREET		1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122397	HAMSHIRE	43212	Appraisal district				
	15824 ALAMO ST	620 T & NO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122232	HAMSHIRE	141725	Appraisal district				
	15700 BLOCK ALAMO ST	620 T & NO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122231	HAMSHIRE	141717	Appraisal district				
	10477 BILL GAULDING RD	198 W. H. SMITH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123840	HAMSHIRE	138921	Appraisal district				
	10619 BILL GAULDING RD	198 W. H. SMITH	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 123839	HAMSHIRE	139113	Appraisal district				
	13753 BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123263	HAMSHIRE	134799	Appraisal district				
	13910 BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123276	HAMSHIRE	134903	Appraisal district				
	13949 BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1973		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123282	HAMSHIRE	135130	Appraisal district				
	13950 BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123285	HAMSHIRE	134892	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	14295 BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131191	HAMSHIRE	134930	Appraisal district				
	14349 BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131192	HAMSHIRE	135087	Appraisal district				
	14366 BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	Limited visibility from ROW
HHM ID: 131255	HAMSHIRE	135303	Appraisal district				
	14475 BOONDOCKS RD	CIRCLE J ACRES	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131257	HAMSHIRE	249910	In field estimate				
	14492 BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	Limited visibility from ROW

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 131260	HAMSHIRE	135365	Appraisal district				
	14500 BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1971		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	Limited visibility from ROW
HHM ID: 131266	HAMSHIRE	347087	Appraisal district				
	14539 BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131263	HAMSHIRE	135091	Appraisal district				
	14699 BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131283	HAMSHIRE	135085	Appraisal district				
	14731 BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131286	HAMSHIRE	263497	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	14752 BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131269	HAMSHIRE	135339	Appraisal district				
	14774 BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131272	HAMSHIRE	134899	Appraisal district				
	14804 BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131276	HAMSHIRE	134966	Appraisal district				
	14876 BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1920		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 131279	HAMSHIRE	135118	In field estimate				
	14933 BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 123237	HAMSHIRE	135103	In field estimate				
	15011 BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 123235	HAMSHIRE	135101	Appraisal district				
	15026 BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123233	HAMSHIRE	135173	Appraisal district				
	16629 BOONDOCKS RD	191 WM. REEVES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123228	HAMSHIRE	138795	Appraisal district				
	16894 BOONDOCKS RD	191 WM. REEVES	1968			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 123212	HAMSHIRE	138798	Appraisal district				
	16898 BOONDOCKS RD	191 WM. REEVES	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 123211	HAMSHIRE	138809	Appraisal district				
	16900 BOONDOCKS RD	191 WM. REEVES	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 123210	HAMSHIRE	138808	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	16902 BOONDOCKS RD	191 WM. REEVES	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 123209	HAMSHIRE	138801	Appraisal district				
	16911 BOONDOCKS RD	191 WM. REEVES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123162	HAMSHIRE	138832	Appraisal district				
	16955 BOONDOCKS RD	191 WM. REEVES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123160	HAMSHIRE	138804	Appraisal district				
	16967 BOONDOCKS RD	191 WM. REEVES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123153	HAMSHIRE	138838	Appraisal district				
	16975 BOONDOCKS RD	191 WM. REEVES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123150	HAMSHIRE	138837	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	17487 BOONDOCKS RD	747 J. W. DENNY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123143	HAMSHIRE	142497	Appraisal district				
	17901 BOONDOCKS RD	747 J. W. DENNY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123087	HAMSHIRE	142476	Appraisal district				
	18064 BOONDOCKS RD	509 L. HAMSHIRE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123084	HAMSHIRE	140964	Appraisal district				
	18164 BOONDOCKS RD	509 L. HAMSHIRE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123079	HAMSHIRE	405237	Appraisal district				
	15300 BLOCK BOONDOCKS RD	191 WM. REEVES	1938			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 123224	HAMSHIRE	138818	Appraisal district				
	15300 BLOCK BOONDOCKS RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 123232	HAMSHIRE	135211	Appraisal district				
	BROUSSARD CEMETERY RD	198 W. H. SMITH	1861-2021	Broussard Cemetery	Eligible as a district (Broussard Cemetery)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 123824	HAMSHIRE	139127, 139091	Oldest grave per FindAGrave.com				
	6823 CYPRESS LN	745 R. W. DENNY	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123132	HAMSHIRE	400291	Appraisal district				
	12865 FIG PLANT RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 136	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121939	HAMSHIRE	52761	Appraisal district				
	12880 FIG PLANT RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121936	HAMSHIRE	52710	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	12949 FIG PLANT RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 136	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121942	HAMSHIRE	52768	Appraisal district				
	13004 FIG PLANT RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121945	HAMSHIRE	52722	Appraisal district				
	13055 FIG PLANT RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 136	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121948	HAMSHIRE	52766	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13083 FIG PLANT RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 136	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121951	HAMSHIRE	52770	Appraisal district				
	13092 FIG PLANT RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121961	HAMSHIRE	52725	Appraisal district				
	13102 FIG PLANT RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121965	HAMSHIRE	52739	Appraisal district				
	13162 FIG PLANT RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121972	HAMSHIRE	52732	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13190 FIG PLANT RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121975	HAMSHIRE	52748	Appraisal district				
	13247 FIG PLANT RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 136	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122073	HAMSHIRE	52778	Appraisal district				
	13252 FIG PLANT RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121989	HAMSHIRE	52730	Appraisal district				
	16426 GALLIER RD	332 T & NO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122962	HAMSHIRE	139908	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	16793 GALLIER RD	198 W. H. SMITH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122965	HAMSHIRE	138927	In field estimate				
	17001 GALLIER RD	198 W. H. SMITH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122968	HAMSHIRE	138934	Appraisal district				
	15408 HALL RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121831	HAMSHIRE	52680	Appraisal district				
	15500 HALL RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121844	HAMSHIRE	52698	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	15530 HALL RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121847	HAMSHIRE	52707	Appraisal district				
	15604 HALL RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121851	HAMSHIRE	52715	Appraisal district				
	15702 HALL RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121931	HAMSHIRE	52721	Appraisal district				
	11601 HAMSHIRE RD	787 E. CARUTHERS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122873	HAMSHIRE	142662	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	12579 HAMSHIRE RD	620 T & NO	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122147	HAMSHIRE	141693	Appraisal district				
	12586 HAMSHIRE RD	FIRST TO HAMSHIRE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122150	HAMSHIRE	33185	Appraisal district				
	12598 HAMSHIRE RD	FIRST TO HAMSHIRE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122151	HAMSHIRE	33179	Appraisal district				
	12629 HAMSHIRE RD	620 T & NO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122161	HAMSHIRE	141676	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	12640 HAMSHIRE RD	FIRST TO HAMSHIRE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122158	HAMSHIRE	33180	Appraisal district				
	12794 HAMSHIRE RD	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122164	HAMSHIRE	43296	Appraisal district				
	12830 HAMSHIRE RD	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122167	HAMSHIRE	43300	Appraisal district				
	12872 HAMSHIRE RD	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122170	HAMSHIRE	43302	Appraisal district				
	12916 HAMSHIRE RD A	204 C. TEAL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 122173	HAMSHIRE	139288	Appraisal district				
	12916 HAMSHIRE RD B	204 C. TEAL	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122176	HAMSHIRE	139289	In field estimate				
	12924 HAMSHIRE RD	204 C. TEAL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122178	HAMSHIRE	139299	Appraisal district				
	13054 HAMSHIRE RD	204 C. TEAL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 122181	HAMSHIRE	139292	Appraisal district				
	13545 HAMSHIRE RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121841	HAMSHIRE	261454	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13591 HAMSHIRE RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 121814	HAMSHIRE	267010	In field estimate				
	13629 HAMSHIRE RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121810	HAMSHIRE	267011	Appraisal district				
	14077 HAMSHIRE RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121791	HAMSHIRE	52583	Appraisal district				
	14364 HAMSHIRE RD	204 C. TEAL	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131163	HAMSHIRE	139284	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	14723 HAMSHIRE RD A	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131157	HAMSHIRE	52566	In field estimate				
	14723 HAMSHIRE RD B	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1950			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 131160	HAMSHIRE	52567	In field estimate				
	15576 HAMSHIRE RD	224 T & NO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121632	HAMSHIRE	405230	Appraisal district				
	16225 HAMSHIRE RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121612	HAMSHIRE	53333	Appraisal district				
	16271 HAMSHIRE RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 121608	HAMSHIRE	53331	Appraisal district				
	16417 HAMSHIRE RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121618	HAMSHIRE	53215	Appraisal district				
	16457 HAMSHIRE RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121596	HAMSHIRE	53207	Appraisal district				
	10450 HAMSHIRE E RD	198 W. H. SMITH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122930	HAMSHIRE	139103	Appraisal district				
	10496 HAMSHIRE E RD	198 W. H. SMITH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122926	HAMSHIRE	139117	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	10618 HAMSHIRE E RD	198 W. H. SMITH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122923	HAMSHIRE	139203	Appraisal district				
	10668 HAMSHIRE E RD	198 W. H. SMITH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122914	HAMSHIRE	138953	Appraisal district				
	10954 HAMSHIRE E RD	462 P. C. GRAMMIER	1859	Hamshire House		ROE needed	House not visible from ROW, gate closed
HHM ID: 122911	HAMSHIRE	140699	Marker				
	11083 HAMSHIRE E RD A	98 J. BOUDREAUX				ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 122909	HAMSHIRE	261958					
	11083 HAMSHIRE E RD B	98 J. BOUDREAUX				ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 122910	HAMSHIRE	254501					
	11196 HAMSHIRE E RD	462 P. C. GRAMMIER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 122899	HAMSHIRE	140702	Appraisal district				
	11314 HAMSHIRE E RD A	462 P. C. GRAMMIER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122890	HAMSHIRE	140687	Appraisal district				
	11314 HAMSHIRE E RD B	462 P. C. GRAMMIER	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122892	HAMSHIRE	140688	In field estimate				
	11428 HAMSHIRE E RD	462 P. C. GRAMMIER	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122845	HAMSHIRE	140693	Appraisal district				
	11534 HAMSHIRE E RD	462 P. C. GRAMMIER	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122850	HAMSHIRE	140696	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	11567 HAMSHIRE E RD	787 E. CARUTHERS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122877	HAMSHIRE	142667	Appraisal district				
	11608 HAMSHIRE E RD	787 E. CARUTHERS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122853	HAMSHIRE	142659	Appraisal district				
	11621 HAMSHIRE E RD	787 E. CARUTHERS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122871	HAMSHIRE	142668	Appraisal district				
	11805 HAMSHIRE E RD	787 E. CARUTHERS	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122859	HAMSHIRE	142671	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	11885 HAMSHIRE E RD	787 E. CARUTHERS	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122255	HAMSHIRE	142669	Appraisal district				
	11897 HAMSHIRE E RD	787 E. CARUTHERS	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 123822	HAMSHIRE	142680	Appraisal district				
	11957 HAMSHIRE E RD	787 E. CARUTHERS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122258	HAMSHIRE	142670	Appraisal district				
	12146 HAMSHIRE E RD	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122345	HAMSHIRE	43291	Appraisal district				
	12184 HAMSHIRE E RD	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122344	HAMSHIRE	43280	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	12199 HAMSHIRE E RD	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122261	HAMSHIRE	43246	Appraisal district				
	12233 HAMSHIRE E RD	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122263	HAMSHIRE	43226	Appraisal district				
	12279 HAMSHIRE E RD	461 JOS. FANNETT	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122266	HAMSHIRE	140680	Appraisal district				
	12323 HAMSHIRE E RD	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122333	HAMSHIRE	43228	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	12396 HAMSHIRE E RD	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122239	HAMSHIRE	43249	Appraisal district				
	12446 HAMSHIRE E RD	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122242	HAMSHIRE	43262	Appraisal district				
	15838 HAMSHIRE E RD	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122280	HAMSHIRE	43231	Appraisal district				
	12119 HECKAMAN RD	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122219	HAMSHIRE	43247	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	15500 BLOCK HECKAMAN RD	FIRST TO HAMSHIRE	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	Limited visibility due to vegetation
HHM ID: 122383	HAMSHIRE	33177	In field estimate				
	15517 HECKAMAN LOOP	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122236	HAMSHIRE	43218	Appraisal district				
	15590 HECKAMAN LOOP	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122223	HAMSHIRE	43272	Appraisal district				
	15610 HECKAMAN LOOP	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122214	HAMSHIRE	43277	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	24527 HIGHWAY 124	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1958	Former Dairy Queen per owner	Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122360	HAMSHIRE	43223	Appraisal district				
	24549 HIGHWAY 124	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122364	HAMSHIRE	43224	In field estimate				
	24569 HIGHWAY 124	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1975	Former trailer park per owner	Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 122366	HAMSHIRE	43251	In field estimate				
	24588 HIGHWAY 124	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1958		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122121	HAMSHIRE	43263	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	24620 HIGHWAY 124	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122124	HAMSHIRE	43268	Appraisal district				
	24636 HIGHWAY 124	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122129	HAMSHIRE	407950	Appraisal district				
	24686 HIGHWAY 124	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122132	HAMSHIRE	43260	Appraisal district				
	24708 HIGHWAY 124	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1948	Hamshire grocery and Post Office	Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 122135	HAMSHIRE	43273	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	24744 HIGHWAY 124	FIRST TO HAMSHIRE	1948		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122138	HAMSHIRE	33183	Appraisal district				
	24758 HIGHWAY 124	FIRST TO HAMSHIRE	1953		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 122141	HAMSHIRE	33184	Appraisal district				
	24840 HIGHWAY 124	620 T & NO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 122144	HAMSHIRE	141686	Appraisal district				
	24886 HIGHWAY 124	620 T & NO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122245	HAMSHIRE	412426	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	25112 HIGHWAY 124	620 T & NO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 122228	HAMSHIRE	141703	Appraisal district				
	25404 HIGHWAY 124	620 T & NO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122407	HAMSHIRE	141782	Appraisal district				
	25454 HIGHWAY 124	620 T & NO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122408	HAMSHIRE	141728	Appraisal district				
	25548 HIGHWAY 124	620 T & NO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122225	HAMSHIRE	141708	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	25100 BLOCK HIGHWAY 124 A	620 T & NO	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122435	HAMSHIRE	141705	In field estimate				
	21144 HIGHWAY 73	53 B. A. VACOCU	1956		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131132	HAMSHIRE	133812	Appraisal district				
	21344 HIGHWAY 73	53 B. A. VACOCU	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131135	HAMSHIRE	133811	Appraisal district				
	21378 HIGHWAY 73	53 B. A. VACOCU	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131138	HAMSHIRE	133807	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	HIGHWAY 73	53 B. A. VACOCU				ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 123069	HAMSHIRE	133877					
	16466 HORTON DR A	SOUTH HAMSHIRE 2	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122637	HAMSHIRE	103293	Appraisal district				
	16466 HORTON DR B	SOUTH HAMSHIRE 2	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122640	HAMSHIRE	103294	In field estimate				
	16498 HORTON DR	SOUTH HAMSHIRE 2	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122634	HAMSHIRE	103295	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	25100 BLOCK HWY 124 B	620 T & NO	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122439	HAMSHIRE	141750	In field estimate				
	KELICE RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW - private road
HHM ID: 131322	HAMSHIRE	135221	Appraisal district				
	17546 KLEIN RD	FARNSWORTH, L. D.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130480	HAMSHIRE	32899	Appraisal district				
	17966 KLEIN RD	642 T & NO - H. LEFLORE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130477	HAMSHIRE	141916	Appraisal district				
	15574 MAIN ST	HAMSHIRE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122202	HAMSHIRE	43209	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	15587 MAIN ST	620 T & NO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122196	HAMSHIRE	141696	Appraisal district				
	15594 MAIN ST	HAMSHIRE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 122193	HAMSHIRE	43210	Appraisal district				
	15451 MARSH RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122066	HAMSHIRE	394990	Appraisal district				
	15537 MARSH RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122050	HAMSHIRE	52681	Appraisal district				
	15572 MARSH RD BLDG A	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 122054	HAMSHIRE	52687	Appraisal district				
	15572 MARSH RD BLDG B	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 122044	HAMSHIRE	52688	In field estimate				
	15611 MARSH RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122031	HAMSHIRE	52689	Appraisal district				
	15635 MARSH RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122028	HAMSHIRE	52691	Appraisal district				
	15699 MARSH RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122024	HAMSHIRE	52693	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	15729 MARSH RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122011	HAMSHIRE	52733	Appraisal district				
	15768 MARSH RD A	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121997	HAMSHIRE	52749	Appraisal district				
	15768 MARSH RD B	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121994	HAMSHIRE	52750	In field estimate				
	15797 MARSH RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122002	HAMSHIRE	52731	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	15894 MARSH RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 136	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122070	HAMSHIRE	52789	Appraisal district				
	15954 MARSH RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 136	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122076	HAMSHIRE	52790	Appraisal district				
	16153 MARSH RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 136	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122082	HAMSHIRE	52781	In field estimate				
	16231 MARSH RD		1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122471	HAMSHIRE	404843	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	16235 MARSH RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 136	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122463	HAMSHIRE	52799	Appraisal district				
	12905 MARTINE RD	620 T & NO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122450	HAMSHIRE	141726	Appraisal district				
	13051 MARTINE RD	620 T & NO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 122423	HAMSHIRE	263413	Appraisal district				
	13096 MARTINE RD	620 T & NO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122418	HAMSHIRE	141743	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	15601 MAYFIELD RD	MACCALLUM ESTATE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121509	HAMSHIRE	59571	Appraisal district				
	15655 MAYFIELD RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122765	HAMSHIRE	361377	In field estimate				
	12223 MCCALL RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 138	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122564	HAMSHIRE	395032	Appraisal district				
	12297 MCCALL RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 138	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122577	HAMSHIRE	52818	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	12600 MCCALL RD	620 T & NO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122665	HAMSHIRE	345432	In field estimate				
	15471 OAKLAND	667 L. HAMSHIRE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 122817	HAMSHIRE	142095	In field estimate				
	15853 PHEND RD	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122327	HAMSHIRE	43229	Appraisal district				
	15916 PHEND RD A	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122322	HAMSHIRE	43242	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	15916 PHEND RD B	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122305	HAMSHIRE	43238	In field estimate				
	15917 PHEND RD	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1930			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 122303	HAMSHIRE	43239	In field estimate				
	13119 POWERS RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121766	HAMSHIRE	52627	In field estimate				
	13412 POWERS RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121761	HAMSHIRE	52596	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13484 POWERS RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121750	HAMSHIRE	52592	Appraisal district				
	13489 POWERS RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121753	HAMSHIRE	52660	Appraisal district				
	13552 POWERS RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121742	HAMSHIRE	52591	Appraisal district				
	13602 POWERS RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121737	HAMSHIRE	52589	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13892 POWERS RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121719	HAMSHIRE	53187	Appraisal district				
	14043 POWERS RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121709	HAMSHIRE	400293	Appraisal district				
	14101 POWERS RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121704	HAMSHIRE	53267	Appraisal district				
	14183 POWERS RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121698	HAMSHIRE	53269	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	14387 POWERS RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1962			ROE needed	Limited visibility from ROW
HHM ID: 122749	HAMSHIRE	53352	Appraisal district				
	15658 SAN JACINTO ST	HAMSHIRE	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 122187	HAMSHIRE	403893	In field estimate				
	16432 SANDELL RD	SOUTH HAMSHIRE 1	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122587	HAMSHIRE	103279	Appraisal district				
	16445 SANDELL RD	SOUTH HAMSHIRE 1	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 122595	HAMSHIRE	103274	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	12669 SIMINO DR	204 C. TEAL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122794	HAMSHIRE	326295	Appraisal district				
	12600 BLOCK SIMINO DR	204 C. TEAL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122791	HAMSHIRE	403372	Appraisal district				
	13242 SOUTH FORK DR	SOUTH FORK	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121776	HAMSHIRE	103192	Appraisal district				
	13413 SOUTH FORK DR	SOUTH FORK	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 121779	HAMSHIRE	103187	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	12913 WARD CIR	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1964		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121871	HAMSHIRE	52702	Appraisal district				
	12948 WARD CIR	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121874	HAMSHIRE	52699	Appraisal district				
	12971 WARD CIR	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1958		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121882	HAMSHIRE	52704	Appraisal district				
	12992 WARD CIR	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121893	HAMSHIRE	52714	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	12800 BLOCK WARD CIR	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121896	HAMSHIRE	412215	Appraisal district				
	12900 BLOCK WARD CIR	KOCH T & NO SEC. 135	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121890	HAMSHIRE	52700	In field estimate				
	9716 WEBB RD	53 B. A. VACOCU	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123046	HAMSHIRE	133815	Appraisal district				
	9767 WEBB RD	698 T & NO - J. W. WEBB	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123062	HAMSHIRE	241071	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	9776 WEBB RD	53 B. A. VACOCU	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123048	HAMSHIRE	133819	Appraisal district				
	16458 WHITE PERCH DR	191 WM. REEVES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123202	HAMSHIRE	138805	Appraisal district				
	16528 WHITE PERCH DR	191 WM. REEVES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123193	HAMSHIRE	138826	Appraisal district				
	16000 BLOCK WHITE PERCH DR	191 WM. REEVES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123195	HAMSHIRE	138819	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	14390 WILBER RD	198 W. H. SMITH	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123829	HAMSHIRE	139020	In field estimate				
	14445 WILBER RD	198 W. H. SMITH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123828	HAMSHIRE	139021	Appraisal district				
	14478 WILBER RD		1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123830	HAMSHIRE	139124	In field estimate				
	16027 WILBER RD	198 W. H. SMITH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122934	HAMSHIRE	138958	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	16433 WILBER RD	198 W. H. SMITH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122940	HAMSHIRE	139012	Appraisal district				
	17808 WILBER RD	53 B. A. VACOCU	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122984	HAMSHIRE	133842	Appraisal district				
	18106 WILBER RD	53 B. A. VACOCU	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122989	HAMSHIRE	133833	In field estimate				
	18277 WILBER RD	64 E. H. ANDREWS	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122992	HAMSHIRE	134686	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	18559 WILBER RD	683 T & NO	1958		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122995	HAMSHIRE	142136	Appraisal district				
	16100 BLOCK WILBER RD	53 B. A. VACOCU	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131290	HAMSHIRE	133882	In field estimate				
	6885 WILFORD RD	747 J. W. DENNY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123093	HAMSHIRE	142475	Appraisal district				
	6943 WILFORD RD	747 J. W. DENNY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123094	HAMSHIRE	142471	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	7023 WILFORD RD	747 J. W. DENNY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123106	HAMSHIRE	142474	Appraisal district				
	7054 WILFORD RD	805 A. L. REARICK	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123121	HAMSHIRE	142727	Appraisal district				
	7059 WILFORD RD A	747 J. W. DENNY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123115	HAMSHIRE	142466	Appraisal district				
	7059 WILFORD RD B	747 J. W. DENNY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123120	HAMSHIRE	142467	Appraisal district				
	7191 WILFORD RD	745 R. W. DENNY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 123123	HAMSHIRE	142434	Appraisal district				
	7221 WILFORD RD	745 R. W. DENNY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123126	HAMSHIRE	142431	Appraisal district				
	15882 WISE RD	620 T & NO	1910		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 122248	HAMSHIRE	0	In field estimate				
	16277 WISE RD	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122542	HAMSHIRE	43235	Appraisal district				
	16409 WISE RD	332 T & NO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122546	HAMSHIRE	139909	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	16574 WISE RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 138	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122612	HAMSHIRE	52816	Appraisal district				
	16609 WISE RD	332 T & NO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122621	HAMSHIRE	139894	Appraisal district				
	17290 WISE RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 138	1940	Built in 1909 and oldest house in area per neighbor, but not on 1938 aerial. Research into possibly moved.		Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 122672	HAMSHIRE	52868	In field estimate (per neighbor 1909, but not on 1938 aerial)				
	17307 WISE RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 138	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122688	HAMSHIRE	52889	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	17393 WISE RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 138	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122690	HAMSHIRE	52888	In field estimate				
	17418 WISE RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 138	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122727	HAMSHIRE	52858	Appraisal district				
	17455 WISE RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 138	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122693	HAMSHIRE	52887	Appraisal district				
	17495 WISE RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 138	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122698	HAMSHIRE	52884	Appraisal district				
	17510 WISE RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 138	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122719	HAMSHIRE	52852	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	17614 WISE RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 138	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122717	HAMSHIRE	52850	In field estimate				
	17647 WISE RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 138	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122707	HAMSHIRE	52894	Appraisal district				
	17773 WISE RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 138	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122714	HAMSHIRE	52900	Appraisal district				
	16200 BLOCK WISE RD	HAMSHIRE GARDENS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122560	HAMSHIRE	360203	Appraisal district				
	17200 BLOCK WISE RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 138	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122679	HAMSHIRE	52883	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	BERGERON	BERGERON	1965 - 1995		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122495	HAMSHIRE		In field estimate				
	De Young	De Young	1940 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122514	HAMSHIRE		In field estimate				
	GREEN THUMB ESTATES	GREEN THUMB ESTATES	1955 - 2022		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131093	HAMSHIRE		In field estimate				
	South Hamshire 1	South Hamshire 1	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122600	HAMSHIRE		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1131 BAYOU RD	23 J. J. FRENCH	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	Limited visibility from ROW
HHM ID: 128509	LABELLE	129301	In field estimate				
	3547 BURRELL RD	102 WM. CARR	1955			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 130973	LABELLE	136003	Appears on 1960 aerial				
	4396 BURRELL LOOP	49 WM. SMITH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126202	LABELLE	133314	Appraisal district				
	4687 BURRELL LOOP	LOVELL FARMS	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126203	LABELLE	58767	In field estimate				
	4789 BURRELL LOOP	LOVELL FARMS	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126204	LABELLE	58776	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	4805 BURRELL LOOP	LOVELL FARMS	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126205	LABELLE	58774	In field estimate				
	4827 BURRELL LOOP	LOVELL FARMS	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126217	LABELLE	58773	In field estimate				
	4974 BURRELL LOOP	49 WM. SMITH	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126206	LABELLE	133312	Appraisal district				
	4988 BURRELL LOOP	49 WM. SMITH	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126207	LABELLE	133360	In field estimate				
	5170 BURRELL LOOP	49 WM. SMITH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126229	LABELLE	133235	Appraisal district				
	5386 BURRELL LOOP	49 WM. SMITH	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126230	LABELLE	0133251, 133252, 133306	In field estimate				
	5735 BURRELL LOOP	STEVENS BROTHERS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126231	LABELLE	103956	Appraisal district				
	18377 BURRELL RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128561	LABELLE	135290	Appraisal district				
	18446 BURRELL RD	68 D. BURRELL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128587	LABELLE	134757	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	18533 BURRELL RD	68 D. BURRELL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128583	LABELLE	135171	Appraisal district				
	18550 BURRELL RD	68 D. BURRELL	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128597	LABELLE	135129, 403382	Appraisal district				
	18760 BURRELL RD	68 D. BURRELL	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128607	LABELLE	135144	Appraisal district				
	12376 BURRELL CEMETARY RD	102 WM. CARR	1960			ROE needed	Not accessible
HHM ID: 130994	LABELLE	135909	Appraisal district				
	11917 BURRELL CEMETERY RD	102 WM. CARR	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128546	LABELLE	136071	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	16067 BURRELL WINGATE RD	AUBEY L J ESTATE	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	Limited visibility due to vegetation
HHM ID: 128556	LABELLE	2885	In field estimate				
	BURRELL WINGATE RD	21 S. EATON	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128558	LABELLE	129103	Appraisal district				
	15200 BLOCK BURRELL-WINGATE RD	49 WM. SMITH	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	Address is Burrell Rd in CAD
HHM ID: 128555	LABELLE	133225	In field estimate				
	3638 EAGLESON LN	102 WM. CARR	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130988	LABELLE	136148	Appraisal district				
	3652 EAGLESON LN	102 WM. CARR	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130989	LABELLE	136166	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	3713 EAGLESON LN	102 WM. CARR	1950			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW - private road
HHM ID: 130993	LABELLE	136214	Appears on 1960 aerial				
	11485 FM 365	102 WM. CARR	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126281	LABELLE	136098	Appraisal district				
	11491 FM 365	102 WM. CARR	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126280	LABELLE	136075	Appraisal district				
	11769 FM 365	102 WM. CARR	1910		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126244	LABELLE	136034	In field estimate				
	11938 FM 365	102 WM. CARR	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126243	LABELLE	136129	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	11971 FM 365	LOVELL FARMS	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126242	LABELLE	58724	In field estimate				
	12585 FM 365		1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126248	LABELLE	58742	In field estimate				
	13330 FM 365	49 WM. SMITH	1940			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 126088	LABELLE	133298	In field estimate				
	12718 FRENCH SURVEY RD	23 J. J. FRENCH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	Limited visibility from ROW
HHM ID: 128510	LABELLE	129263	Appraisal district				
	12083 GARNER RD	23 J. J. FRENCH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 128383	LABELLE	129123	Appraisal district				
	12113 GARNER RD	23 J. J. FRENCH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128385	LABELLE	129235	Appraisal district				
	12161 GARNER RD	23 J. J. FRENCH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128389	LABELLE	129242	Appraisal district				
	12167 GARNER RD	23 J. J. FRENCH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128393	LABELLE	129125	Appraisal district				
	12186 GARNER RD	102 WM. CARR	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128391	LABELLE	136054	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	12195 GARNER RD	23 J. J. FRENCH	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128394	LABELLE	129261	In field estimate				
	12208 GARNER RD	102 WM. CARR	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128397	LABELLE	136041	In field estimate				
	12240 GARNER RD	102 WM. CARR	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128443	LABELLE	136171	In field estimate				
	12255 GARNER RD	23 J. J. FRENCH	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128442	LABELLE	129258	In field estimate				
	12341 GARNER RD	23 J. J. FRENCH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 128444	LABELLE	129268	Appraisal district				
	12368 GARNER RD	102 WM. CARR	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	Limited visibility from ROW
HHM ID: 128445	LABELLE	136043	Appraisal district				
	12422 GARNER RD	102 WM. CARR	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128447	LABELLE	136029, 264133	In field estimate				
	12439 GARNER RD	23 J. J. FRENCH	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128446	LABELLE	129255	Appraisal district				
	12619 GARNER RD	23 J. J. FRENCH	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128483	LABELLE	345374	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13091 GARNER RD	23 J. J. FRENCH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128502	LABELLE	129252	Appraisal district				
	13351 GARNER RD	23 J. J. FRENCH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128503	LABELLE	129272	Appraisal district				
	14031 GARNER RD	102 WM. CARR	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128532	LABELLE	246355	Appraisal district				
	14259 GARNER RD	102 WM. CARR	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128535	LABELLE	135902	Appraisal district				
	14603 GARNER RD	102 WM. CARR	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 128537	LABELLE	136038	Appraisal district				
	14865 GARNER RD	102 WM. CARR	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128538	LABELLE	135956	In field estimate				
	14899 GARNER RD	102 WM. CARR	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128539	LABELLE	136141	In field estimate				
	12500 BLOCK GARNER RD	23 J. J. FRENCH	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128480	LABELLE	264226	In field estimate				
	12166 KARNES RD	102 WM. CARR	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126247	LABELLE	135885	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	12413 KARNES RD	102 WM. CARR	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126272	LABELLE	136127	Appraisal district				
	11779 LABELLE RD	102 WM. CARR	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126086	LABELLE	136198	In field estimate				
	12542 LABELLE RD	49 WM. SMITH	1886	LaBelle School	Within district eligible for NRHP (Duplantis Farmstead - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126089	LABELLE	133203	Per owner				
	12566 LABELLE RD	49 WM. SMITH	1920		Within district eligible for NRHP (Duplantis Farmstead - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126110	LABELLE	133232, 133231	In field estimate				
	14446 LABELLE RD	49 WM. SMITH	1920			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 128552	LABELLE	133208	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	14572 LABELLE RD	49 WM. SMITH	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131004	LABELLE	133212	Appraisal district				
	14595 LABELLE RD	102 WM. CARR	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131007	LABELLE	136027	Appraisal district				
	14697 LABELLE RD	102 WM. CARR	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131001	LABELLE	136040	Appraisal district				
	14807 LABELLE RD	102 WM. CARR	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131012	LABELLE	136028	Appraisal district				
	14863 LABELLE RD	102 WM. CARR	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 131009	LABELLE	326149	Appraisal district				
	14919 LABELLE RD	102 WM. CARR	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130996	LABELLE	136018	Appraisal district				
	14995 LABELLE RD	102 WM. CARR	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130995	LABELLE	136077	Appraisal district				
	11772 LOUIS DR		1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126271	LABELLE	136112	In field estimate				
	11914 LOUIS DR	102 WM. CARR	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126270	LABELLE	136084	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	12240 LOUIS RD	102 WM. CARR	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126260	LABELLE	136082	In field estimate				
	12289 LOUIS RD	102 WM. CARR	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126266	LABELLE	136066	Appraisal district				
	12313 LOUIS RD	102 WM. CARR	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126265	LABELLE	136068	In field estimate				
	12413 LOUIS DR	ELLIOTT PLACE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126259	LABELLE	254879	Appraisal district				
	3296 PINE TREE RD	102 WM. CARR	1958		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130985	LABELLE	136130	Appraisal district				
	1042 TAYLORS BAYOU RD	23 J. J. FRENCH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	Limited visibility from ROW
HHM ID: 128508	LABELLE	129147	Appraisal district				
	1246 TAYLORS BAYOU RD	23 J. J. FRENCH	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128507	LABELLE	129313	Appraisal district				
	49 WM. SMITH & 102 WM. CARR (GLEN AVE, BALLARD RD, DOUCET, AND PEYTON PL)	49 WM. SMITH & 102 WM. CARR (GLEN AVE, BALLARD RD, DOUCET, AND PEYTON PL)	1955 - 1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130982	LABELLE		In field estimate				
	120 10TH ST	NEDERLAND	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128343	NEDERLAND	361294	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	124 10TH ST	NEDERLAND	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 128340	NEDERLAND	67272	In field estimate				
	212 10TH ST	NEDERLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128336	NEDERLAND	67267	Appraisal district				
	315 10TH ST	NEDERLAND	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128404	NEDERLAND	67167	In field estimate				
	316 10TH ST	NEDERLAND	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128407	NEDERLAND	67149	Appraisal district				
	407 10TH ST	NEDERLAND	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 128481	NEDERLAND	67141	In field estimate				
	411 10TH ST	NEDERLAND	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128487	NEDERLAND	67142	In field estimate				
	412 10TH ST	NEDERLAND	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128398	NEDERLAND	67143	Appraisal district				
	324 11TH ST	NEDERLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128454	NEDERLAND	67158	Appraisal district				
	336 11TH ST	NEDERLAND	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128457	NEDERLAND	67155	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	424 11TH ST	NEDERLAND	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128460	NEDERLAND	67138	In field estimate				
	715 11TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129284	NEDERLAND	75361	In field estimate				
	719 11TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129281	NEDERLAND	75362	In field estimate				
	300 S 12TH	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127430	NEDERLAND	75298	Appraisal district				
	505 N 12TH		1890		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126898	NEDERLAND	47562	In field estimate				
	800 S 12TH ST	HOLLAND	1939		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 127412	NEDERLAND	43184	Research/Aerial images				
	816 12TH ST	HOLLAND TO NEDERLAND	1938		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127445	NEDERLAND	47553	Appraisal district				
	904 S 12TH ST	WAGNER 2	1930		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 127627	NEDERLAND	110164	In field estimate				
	112 12TH N ST	NEDERLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127184	NEDERLAND	67305	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	113 12TH N ST	NEDERLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127171	NEDERLAND	67310	Appraisal district				
	119 12TH N ST	NEDERLAND	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127168	NEDERLAND	67311	In field estimate				
	125 12TH N ST	NEDERLAND	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127165	NEDERLAND	67312	In field estimate				
	215 12TH N ST	NEDERLAND	1963		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126492	NEDERLAND	67230	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	321 12TH N ST	NEDERLAND	1963		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127011	NEDERLAND	67199	Appraisal district				
	327 12TH N ST	NEDERLAND	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127008	NEDERLAND	67200	In field estimate				
	331 12TH N ST	NEDERLAND	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127006	NEDERLAND	67201	In field estimate				
	404 12TH N ST	NEDERLAND	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126915	NEDERLAND	67131	In field estimate				
	424 12TH N ST	NEDERLAND	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126936	NEDERLAND	67128	In field estimate				
	508 12TH N ST	NELSON TO NEDERLAND	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126941	NEDERLAND	67564	Appraisal district				
	516 12TH N ST	NELSON TO NEDERLAND	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126944	NEDERLAND	67565	In field estimate				
	519 12TH N ST	HOLLAND TO NEDERLAND	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126988	NEDERLAND	47564	In field estimate				
	923 12TH N ST	PALCO - NED.	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127974	NEDERLAND	75492	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	935 12TH N ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127971	NEDERLAND	75490	Appraisal district				
	116 12TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127283	NEDERLAND	75297	Appraisal district				
	123 12TH S ST	DOORNBOS, J.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127319	NEDERLAND	28097	In field estimate				
	128 12TH S ST	DOORNBOS, J.	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127279	NEDERLAND	28107	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	131 12TH S ST	DOORNBOS, J.	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127316	NEDERLAND	28098	In field estimate				
	132 12TH S ST	DOORNBOS, J.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127274	NEDERLAND	28106	In field estimate				
	207 12TH S ST	DOORNBOS, J.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127303	NEDERLAND	28099	Appraisal district				
	211 12TH S ST	DOORNBOS, J.	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127300	NEDERLAND	28100	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	411 12TH S ST	DOORNBOS, J.	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127645	NEDERLAND	28104	In field estimate				
	423 12TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127648	NEDERLAND	75295	Appraisal district				
	507 12TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127651	NEDERLAND	75250	In field estimate				
	511 12TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127654	NEDERLAND	75251	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	517 12TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127657	NEDERLAND	75252	In field estimate				
	523 12TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127659	NEDERLAND	75253	Appraisal district				
	603 12TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127662	NEDERLAND	75254	In field estimate				
	609 12TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127665	NEDERLAND	75255	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	615 12TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127674	NEDERLAND	75259	Appraisal district				
	619 12TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127679	NEDERLAND	75247	Appraisal district				
	703 12TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127683	NEDERLAND	75266	In field estimate				
	707 12TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127691	NEDERLAND	75264	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	715 12TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127696	NEDERLAND	75263	In field estimate				
	719 12TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127701	NEDERLAND	75262	Appraisal district				
	727 12TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127707	NEDERLAND	75249	In field estimate				
	807 12TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127710	NEDERLAND	75261	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	819 12TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127717	NEDERLAND	75260	Appraisal district				
	203 13TH ST	NEDERLAND	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127196	NEDERLAND	67223	In field estimate				
	206 S 13TH		1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127361	NEDERLAND	62423	In field estimate				
	208 S 13TH		1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127365	NEDERLAND	62424	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	212 S 13TH		1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127367	NEDERLAND	127367	In field estimate				
	324 13TH ST	NEDERLAND	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127054	NEDERLAND	67189	In field estimate				
	404 13TH ST	NEDERLAND	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127058	NEDERLAND	67126	In field estimate				
	408 13TH ST	NEDERLAND	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127062	NEDERLAND	67125	In field estimate				
	411 13TH ST	NEDERLAND	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 127068	NEDERLAND	67123	In field estimate				
	520 13TH N ST	HOLLAND TO NEDERLAND	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127065	NEDERLAND	47563	Appraisal district				
	807 13TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127745	NEDERLAND	75275	Appraisal district				
	808 13TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127742	NEDERLAND	75267	Appraisal district				
	815 13TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127739	NEDERLAND	75269	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	816 13TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127732	NEDERLAND	75268	In field estimate				
	824 13TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127729	NEDERLAND	75257	In field estimate				
	123 14TH ST	NEDERLAND	1969		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127203	NEDERLAND	67324	Appraisal district				
	203 14TH ST	NEDERLAND	1958		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127208	NEDERLAND	67217	Appraisal district				
	204 14TH ST	NEDERLAND	1969		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 127200	NEDERLAND	67221	Appraisal district				
	207 S 14TH		1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127357	NEDERLAND	62448	In field estimate				
	207 14TH ST	NEDERLAND	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127214	NEDERLAND	67216	In field estimate				
	211 14TH ST	NEDERLAND	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127217	NEDERLAND	67215	In field estimate				
	223 14TH ST	NEDERLAND	1968		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126533	NEDERLAND	67214	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	405 14TH ST	NEDERLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127074	NEDERLAND	67120	Appraisal district				
	411 14TH ST	NEDERLAND	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127071	NEDERLAND	67121	In field estimate				
	823 N 14TH		1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127885	NEDERLAND	56478	Aerial images				
	115 15TH ST	COOKE, J. B.	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126635	NEDERLAND	23792	In field estimate				
	119 15TH ST	COOKE, J. B.	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126638	NEDERLAND	23791	In field estimate				
	203 15TH ST	COOKE, J. B.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126659	NEDERLAND	23786	Appraisal district				
	204 15TH ST	NEDERLAND	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127225	NEDERLAND	67218	In field estimate				
	212 15TH ST	NEDERLAND	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127222	NEDERLAND	67219	In field estimate				
	311 15TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126731	NEDERLAND	75387	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	315 15TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126735	NEDERLAND	75376	In field estimate				
	316 15TH ST	NEDERLAND	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126762	NEDERLAND	67209	In field estimate				
	319 15TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1920		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 126740	NEDERLAND	75375	In field estimate				
	320 15TH ST	NEDERLAND	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126759	NEDERLAND	67208	In field estimate				
	403 15TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126749	NEDERLAND	75391	In field estimate				
	412 15TH ST	NEDERLAND	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126752	NEDERLAND	67118	In field estimate				
	515 15TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127112	NEDERLAND	75395	In field estimate				
	523 15TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127115	NEDERLAND	75394	In field estimate				
	704 N 15TH		1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127884	NEDERLAND	56468	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	323 15TH N ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126746	NEDERLAND	75374	Appraisal district				
	200 N 17TH ST	PALCO CENTRAL MIDDLE SCH	1950	Central Middle School	Individually eligible for NRHP (Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 126765	NEDERLAND	75393	In field estimate				
	220 N 17TH ST		1965		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126618	NEDERLAND	75379	In field estimate				
	318 17TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127101	NEDERLAND	75385	Appraisal district				
	410 17TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 127095	NEDERLAND	75384	Appraisal district				
	416 17TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127092	NEDERLAND	75383	Appraisal district				
	106 18TH ST	CARTER 1	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126785	NEDERLAND	17045	Appraisal district				
	1803 18TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128826	NEDERLAND	75681	Appraisal district				
	2101 N 18TH ST		1971 - 1999		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 130882	NEDERLAND	75725, 75724, 75691	School history				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1808 19TH ST	CLAYTON	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128799	NEDERLAND	22434	In field estimate				
	1812 19TH ST	CLAYTON	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128796	NEDERLAND	22433	In field estimate				
	1816 19TH ST	CLAYTON	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128782	NEDERLAND	22432	In field estimate				
	1819 19TH ST	CLAYTON	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128771	NEDERLAND	22422	In field estimate				
	1908 19TH ST	CLAYTON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 128769	NEDERLAND	22429	Appraisal district				
	1916 19TH ST	CLAYTON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128766	NEDERLAND	22428	Appraisal district				
	1803 19TH N ST	CLAYTON	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128805	NEDERLAND	22418	In field estimate				
	8704 1ST ST	PLEASANT HOME REPLAT	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129112	NEDERLAND	85076	Appraisal district				
	8789 1ST ST	PLEASANT HOME	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129109	NEDERLAND	85024	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1807 21ST ST	CLAYTON	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128809	NEDERLAND	22406	In field estimate				
	1908 21ST ST	CLAYTON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128763	NEDERLAND	22411	Appraisal district				
	1912 21ST ST	CLAYTON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128765	NEDERLAND	22410	Appraisal district				
	1915 21ST ST	CLAYTON	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128777	NEDERLAND	22399	In field estimate				
	1920 21ST ST	CLAYTON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 128761	NEDERLAND	22408	Appraisal district				
	519 25TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128199	NEDERLAND	75441	Appraisal district				
	1812 26TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128946	NEDERLAND	75741	Appraisal district				
	1814 26TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128965	NEDERLAND	75738	Appraisal district				
	204 27TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1976		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128146	NEDERLAND	75416	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	812 27TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129084	NEDERLAND	75430	Appraisal district				
	1011 27TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129141	NEDERLAND	75571	Appraisal district				
	1013 27TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129145	NEDERLAND	75570	Appraisal district				
	1119 27TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129150	NEDERLAND	75569	Appraisal district				
	1127 27TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129156	NEDERLAND	75567	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1304 27TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129162	NEDERLAND	75557	Appraisal district				
	1324 27TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129181	NEDERLAND	75558	Appraisal district				
	1512 27TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130627	NEDERLAND	75551	In field estimate				
	1603 27TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128921	NEDERLAND	75783	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1604 27TH ST A	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128943	NEDERLAND	75733	Appraisal district				
	1604 27TH ST B	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128931	NEDERLAND	75733	Appraisal district				
	1605 27TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128925	NEDERLAND	75780	Appraisal district				
	1608 27TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128928	NEDERLAND	75734	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1639 27TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128970	NEDERLAND	75794	Appraisal district				
	2104 27TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129434	NEDERLAND	75751	Appraisal district				
	2212 27TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129441	NEDERLAND	75752	In field estimate				
	1323 27TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127816	NEDERLAND	75149	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1812 28TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128902	NEDERLAND	75785	In field estimate				
	1813 28TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128880	NEDERLAND	75795	Appraisal district				
	1711 29TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128865	NEDERLAND	75807	Appraisal district				
	1713 29TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128869	NEDERLAND	75784	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1717 29TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128872	NEDERLAND	75781	Appraisal district				
	1718 29TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128909	NEDERLAND	75799	Appraisal district				
	1721 29TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128878	NEDERLAND	75801	Appraisal district				
	1722 29TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128906	NEDERLAND	75803	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1805 29TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128887	NEDERLAND	75806	Appraisal district				
	1809 29TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128883	NEDERLAND	75802	Appraisal district				
	101 2ND N AVE	WILLIAMS, EARL E.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128717	NEDERLAND	115474	In field estimate				
	104 2ND N AVE	WILLIAMS, EARL E.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128711	NEDERLAND	115477	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	105 2ND N AVE	WILLIAMS, EARL E.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128716	NEDERLAND	115476	Appraisal district				
	107 2ND N AVE	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128710	NEDERLAND	75979	Appraisal district				
	1420 31ST ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130594	NEDERLAND	75580	Appraisal district				
	808 S 37TH		1900			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 128117	NEDERLAND	272	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	202 4TH N AVE A	CRARY, CHAS. T.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 128696	NEDERLAND	25536	Appraisal district				
	8929 5TH ST	258 T & NO				ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 121925	NEDERLAND	139607					
	117 6TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129030	NEDERLAND	75336	Appraisal district				
	123 6TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129033	NEDERLAND	75340	In field estimate				
	200 S 6TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1965	Highland Park Elementary School	Individually eligible for NRHP (Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 128973	NEDERLAND	75198	Aerial images				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	203 6TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129036	NEDERLAND	75335	Appraisal district				
	207 6TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129039	NEDERLAND	75345	In field estimate				
	211 6TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129042	NEDERLAND	75347	In field estimate				
	200 7TH ST		1965	Seventh Street Baptist Church		Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 128981	NEDERLAND	75338	In field estimate				
	412 7TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128996	NEDERLAND	75354	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	110 7TH N AVE	13 WM. CARROLL	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128685	NEDERLAND	127200	In field estimate				
	115 9TH ST	NEDERLAND	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128356	NEDERLAND	67279	In field estimate				
	207 9TH ST	NEDERLAND	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128361	NEDERLAND	67269	Appraisal district				
	211 9TH ST	NEDERLAND	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128374	NEDERLAND	67271	In field estimate				
	321 9TH ST	NEDERLAND	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128382	NEDERLAND	67151	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	403 9TH ST	NEDERLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128386	NEDERLAND	67145	Appraisal district				
	612 9TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129295	NEDERLAND	75370	In field estimate				
	616 9TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129292	NEDERLAND	253084	In field estimate				
	624 9TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129287	NEDERLAND	75366	Appraisal district				
	123 9TH N ST	NEDERLAND	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128358	NEDERLAND	67280	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	224 9TH S ST	PALCO - NED.	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 131329	NEDERLAND	75240	In field estimate				
	600 AIRLINE DR	13 WM. CARROLL	1978	Jack Brooks Regional Airport	Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	Off US Hwy 69
HHM ID: 129148	NEDERLAND	400815	Appraisal district				
	722 ATLANTA AVE	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129008	NEDERLAND	75352	Appraisal district				
	723 ATLANTA AVE	PALCO - NED.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129002	NEDERLAND	75349	In field estimate				
	840 ATLANTA AVE		1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 128366	NEDERLAND	43086	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	912 ATLANTA AVE	NEDERLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128371	NEDERLAND	67270	Appraisal district				
	1011 ATLANTA AVE	NEDERLAND	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 128495	NEDERLAND	67287	In field estimate				
	1012 ATLANTA AVE	NEDERLAND	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128528	NEDERLAND	67261	In field estimate				
	1015 ATLANTA AVE	NEDERLAND	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128511	NEDERLAND	67289	In field estimate				
	1016 ATLANTA AVE	NEDERLAND	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128523	NEDERLAND	67260	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1019 ATLANTA AVE	NEDERLAND	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 128514	NEDERLAND	67290	In field estimate				
	1020 ATLANTA AVE	NEDERLAND	1905		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 128517	NEDERLAND	67259	In field estimate				
	1119 ATLANTA AVE	NEDERLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127153	NEDERLAND	67298	Appraisal district				
	1125 ATLANTA AVE	NEDERLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127156	NEDERLAND	67297	Appraisal district				
	1131 ATLANTA AVE	NEDERLAND	1910		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127159	NEDERLAND	67296	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1132 ATLANTA AVE	NEDERLAND	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127150	NEDERLAND	67253	In field estimate				
	1143 ATLANTA AVE		1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127162	NEDERLAND	67295	In field estimate				
	1148 ATLANTA AVE	NEDERLAND	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127147	NEDERLAND	67254	In field estimate				
	1419 ATLANTA AVE	NEDERLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127228	NEDERLAND	67320	Appraisal district				
	1515 ATLANTA AVE	COOKE, J. B.	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126643	NEDERLAND	23798	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1516 ATLANTA AVE	COOKE, J. B.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126656	NEDERLAND	23787	Appraisal district				
	1520 ATLANTA AVE	COOKE, J. B.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126653	NEDERLAND	23788	Appraisal district				
	1521 ATLANTA AVE	COOKE, J. B.	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126647	NEDERLAND	23796	In field estimate				
	1524 ATLANTA AVE	COOKE, J. B.	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126650	NEDERLAND	23789	In field estimate				
	1715 ATLANTA AVE	CARTER 1	1977		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126769	NEDERLAND	17038	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1813 ATLANTA AVE	CARTER 1	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126788	NEDERLAND	17046	Appraisal district				
	1304 AVE A		1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127346	NEDERLAND	62459	In field estimate				
	1312 AVE A		1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127350	NEDERLAND	62460	In field estimate				
	1320 AVE A		1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127353	NEDERLAND	62461	In field estimate				
	2304 AVE B	HILLCREST 1	1920		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 127567	NEDERLAND	46097	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2301 AVE H		1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128133	NEDERLAND	75152	In field estimate				
	2611 AVE H	PALCO - NED.	1965	Hillcrest Elementary School	Individually eligible for NRHP (Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 128130	NEDERLAND	75151	Aerial images				
	1220 AVENUE A	KELLY, J. C.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127323	NEDERLAND	51305	Appraisal district				
	1224 AVENUE A	KELLY, J. C.	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127330	NEDERLAND	51304	In field estimate				
	1228 AVENUE A	KELLY, J. C.	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127333	NEDERLAND	51303	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1232 AVENUE A	KELLY, J. C.	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127340	NEDERLAND	51302	In field estimate				
	1003 AVENUE B	NEDERLAND PLAZA	1973		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128918	NEDERLAND	67329	Appraisal district				
	712 AVENUE H	PALCO - NED.	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130914	NEDERLAND	75199	In field estimate				
	1204 AVENUE H	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127778	NEDERLAND	75246	Appraisal district				
	1220 AVENUE H	PALCO - NED.	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127736	NEDERLAND	75258	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1316 AVENUE H	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127804	NEDERLAND	75280	Appraisal district				
	1324 AVENUE H	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127806	NEDERLAND	75278	Appraisal district				
	1403 AVENUE H	PALCO - NED.	1930		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 127603	NEDERLAND	75111	In field estimate				
	1411 AVENUE H	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127781	NEDERLAND	75120	Appraisal district				
	1423 AVENUE H	PALCO - NED.	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127784	NEDERLAND	75110	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	7620 BEAUXART GARDENS RD A	SMITH HODGESON & BIGELOW	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121969	NEDERLAND	102276	Appraisal district				
	7620 BEAUXART GARDENS RD B	SMITH HODGESON & BIGELOW	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121970	NEDERLAND	102275	Appraisal district				
	7744 BEAUXART GARDENS RD	SMITH HODGESON & BIGELOW	1969		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121971	NEDERLAND	102280	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	7862 BEAUXART GARDENS RD	SMITH HODGESON & BIGELOW	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121986	NEDERLAND	102309	Appraisal district				
	7916 BEAUXART GARDENS RD	SMITH HODGESON & BIGELOW	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 121987	NEDERLAND	102316	In field estimate				
	7946 BEAUXART GARDENS RD	SMITH HODGESON & BIGELOW	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121988	NEDERLAND	102318	Appraisal district				
	8006 BEAUXART GARDENS RD		1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122014	NEDERLAND	102314	In field estimate				
	8030 BEAUXART GARDENS RD	SMITH HODGESON & BIGELOW	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 121990	NEDERLAND	102320	In field estimate				
	8054 BEAUXART GARDENS RD	SMITH HODGESON & BIGELOW	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121991	NEDERLAND	102319	Appraisal district				
	8490 BEAUXART GARDENS RD	PALCO - NED.	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122065	NEDERLAND	263476	In field estimate				
	607 BOSTON AVE	PALCO - NED.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129046	NEDERLAND	75333	In field estimate				
	611 BOSTON AVE	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129051	NEDERLAND	75350	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	620 BOSTON AVE	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128991	NEDERLAND	75344	Appraisal district				
	908 BOSTON AVE		1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 128379	NEDERLAND	67152	In field estimate				
	923 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1932	Old public library - site formerly had the city jail, well pump, and a Boy Scout hut	Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 128323	NEDERLAND	67266	Newspaper research				
	1023 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128410	NEDERLAND	67264	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1035 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128413	NEDERLAND	67265	Appraisal district				
	1036 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128430	NEDERLAND	67164	Appraisal district				
	1048 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128425	NEDERLAND	67163	In field estimate				
	1049 BOSTON AVE		1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128416	NEDERLAND	67257	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1054 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128422	NEDERLAND	67160	In field estimate				
	1058 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128417	NEDERLAND	67161	Appraisal district				
	1101 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1948		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126841	NEDERLAND	67256	Appraisal district				
	1112 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1948		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126592	NEDERLAND	67181	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1113 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1935		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126579	NEDERLAND	67246	In field estimate				
	1123 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1958		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Noncontributing)	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126576	NEDERLAND	67245	Appraisal district				
	1126 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1958		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126595	NEDERLAND	67182	Appraisal district				
	1127 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1958		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Noncontributing)	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126573	NEDERLAND	67244	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1135 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1938		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126570	NEDERLAND	67243	Appraisal district				
	1140 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1953		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126599	NEDERLAND	67185	Appraisal district				
	1143 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1953		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126562	NEDERLAND	67241	Appraisal district				
	1147 BOSTON		1940		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126566	NEDERLAND	67240	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1148 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1935		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126604	NEDERLAND	67186	In field estimate				
	1151 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1948		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126558	NEDERLAND	67239	Appraisal district				
	1155 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1935		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126555	NEDERLAND	67238	In field estimate				
	1166 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1915		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 126607	NEDERLAND	249588	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1205 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1938		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126551	NEDERLAND	67231	Appraisal district				
	1208 BOSTON		1955		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126503	NEDERLAND	67198	In field estimate				
	1211 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1955		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126548	NEDERLAND	67229	In field estimate				
	1215 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1958		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126545	NEDERLAND	67228	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1219 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1955		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126541	NEDERLAND	67227	In field estimate				
	1220 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1953		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126506	NEDERLAND	67196	Appraisal district				
	1222 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1948		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126513	NEDERLAND	67195	Appraisal district				
	1228 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1953		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126517	NEDERLAND	67194	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1237 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1955		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126538	NEDERLAND	67226	In field estimate				
	1308 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1966		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126521	NEDERLAND	67206	Appraisal district				
	1344 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1953		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126526	NEDERLAND	67205	Appraisal district				
	1423 BOSTON AVE	NEDERLAND	1977		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126662	NEDERLAND	67213	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1500 BOSTON AVE	PALCO - NED.	1969		Individually eligible for NRHP, Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 126666	NEDERLAND	75390	Research				
	2416 BOSTON AVE	PALCO - NED.	1958		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128180	NEDERLAND	75409	Appraisal district				
	2419 BOSTON AVE	PALCO - NED.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128183	NEDERLAND	75415	In field estimate				
	2420 BOSTON AVE	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128174	NEDERLAND	75410	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2423 BOSTON AVE	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128187	NEDERLAND	75413	Appraisal district				
	2424 BOSTON AVE	PALCO - NED.	1964		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128168	NEDERLAND	75411	Appraisal district				
	2425 BOSTON AVE	PALCO - NED.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128186	NEDERLAND	75414	In field estimate				
	1123 CANAL AVE	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130881	NEDERLAND	75526	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1519 CANAL AVE	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127983	NEDERLAND	75521	Appraisal district				
	2300 CANAL AVE	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128953	NEDERLAND	75732	Appraisal district				
	2400 CANAL AVE	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128956	NEDERLAND	75729	Appraisal district				
	2510 CANAL AVE	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128940	NEDERLAND	75736	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2803 CANAL AVE	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128838	NEDERLAND	75597	Appraisal district				
	2807 CANAL AVE	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128842	NEDERLAND	75596	Appraisal district				
	2810 CANAL AVE	PALCO - NED.	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128845	NEDERLAND	75774	In field estimate				
	2911 CANAL AVE	PALCO - NED.	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128857	NEDERLAND	75585	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	3007 CANAL AVE	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129214	NEDERLAND	75587	Appraisal district				
	3011 CANAL AVE	PALCO - NED.	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129207	NEDERLAND	75584	In field estimate				
	3020 CANAL AVE	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129222	NEDERLAND	75812	Appraisal district				
	3022 CANAL AVE	PALCO - NED.	1976		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129362	NEDERLAND	75813	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	3027 CANAL AVE	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129211	NEDERLAND	75592	Appraisal district				
	3111 CANAL AVE	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129228	NEDERLAND	75576	Appraisal district				
	3211 CANAL AVE A	PALCO - NED.	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129356	NEDERLAND	75578	Appraisal district				
	3211 CANAL AVE B	PALCO - NED.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129236	NEDERLAND	75578	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	3500 BLOCK CANAL AVE	PALCO - NED.	1978		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 130602	NEDERLAND	75621	In field estimate				
	103 CHAPEG ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128672	NEDERLAND	75885	Appraisal district				
	105 CHAPEG ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128669	NEDERLAND	75899	Appraisal district				
	911 CHICAGO AVE	NEDERLAND	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128392	NEDERLAND	67150	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	923 CHICAGO AVE	NEDERLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128401	NEDERLAND	67148	Appraisal district				
	1004 CHICAGO AVE	NEDERLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128476	NEDERLAND	67140	Appraisal district				
	1019 CHICAGO AVE	NEDERLAND	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128473	NEDERLAND	67171	In field estimate				
	1020 CHICAGO AVE	NEDERLAND	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128468	NEDERLAND	67139	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1023 CHICAGO AVE	NEDERLAND	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128464	NEDERLAND	67172	In field estimate				
	1127 CHICAGO AVE	NEDERLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127000	NEDERLAND	67176	Appraisal district				
	1135 CHICAGO AVE	NEDERLAND	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127003	NEDERLAND	67175	In field estimate				
	1163 CHICAGO AVE	NEDERLAND	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126914	NEDERLAND	67173	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1420 CHICAGO AVE	NEDERLAND	1915		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126755	NEDERLAND	67119	In field estimate				
	727 DETROIT AVE	DE ROUEN	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129310	NEDERLAND	27460	In field estimate				
	803 DETROIT AVE	DE ROUEN	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129312	NEDERLAND	27461	In field estimate				
	808 DETROIT AVE		1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129307	NEDERLAND	96634	In field estimate				
	816 DETROIT AVE	RIENSTRA, G.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129304	NEDERLAND	96636	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	819 DETROIT AVE	DE ROUEN	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129315	NEDERLAND	27463	In field estimate				
	820 DETROIT AVE	RIENSTRA, G.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129301	NEDERLAND	96637	Appraisal district				
	829 DETROIT AVE	DE ROUEN	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129318	NEDERLAND	27464	Appraisal district				
	836 DETROIT AVE	RIENSTRA, G.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129298	NEDERLAND	96643	In field estimate				
	1050 DETROIT AVE A	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129323	NEDERLAND	75359	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1050 DETROIT AVE B	PALCO - NED.	1958		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126973	NEDERLAND	75360	Appraisal district				
	1503 DETROIT AVE	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127077	NEDERLAND	75373	Appraisal district				
	1504 DETROIT AVE	PALCO - NED.	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127109	NEDERLAND	75396	In field estimate				
	1516 DETROIT AVE	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127104	NEDERLAND	75398	Appraisal district				
	1521 DETROIT AVE	PALCO - NED.	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127084	NEDERLAND	75388	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1611 DETROIT AVE	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127089	NEDERLAND	75377	Appraisal district				
	1298 DIXIE BLVD	HOLLYWOOD	1930		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 128300	NEDERLAND	47687	In field estimate				
	1111 ELGIN AVE	NELSON TO NEDERLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126976	NEDERLAND	67570	Appraisal district				
	1123 ELGIN AVE	NELSON TO NEDERLAND	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126979	NEDERLAND	67568	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1127 ELGIN AVE	NELSON TO NEDERLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126982	NEDERLAND	67567	Appraisal district				
	1130 ELGIN AVE	NELSON TO NEDERLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126985	NEDERLAND	67556	Appraisal district				
	1523 ELGIN AVE	PALCO - NED.	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127118	NEDERLAND	75400	In field estimate				
	1601 ELGIN		1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126908	NEDERLAND	53411	In field estimate				
	1616 FAIRBANKS ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 128244	NEDERLAND	75657	Appraisal district				
	1620 FAIRBANKS ST	PALCO - NED.	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128247	NEDERLAND	75656	In field estimate				
	1708 FAIRBANKS ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128251	NEDERLAND	75655	Appraisal district				
	1716 FAIRBANKS ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128254	NEDERLAND	75654	Appraisal district				
	1808 FAIRBANKS ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128257	NEDERLAND	75652	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1816 FAIRBANKS ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128260	NEDERLAND	75651	Appraisal district				
	1920 FAIRBANKS AVE		1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128263	NEDERLAND	75650	In field estimate				
	2012 FAIRBANKS ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128308	NEDERLAND	75646	Appraisal district				
	8042 FORD ST	FORD, J. D.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122113	NEDERLAND	33495	Appraisal district				
	8062 FORD ST	FORD, J. D.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 122112	NEDERLAND	33494	Appraisal district				
	8065 FORD ST	FORD, J. D.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122110	NEDERLAND	33476	Appraisal district				
	8074 FORD ST	FORD, J. D.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122111	NEDERLAND	33493	Appraisal district				
	8214 FORD ST	FORD, J. D.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122101	NEDERLAND	33486	Appraisal district				
	1113 FRANKLIN AVE	NELSON TO NEDERLAND	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126963	NEDERLAND	67547	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1130 FRANKLIN AVE	HOLLAND TO NEDERLAND	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126956	NEDERLAND	47558	In field estimate				
	1131 FRANKLIN AVE	NELSON TO NEDERLAND	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126960	NEDERLAND	67542	In field estimate				
	1139 FRANKLIN AVE	NELSON TO NEDERLAND	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126949	NEDERLAND	67541	In field estimate				
	1140 FRANKLIN AVE	HOLLAND TO NEDERLAND	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126953	NEDERLAND	47560	In field estimate				
	1508 FRANKLIN AVE	11 D. CHOATE	1925		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 127041	NEDERLAND	53382	In field estimate				
	515 GAGE AVE	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130753	NEDERLAND	75328	Appraisal district				
	519 GAGE AVE	PALCO - NED.	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130750	NEDERLAND	75329	In field estimate				
	1109 GARY		1930		Within district eligible for NRHP (COLLEGE TO NEDERLAND - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 127502	NEDERLAND	22825	In field estimate				
	1111 GARY		1935		Within district eligible for NRHP (COLLEGE TO NEDERLAND - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 127499	NEDERLAND	22827	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1112 GARY		1940		Within district eligible for NRHP (COLLEGE TO NEDERLAND - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 127507	NEDERLAND	22820	In field estimate				
	1116 GARY		1935		Within district eligible for NRHP (COLLEGE TO NEDERLAND - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 127510	NEDERLAND	22819	In field estimate				
	1119 GARY		1935		Within district eligible for NRHP (COLLEGE TO NEDERLAND - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 127496	NEDERLAND	22827	In field estimate				
	1123 GARY		1930		Within district eligible for NRHP (COLLEGE TO NEDERLAND - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 127489	NEDERLAND	22828	In field estimate				
	1124 GARY		1935		Within district eligible for NRHP (COLLEGE TO NEDERLAND - Noncontributing)	Lacks integrity	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 127513	NEDERLAND	22818	In field estimate				
	1127 GARY		1930		Within district eligible for NRHP (COLLEGE TO NEDERLAND - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 127485	NEDERLAND	22829	In field estimate				
	1131 GARY		1935		Within district eligible for NRHP (COLLEGE TO NEDERLAND - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 127482	NEDERLAND	22830	In field estimate				
	1135 GARY		1930		Within district eligible for NRHP (COLLEGE TO NEDERLAND - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 127477	NEDERLAND	22831	In field estimate				
	1136 GARY		1930		Within district eligible for NRHP (COLLEGE TO NEDERLAND - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 127514	NEDERLAND	22815	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2500 GARY AVE	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129056	NEDERLAND	75436	Appraisal district				
	2507 GARY AVE	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129074	NEDERLAND	75434	Appraisal district				
	2512 GARY AVE	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129063	NEDERLAND	75433	Appraisal district				
	2608 GARY AVE	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129071	NEDERLAND	75431	Appraisal district				
	2620 GARY AVE	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129081	NEDERLAND	75432	Appraisal district				
	7631 GAYLE	SMITH HODGESON & BIGELOW	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122045	NEDERLAND	262838	In field estimate				
	2011 GRANT ST	PRICE, E. N.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129420	NEDERLAND	94054	Appraisal district				
	2015 GRANT ST	PRICE, E. N.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129413	NEDERLAND	94053	Appraisal district				
	2024 GRANT ST	PRICE, E. N.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129424	NEDERLAND	94073	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	7762 GREEN AVE	PLEASANT HOME REPLAT	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129089	NEDERLAND	85081	Appraisal district				
	7786 GREEN AVE	PLEASANT HOME REPLAT	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129092	NEDERLAND	85082	In field estimate				
	7851 GREEN AVE	PLEASANT HOME REPLAT	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129099	NEDERLAND	85072	Appraisal district				
	7889 GREEN AVE	PLEASANT HOME REPLAT	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129102	NEDERLAND	85070	Appraisal district				
	7914 GREEN AVE	PLEASANT HOME REPLAT	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129096	NEDERLAND	85086	Appraisal district				
	7948 GREEN AVE	PLEASANT HOME REPLAT	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129105	NEDERLAND	85087	Appraisal district				
	8010 GREEN AVE	PLEASANT HOME REPLAT	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122098	NEDERLAND	85089	Appraisal district				
	8072 GREEN AVE	PLEASANT HOME	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122095	NEDERLAND	85041	Appraisal district				
	8098 GREEN AVE	PLEASANT HOME	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122092	NEDERLAND	85040	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	8140 GREEN AVE	PLEASANT HOME	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122089	NEDERLAND	85043	Appraisal district				
	124 HARDY AVE	240 T & NO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128860	NEDERLAND	139459	Appraisal district				
	211 HARDY AVE		1968	St. Charles Borromeo Catholic Church	Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 128841	NEDERLAND	46502	Church website				
	900 HELENA AVE	RIENSTRA ACRES	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129258	NEDERLAND	96625	In field estimate				
	904 HELENA AVE	RIENSTRA ACRES	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129261	NEDERLAND	96626	In field estimate				
	920 HELENA AVE	RIENSTRA ACRES	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129264	NEDERLAND	96627	In field estimate				
	922 HELENA AVE	RIENSTRA ACRES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129270	NEDERLAND	96629	Appraisal district				
	924 HELENA AVE	RIENSTRA ACRES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129267	NEDERLAND	96628	Appraisal district				
	1028 HELENA AVE	RIENSTRA ACRES	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129275	NEDERLAND	96632	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1036 HELENA AVE	RIENSTRA ACRES	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129278	NEDERLAND	96633	In field estimate				
	1111 HELENA AVE	HOLLAND TO NEDERLAND	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127459	NEDERLAND	47550	In field estimate				
	1121 HELENA AVE	HOLLAND TO NEDERLAND	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127456	NEDERLAND	47551	In field estimate				
	1122 HELENA AVE	BLANCHE	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127468	NEDERLAND	8755	In field estimate				
	1123 HELENA AVE	HOLLAND TO NEDERLAND	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 127453	NEDERLAND	47552	In field estimate				
	1129 HELENA AVE	HOLLAND TO NEDERLAND	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127448	NEDERLAND	47554	In field estimate				
	1148 HELENA AVE	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127473	NEDERLAND	75496	Appraisal district				
	1220 HELENA AVE	RORY HANCOCK PLACE	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127926	NEDERLAND	344519	In field estimate				
	2304 HELENA AVE	PALCO - NED.	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130631	NEDERLAND	75539	In field estimate				
	2312 HELENA AVE	PALCO - NED.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130634	NEDERLAND	75540	In field estimate				
	2404 HELENA AVE	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130624	NEDERLAND	75543	Appraisal district				
	2503 HELENA AVE	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129133	NEDERLAND	75427	Appraisal district				
	2511 HELENA AVE	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129130	NEDERLAND	75428	Appraisal district				
	2523 HELENA AVE	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129121	NEDERLAND	75443	Appraisal district				
	2615 HELENA AVE	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129115	NEDERLAND	75426	Appraisal district				
	2620 HELENA AVE	PALCO - NED.	1962	C. O. Wilson Middle School	Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129137	NEDERLAND	75545	Appraisal district				
	2711 HELENA AVE		1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129086	NEDERLAND	74542	In field estimate				
	2800 HELENA AVE	PALCO - NED.	1965	Helena Park Elementary School	Individually eligible for NRHP (Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 130566	NEDERLAND	75572	Aerial images				
	2901 HELENA AVE	MAISON HELENA TOWNHOUSES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130563	NEDERLAND	60193	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	3527 HELENA AVE	NEDERLAND TOWNHOMES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130567	NEDERLAND	67504	Appraisal district				
	3535 HELENA AVE	240 T & NO	1963		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130570	NEDERLAND	139445	Appraisal district				
	1616 HIGHWAY 365	PALCO - NED.	1974		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127809	NEDERLAND	75102	Appraisal district				
	1706 HIGHWAY 365	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127811	NEDERLAND	75104	Appraisal district				
	2200 HIGHWAY 365	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128103	NEDERLAND	75139	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2400 HIGHWAY 365 A	PALCO - NED.	1966		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127814	NEDERLAND	75147	Appraisal district				
	2400 HIGHWAY 365 B	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127819	NEDERLAND	75145	Appraisal district				
	1855 HIGHWAY 69	PLEASANT HOME REPLAT	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No photo due to no parking or safe walking
HHM ID: 129218	NEDERLAND	85064	Appraisal district				
	2000 HIGHWAY 69	PLEASANT HOME REPLAT	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130718	NEDERLAND	85057	Appraisal district				
	2468 HIGHWAY 69	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130641	NEDERLAND	75944	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	3098 HIGHWAY 69		1950-2022	Memory Gardens Cemetery		Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 129230	NEDERLAND	187555	Aerial images, FindAGrave				
	3500 HIGHWAY 69	PALCO - NED.	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129239	NEDERLAND	76014	Appraisal district				
	1769 HIGHWAY 69 N	PLEASANT HOME REPLAT	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129215	NEDERLAND	85066	In field estimate				
	1821 HIGHWAY 69 N	PLEASANT HOME REPLAT	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129135	NEDERLAND	85065	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2897 HIGHWAY 69 N	PALCO - NED.	1966		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129198	NEDERLAND	75954	Appraisal district				
	1524 HILL ST	PALCO - NED.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129366	NEDERLAND	75702	In field estimate				
	7910 HOLMES RD	SMITH HODGESON & BIGELOW	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 122046	NEDERLAND	102365	In field estimate				
	7988 HOLMES RD	SMITH HODGESON & BIGELOW	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122047	NEDERLAND	102353	Appraisal district				
	8529 HOLMES RD	PLEASANT HOME	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 122079	NEDERLAND	85044	Appraisal district				
	8572 HOLMES RD	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122099	NEDERLAND	75821	Appraisal district				
	8722 HOLMES RD	FORD, J. D.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122100	NEDERLAND	33480	Appraisal district				
	1507 S HWY 69		1960	Schooner Restaurant	Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126459	NEDERLAND	46859	Restaurant website				
	1123 ITHACA AVE	BLANCHE	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127896	NEDERLAND	8758	In field estimate				
	1125 ITHACA AVE	BLANCHE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	No photo due to kids in yard
HHM ID: 127901	NEDERLAND	8757	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1119 JACKSON AVE	CARTER 2	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128075	NEDERLAND	17077	In field estimate				
	1123 JACKSON AVE	CARTER 2	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128078	NEDERLAND	17078	In field estimate				
	1124 JACKSON		1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128081	NEDERLAND	17070	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1143 JACKSON AVE	HUMPHREY HEIGHTS 1	1930		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 127968	NEDERLAND	49000	In field estimate				
	1116 KENT AVE	CARTER 2	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128084	NEDERLAND	17061	Appraisal district				
	1120 KENT AVE	CARTER 2	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128101	NEDERLAND	17062	In field estimate				
	1304 KENT AVE	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127952	NEDERLAND	75502	Appraisal district				
	1312 KENT AVE	PALCO - NED.	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 127949	NEDERLAND	75503	In field estimate				
	1316 KENT AVE	PALCO - NED.	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127946	NEDERLAND	75500	In field estimate				
	1320 KENT AVE	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127944	NEDERLAND	75501	Appraisal district				
	1116 LAMAR AVE	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128690	NEDERLAND	75840	Appraisal district				
	1117 LAMAR AVE	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130743	NEDERLAND	75844	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1118 LAMAR AVE	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128684	NEDERLAND	75841	Appraisal district				
	1198 LAMAR AVE	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128682	NEDERLAND	75842	Appraisal district				
	1200 LAMAR AVE	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128680	NEDERLAND	75889	Appraisal district				
	1201 LAMAR AVE	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128676	NEDERLAND	75894	Appraisal district				
	1203 LAMAR AVE	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130746	NEDERLAND	75893	Appraisal district				
	1204 LAMAR AVE	PALCO - NED.	1963		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128743	NEDERLAND	75888	Appraisal district				
	1208 LAMAR AVE	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128745	NEDERLAND	75887	Appraisal district				
	1111 LULING ST	PALCO - NED.	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 128053	NEDERLAND	75475	In field estimate				
	1112 LULING ST	PALCO - NED.	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 128022	NEDERLAND	75474	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1114 LULING ST	PALCO - NED.	1900	Early settler (Ellis) home	Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 128032	NEDERLAND	75480	In field estimate				
	1115 LULING ST	PALCO - NED.	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128049	NEDERLAND	75479	In field estimate				
	1119 LULING ST	PALCO - NED.	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128048	NEDERLAND	75483	In field estimate				
	1123 LULING ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128045	NEDERLAND	75530	Appraisal district				
	1128 LULING ST	PALCO - NED.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 128034	NEDERLAND	75529	In field estimate				
	1131 LULING ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128041	NEDERLAND	75535	Appraisal district				
	1141 LULING ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128040	NEDERLAND	75534	Appraisal district				
	200 MEMORIAL N FWY	240 T & NO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129173	NEDERLAND	139453	Appraisal district				
	808 MEMORIAL N FWY	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130712	NEDERLAND	75456	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	824 MEMORIAL N FWY	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130714	NEDERLAND	75455	Appraisal district				
	1002 MEMORIAL N FWY	PALCO - NED.	1966		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130637	NEDERLAND	75602	Appraisal district				
	604 NEDERLAND AVE	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129026	NEDERLAND	75339	Appraisal district				
	723 NEDERLAND AVE	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129018	NEDERLAND	75241	Appraisal district				
	844 NEDERLAND AVE	HAIZLIP	1948	Southwestern Bell Telephone Co.	Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 128351	NEDERLAND	43074	Sanborn map, 1949, sheet 5				
	922 NEDERLAND AVE	NEDERLAND	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128348	NEDERLAND	67275	Appraisal district				
	1022 NEDERLAND AVE	NEDERLAND	1971		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128893	NEDERLAND	67284	Appraisal district				
	1036 NEDERLAND AVE	NEDERLAND	1958		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128886	NEDERLAND	67283	Appraisal district				
	1158 NEDERLAND AVE	NEDERLAND	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127775	NEDERLAND	67306	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1203 NEDERLAND AVE	PALCO - NED.	1938		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127305	NEDERLAND	75296	Appraisal district				
	1208 NEDERLAND AVE	NEDERLAND	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127180	NEDERLAND	67308	In field estimate				
	1217 NEDERLAND AVE	KELLY, J. C.	1963		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127190	NEDERLAND	51306	Appraisal district				
	1233 NEDERLAND AVE	KELLY, J. C.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127192	NEDERLAND	51307	Appraisal district				
	1300 NEDERLAND AVE	NEDERLAND	1963	First Methodist Church	Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126868	NEDERLAND	67307	Cornerstone				
	1320 NEDERLAND AVE	NEDERLAND	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127135	NEDERLAND	67315	Appraisal district				
	1424 NEDERLAND AVE	NEDERLAND	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127231	NEDERLAND	67321	Appraisal district				
	1504 NEDERLAND AVE	COOKE, J. B.	1963		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126631	NEDERLAND	23793	Appraisal district				
	1624 NEDERLAND AVE	PALCO - NED.	1976		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126624	NEDERLAND	75381	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1718 NEDERLAND AVE	CARTER 1	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126815	NEDERLAND	17042	Appraisal district				
	1722 NEDERLAND AVE	CARTER 1	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126812	NEDERLAND	17041	Appraisal district				
	1803 NEDERLAND AVE	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126701	NEDERLAND	75282	Appraisal district				
	1804 NEDERLAND AVE	CARTER 1	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126800	NEDERLAND	17050	Appraisal district				
	1904 NEDERLAND AVE	CARTER 1	1973		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126797	NEDERLAND	17057	Appraisal district				
	1911 NEDERLAND AVE	PALCO - NED.	1955	First Baptist Church	Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 126680	NEDERLAND	75302	Newspaper				
	2310 NEDERLAND AVE	HILLTOP 2ND	1951	Nederland Avenue Church of Christ	Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 127850	NEDERLAND	47427	Newspaper article				
	2424 NEDERLAND AVE A	PALCO - NED.	1976		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128150	NEDERLAND	75406	Appraisal district				
	2424 NEDERLAND AVE B	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128158	NEDERLAND	75403	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2500 NEDERLAND AVE	PALCO - NED.	1953		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128149	NEDERLAND	398538	Appraisal district				
	3520 NEDERLAND AVE	240 T & NO	1972		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129170	NEDERLAND	139456	Appraisal district				
	3612 NEDERLAND AVE	240 T & NO	1971		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129168	NEDERLAND	139446	Appraisal district				
	3720 NEDERLAND AVE	240 T & NO	1976		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129157	NEDERLAND	326188	Appraisal district				
	1000 BLOCK NEDERLAND AVE	NEDERLAND PLAZA	1977		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 128896	NEDERLAND	67325, 67327, 75235, 75239	Appraisal district				
	3716-3718 NEDERLAND AVE	240 T & NO	1976		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129161	NEDERLAND	139454	Appraisal district				
	1824 PETERSON ST	PETERSON TO NEDERLAND	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128740	NEDERLAND	82826	In field estimate				
	1917 PETERSON ST	PETERSON TO NEDERLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128736	NEDERLAND	82832	Appraisal district				
	2109 PETERSON ST	PETERSON TO NEDERLAND	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128272	NEDERLAND	82828	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2516 PRICE ST	PRICE, E. N.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129406	NEDERLAND	94049	Appraisal district				
	2604 PRICE ST	PRICE, E. N.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129431	NEDERLAND	94075	Appraisal district				
	2011 QUEENS AVE	CLAYTON	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128821	NEDERLAND	22395	In field estimate				
	2704 SEATTLE ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128977	NEDERLAND	75796	Appraisal district				
	2707 SEATTLE ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 128990	NEDERLAND	75787	Appraisal district				
	2708 SEATTLE ST	PALCO - NED.	1977		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128983	NEDERLAND	75793	Appraisal district				
	2712 SEATTLE ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128985	NEDERLAND	75792	Appraisal district				
	2720 SEATTLE ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129001	NEDERLAND	75791	Appraisal district				
	2811 SEATTLE ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128997	NEDERLAND	75786	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2824 SEATTLE ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129007	NEDERLAND	75788	Appraisal district				
	2850 SEATTLE ST	PALCO - NED.	1977		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129013	NEDERLAND	75789	Appraisal district				
	2900 SEATTLE ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129017	NEDERLAND	75797	Appraisal district				
	2911 SEATTLE ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129022	NEDERLAND	75798	Appraisal district				
	4293 SHELLY DR	PRAIRIE VIEW TO PORT ARTHUR	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 122019	NEDERLAND	93994	Appraisal district				
	4302 SHELLY DR	PRAIRIE VIEW TO PORT ARTHUR	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122025	NEDERLAND	94001	Appraisal district				
	4330 SHELLY DR	PRAIRIE VIEW TO PORT ARTHUR	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122023	NEDERLAND	94003	Appraisal district				
	4355 SHELLY DR	PRAIRIE VIEW TO PORT ARTHUR	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122020	NEDERLAND	93997	Appraisal district				
	4398 SHELLY DR	SMITH HODGESON & BIGELOW	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122021	NEDERLAND	102333	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1101 SPRING ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128276	NEDERLAND	75631	Appraisal district				
	1103 SPRING ST	PALCO - NED.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128279	NEDERLAND	75630	In field estimate				
	1139 SPRING ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128282	NEDERLAND	75717	Appraisal district				
	1211 SPRING ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128285	NEDERLAND	75721	Appraisal district				
	1301 SPRING ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 128290	NEDERLAND	75723	Appraisal district				
	1307 SPRING ST	PALCO - NED.	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128294	NEDERLAND	75722	In field estimate				
	1512 SPRING		1930	From JCHC: In area where Depression-era truck farms built. Potentially one of the oldest houses in Nederland in near as-built condition.	Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 128733	NEDERLAND	47793	In field estimate				
	1148 SPURLOCK RD	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128759	NEDERLAND	75890	Appraisal district				
	1204 SPURLOCK RD	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128755	NEDERLAND	75884	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1603 SPURLOCK RD	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129371	NEDERLAND	75708	Appraisal district				
	1703 SPURLOCK RD	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129374	NEDERLAND	75704	Appraisal district				
	1715 SPURLOCK RD A	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129377	NEDERLAND	75694	Appraisal district				
	1715 SPURLOCK RD B	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129387	NEDERLAND	75695	Appraisal district				
	1721 SPURLOCK RD	PALCO - NED.	1973		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129390	NEDERLAND	75696	Appraisal district				
	1904 SPURLOCK RD	PRICE, E. N.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129393	NEDERLAND	94037	Appraisal district				
	2016 SPURLOCK RD	PRICE, E. N.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129396	NEDERLAND	94046	Appraisal district				
	2303 SPURLOCK RD	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129446	NEDERLAND	75762	Appraisal district				
	3010 SPURLOCK RD	PALCO - NED.	1972		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130649	NEDERLAND	75925	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	3304 SPURLOCK RD	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130646	NEDERLAND	75935	Appraisal district				
	3400 SPURLOCK RD	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130643	NEDERLAND	75947	Appraisal district				
	210 TWIN CITY HWY	PALCO - NED.	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127297	NEDERLAND	75232	Appraisal district				
	247 N TWIN CITY HWY		1950		Within district eligible for NRHP (Downtown Nederland - Contributing)	Possesses integrity and contributes to district	
HHM ID: 126585	NEDERLAND	67247	In field estimate				
	507 TWIN CITY HWY	NELSON TO NEDERLAND	1973		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 128218	NEDERLAND	67561	Appraisal district				
	605 TWIN CITY HWY	NELSON TO NEDERLAND	1948		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126970	NEDERLAND	67551	Appraisal district				
	939 TWIN CITY HWY	BLANCHE	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127895	NEDERLAND	8748	In field estimate				
	1119 TWIN CITY HWY	CARTER 2	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128065	NEDERLAND	17065	Appraisal district				
	1203 TWIN CITY HWY	CARTER 2	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128061	NEDERLAND	17060	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	203 N TWIN CITY HWY	NEDERLAND	1910		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	Address is 1118 Atlanta Ave in CAD
HHM ID: 126859	NEDERLAND	67250	In field estimate				
	2806 N TWIN CITY HWY	BEARD	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128747	NEDERLAND	5005	In field estimate				
	6200 BLOCK N TWIN CITY HWY	32 P. HUMPHRIES	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128645	NEDERLAND	130578	In field estimate				
	107 TWIN CITY N HWY	NEDERLAND	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 128757	NEDERLAND	67301	In field estimate				
	219 TWIN CITY N HWY	NEDERLAND	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126852	NEDERLAND	67249	Appraisal district				
	231 TWIN CITY N HWY	NEDERLAND	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126849	NEDERLAND	67248	Appraisal district				
	411 TWIN CITY N HWY	NEDERLAND	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126995	NEDERLAND	67178	Appraisal district				
	703 TWIN CITY N HWY	HOLLAND TO NEDERLAND	1948		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 126967	NEDERLAND	47555	Appraisal district				
	1221 TWIN CITY N HWY	PALCO - NED.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128058	NEDERLAND	75476	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1303 TWIN CITY N HWY	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128019	NEDERLAND	75481	Appraisal district				
	2700 TWIN CITY N HWY	PALCO - NED.	1967		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130738	NEDERLAND	75838	Appraisal district				
	2801 TWIN CITY N HWY	PALCO - NED.	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130740	NEDERLAND	75836	Appraisal district				
	2901 TWIN CITY N HWY	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128704	NEDERLAND	75860	Appraisal district				
	2920 TWIN CITY N HWY	PALCO - NED.	1967		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 128751	NEDERLAND	75873	Appraisal district				
	3045 TWIN CITY N HWY	PALCO - NED.	1977		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128731	NEDERLAND	75862	Appraisal district				
	3105 TWIN CITY N HWY	PALCO - NED.	1967		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128729	NEDERLAND	75851	Appraisal district				
	3221 TWIN CITY N HWY	PALCO - NED.	1966		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128725	NEDERLAND	75852	Appraisal district				
	3404 TWIN CITY N HWY	PALCO - NED.	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 128665	NEDERLAND	75982	In field estimate				
	3408 TWIN CITY N HWY	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128666	NEDERLAND	75992	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	3420 TWIN CITY N HWY	WILLIAMS, EARL E.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128671	NEDERLAND	115475	Appraisal district				
	3508 TWIN CITY N HWY	CRARY, CHAS. T.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128707	NEDERLAND	25531	Appraisal district				
	3510 TWIN CITY N HWY	CRARY, CHAS. T.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128700	NEDERLAND	25530	Appraisal district				
	3904 TWIN CITY N HWY	CRARY, CHAS. T.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128722	NEDERLAND	25529	Appraisal district				
	3922 TWIN CITY N HWY	CRARY, CHAS. T.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 128689	NEDERLAND	25526	Appraisal district				
	104 TWIN CITY S HWY	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127287	NEDERLAND	75217	Appraisal district				
	110 TWIN CITY S HWY	PALCO - NED.	1973		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127291	NEDERLAND	75223	Appraisal district				
	128 TWIN CITY S HWY	PALCO - NED.	1958		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127293	NEDERLAND	75229	Appraisal district				
	428 TWIN CITY S HWY	PALCO - NED.	1948		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127748	NEDERLAND	75212	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	812 TWIN CITY S HWY	PALCO - NED.	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127765	NEDERLAND	75216	In field estimate				
	820 TWIN CITY S HWY	PALCO - NED.	1964		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127761	NEDERLAND	75209	Appraisal district				
	7966 VITERBO RD	PLEASANT HOME	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129127	NEDERLAND	85022	Appraisal district				
	8134 VITERBO RD	PLEASANT HOME	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129118	NEDERLAND	85014	In field estimate				
	764 BURR & CASWELL	764 BURR & CASWELL				ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 130756	NEDERLAND	142576					

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	Airport	Airport	1960 - 1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128868	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	AIRPORT 2	AIRPORT 2	1950-1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128106	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	ALLAN MEADOWS	ALLAN MEADOWS	1965-1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127572	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	ALLAN MEADOWS SEC 1-3	ALLAN MEADOWS SEC 1-3	1965-1985		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127580	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	ANDERSON ESTATES TO NED 1	ANDERSON ESTATES TO NED 1	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130067	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	ANDERSON ESTATES TO NED 2	ANDERSON ESTATES TO NED 2	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 130071	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	ANDERSON ESTATES TO NED 3	ANDERSON ESTATES TO NED 3	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130066	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Anderson Estates to Ned 4	Anderson Estates to Ned 4	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129337	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	ARMSTRONG ESTATES	ARMSTRONG ESTATES	1965 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129043	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	Banks	Banks	1950 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129328	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	BARNETT ESTATES (1400-1500 BLOCK KENT AVE)	BARNETT ESTATES (1400-1500 BLOCK KENT AVE)	1970s		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128000	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Block Estates 2	Block Estates 2	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130661	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Block Estates 3	Block Estates 3	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130664	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Block Estates 4	Block Estates 4	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130667	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Block Estates 5	Block Estates 5	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130671	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Blue Bonnet	Blue Bonnet	1955 - 1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130586	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Burnson	Burnson	1940 - 1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129250	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	CALLIHAN	CALLIHAN	1945-1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127978	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	CARABIN 1	CARABIN 1	1930-1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127387	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	CARABIN 2	CARABIN 2	1950 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128952	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Carolyn	Carolyn	1945 - 1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128699	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Carter 3	Carter 3	1960 - 2010		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130612	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Central Gardens	Central Gardens	1940 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 128656	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Central Heights 1	Central Heights 1	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130730	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Central Heights 2	Central Heights 2	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130731	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	CESSAC 1	CESSAC 1	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127990	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	CESSAC 2	CESSAC 2	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127985	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	COLLEGE TO NEDERLAND	COLLEGE TO NEDERLAND	1925-1935		Eligible as a district (College to Nederland Subdivision)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 127440	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Cottage Grove 1	Cottage Grove 1	1910 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130610	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Cottage Grove 2	Cottage Grove 2	1940 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130611	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Crestview	Crestview	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130601	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Del Monte	Del Monte	1960 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129219	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	DOORNBOS, C.	DOORNBOS, C.	1945-1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126707	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	DOORNBOS, WM.	DOORNBOS, WM.	1945-2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127633	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Golden Triangle Industrial Park	Golden Triangle Industrial Park	1960 - 1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128649	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Haizlip	Haizlip	1930 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 128922	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	HAMMOND	HAMMOND	1925-1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127874	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Helena Park 1	Helena Park 1	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130577	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	HELENA PARK 2	HELENA PARK 2	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129202	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Helena Park 3	Helena Park 3	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130587	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	HELENA PARK 4	HELENA PARK 4	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129184	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Helena Terrace	Helena Terrace	1965 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130575	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	HIGHLAND NORTH ESTATES 1	HIGHLAND NORTH ESTATES 1	1970 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130724	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	HIGHLAND NORTH ESTATES 2	HIGHLAND NORTH ESTATES 2	1970 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130725	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	HIGHLAND PARK TO NEDERLAND	HIGHLAND PARK TO NEDERLAND	1960 - 1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 130117	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	HILLCREST 1	HILLCREST 1	1925-1965			Intensive survey needed - possible smaller districts	
HHM ID: 127408	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	HILLCREST 2	HILLCREST 2	1945 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128828	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	HILLCREST 2 REVISED	HILLCREST 2 REVISED	1930 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126458	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	HILLCREST TERRACE	HILLCREST TERRACE	1945 - 1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 128776	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	HILLTOP 1 TO NEDERLAND	HILLTOP 1 TO NEDERLAND	1950-1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126791	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	HILLTOP TO NEDERLAND	HILLTOP TO NEDERLAND	1950 - 1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127830	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Holiday Heights 1	Holiday Heights 1	1955 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128655	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Holiday Heights 2	Holiday Heights 2	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128654	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	HOLLYWOOD TO NEDERLAND	HOLLYWOOD TO NEDERLAND	1939-1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 128267	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	HUMPHREY HEIGHTS 1	HUMPHREY HEIGHTS 1	1930-1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127955	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	HUMPHREY HEIGHTS 1 CLASS 5 (1500 Block Jackson Ave)	HUMPHREY HEIGHTS 1 CLASS 5 (1500 Block Jackson Ave)	1945-1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128003	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	HUMPHREY HEIGHTS 2	HUMPHREY HEIGHTS 2	1935 - 1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130880	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	HUMPHREY HEIGHTS 3	HUMPHREY HEIGHTS 3	1950-1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127963	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	INGWERSON	INGWERSON	1945 - 2010		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 126686	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	JOHANNA	JOHANNA	1930-2010		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127121	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Johnson to Nederland	Johnson to Nederland	1945 - 2010		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128951	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Kinard Acres	Kinard Acres	1930 - 1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130720	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	KOELEMAY	KOELEMAY	1930-1990s		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126899	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	LANGHAM, T. B. SUB.	LANGHAM, T. B. SUB.	1930-1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127875	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Matherne, J. J.	Matherne, J. J.	1970 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128856	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	MCCAULEY	MCCAULEY	1925-2010		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127343	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	MCNEILL	MCNEILL	1940 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129251	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Memphis Avenue	Memphis Avenue	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129174	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Midway	Midway	1950 - 1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128905	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Moak	Moak	1960 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130597	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	NEDERLAND TERRACE	NEDERLAND TERRACE	1950-1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127858	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	NEDERLAND TERRACE 2	NEDERLAND TERRACE 2	1950-1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127867	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	NORTH SIDE	NORTH SIDE	1930-1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127933	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	OAKLAWN TO NEDERLAND	OAKLAWN TO NEDERLAND	1950-1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127401	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Oakley	Oakley	1930 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 128939	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	PALCO-NED (3600 BLOCK HELENA AVE)	PALCO-NED (3600 BLOCK HELENA AVE)	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130569	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Palco-Ned (5th and 5 1/2 Streets)	Palco-Ned (5th and 5 1/2 Streets)	1960 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130679	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Palco-Ned (700 Block 7th Street South Side)	Palco-Ned (700 Block 7th Street South Side)	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130658	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Palco-Ned (Parkway Village Estates)	Palco-Ned (Parkway Village Estates)	1970 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129191	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Parkside to Nederland	Parkside to Nederland	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128774	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Ridgecrest	Ridgecrest	1965 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130600	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	Roach, F. A.	Roach, F. A.	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129321	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	SIERKS, M.	SIERKS, M.	1945-2010		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126719	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Songwood Unit 1	Songwood Unit 1	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130670	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Songwood Unit 2	Songwood Unit 2	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130676	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Southcrest	Southcrest	1950 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 128829	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Staffen, John M.	Staffen, John M.	1946 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129322	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Sycamore 1	Sycamore 1	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128794	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Sycamore 2	Sycamore 2	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128791	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Sycamore 3	Sycamore 3	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128795	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	Sycamore 4	Sycamore 4	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128793	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Sycamore 5	Sycamore 5	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128792	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	WAGNER 1	WAGNER 1	1945-2010		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127640	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	WAGNER 2	WAGNER 2	1930-2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 127721	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	WALLING MEADOWS	WALLING MEADOWS	1965-1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 127571	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Weschester 1 to Nederland	Weschester 1 to Nederland	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130529	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Weschester 2	Weschester 2	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130526	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	WEST SIDE TO NEDERLAND	WEST SIDE TO NEDERLAND	1955 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 126824	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	WILLIAMSBURG PARK SEC. 1	WILLIAMSBURG PARK SEC. 1	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127822	NEDERLAND		Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	WOODCREST TO NEDERLAND	WOODCREST TO NEDERLAND	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 127399	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Youmans 1	Youmans 1	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130551	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Youmans 2	Youmans 2	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130550	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Youmans 3	Youmans 3	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130545	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Youmans 4	Youmans 4	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130544	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Youmans 5	Youmans 5	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130530	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Youmans 6	Youmans 6	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130528	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Youmans 7	Youmans 7	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130527	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	Youmans Acres	Youmans Acres	1960 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130552	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	Youmans Terrace	Youmans Terrace	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130576	NEDERLAND		In field estimate				
	1170 2ND ST		1955			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 124074	NOME	102963	In field estimate				
	1460 2ND ST	SOUR LAKE TO NOME	1910		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	Address is 1474 2nd St on fence
HHM ID: 123960	NOME	103022	In field estimate				
	1000 BLOCK N 3RD ST	SOUR LAKE TO NOME	1948	Nome Colored School	Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 124057	NOME	102946	Appraisal district				
	1669 AVE C	MOON TO NOME	1920		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 123919	NOME	66597	In field estimate				
	1744 AVENUE C	380 JNO. VANNESS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123938	NOME	140171	Appraisal district				
	1805 AVENUE C	380 JNO. VANNESS	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123959	NOME	140157	Neighbor				
	1811 AVENUE C	380 JNO. VANNESS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123955	NOME	140148	Appraisal district				
	1855 AVENUE C	380 JNO. VANNESS	1916		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123941	NOME	140144	Neighbor				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1784 AVENUE E	380 JNO. VANNESS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124032	NOME	140099	Appraisal district				
	BONNER RD	4 JOHN BLAIR	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123928	NOME	124711	In field estimate				
	11291 EBNER RD	596 T & NO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131065	NOME	141609	Appraisal district				
	11340 EBNER RD	882 TC & MC	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131068	NOME	143148	In field estimate				
	1155 FLORIDA ST	LEWIS ESTATES	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 124050	NOME	413241	In field estimate				
	1649 FM 1009	380 JNO. VANNESS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123899	NOME	140163	Appraisal district				
	1815 FM 1009	4 JOHN BLAIR	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123957	NOME	124692	Appraisal district				
	1894 FM 1009	4 JOHN BLAIR	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123952	NOME	124689	Appraisal district				
	4295 FM 1009	4 JOHN BLAIR	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123934	NOME	124677	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	4382 FM 1009	4 JOHN BLAIR	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123926	NOME	124656	Appraisal district				
	4512 FM 1009	4 JOHN BLAIR	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123912	NOME	124701	Appraisal district				
	4632 FM 1009	4 JOHN BLAIR	1967		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123911	NOME	124698	Appraisal district				
	4707 FM 1009 RD	4 JOHN BLAIR	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123910	NOME	124620	Appraisal district				
	4969 FM 1009 RD	4 JOHN BLAIR	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 123909	NOME	124706	Appraisal district				
	5044 FM 1009	4 JOHN BLAIR	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123906	NOME	124671	Appraisal district				
	3500 BLOCK FM 1009	4 JOHN BLAIR	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 123951	NOME	264194	Appraisal district				
	3500 BLOCK FM 1009		1876	Pivoto-Robinson Cemetery		ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 123984	NOME	124663	Oldest burial per FindAGrave.com				
	4200 BLOCK FM 1009	4 JOHN BLAIR	1962			ROE needed	Limited visibility from ROW
HHM ID: 123937	NOME	124638	Appraisal district				
	4300 BLOCK FM 1009	4 JOHN BLAIR	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123931	NOME	124708	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	8930 FM 1406	39 WM. MCFARLAND	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131060	NOME	131892	Appraisal district				
	2423 GULF ST	4 JOHN BLAIR	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123976	NOME	124673	Appraisal district				
	2491 GULF ST	4 JOHN BLAIR	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123973	NOME	124658	In field estimate				
	2547 GULF ST	4 JOHN BLAIR	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123970	NOME	124693	Appraisal district				
	1607 HIGHWAY 365	29 A. HORTON	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 124006	NOME	130344	In field estimate				
	1673 HIGHWAY 365	29 A. HORTON	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124009	NOME	130347	In field estimate				
	1676 HIGHWAY 365	380 JNO. VANNESS	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124014	NOME	140113	In field estimate				
	1876 HIGHWAY 365	380 JNO. VANNESS	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123987	NOME	140109	In field estimate				
	1932 HIGHWAY 365	MAUBAULES, A. J.	1952		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123990	NOME	61939	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2280 HIGHWAY 365	MAUBAULES, A. J.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124129	NOME	61953	Appraisal district				
	33955 HIGHWAY 365	4 JOHN BLAIR	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131057	NOME	124623	Appraisal district				
	21861 HIGHWAY 90	30 S. HORTON	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124183	NOME	130399	In field estimate				
	22051 HIGHWAY 90	30 S. HORTON	1973		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124180	NOME	130421	Appraisal district				
	22753 HIGHWAY 90	29 A. HORTON	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 124163	NOME	130322	Appraisal district				
	23067 HIGHWAY 90	29 A. HORTON	1964		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124159	NOME	246339	Appraisal district				
	23321 HIGHWAY 90	29 A. HORTON	1957		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 124150	NOME	130348	Appraisal district				
	1700 BLOCK HIGHWAY 90	380 JNO. VANNESS	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123898	NOME	140165	In field estimate				
	27200 BLOCK HIGHWAY 90	380 JNO. VANNESS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123895	NOME	140165	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1135 KOTZ RD	MAUBAULES, A. J.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124042	NOME	61937	Appraisal district				
	1148 KOTZ RD	380 JNO. VANNESS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 123994	NOME	140182	Appraisal district				
	1726 KOTZ RD	380 JNO. VANNESS	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124027	NOME	140149	In field estimate				
	1768 KOTZ RD	380 JNO. VANNESS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124020	NOME	140129	Appraisal district				
	KOTZ RD	4 JOHN BLAIR				ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 124039	NOME	124645					

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	MCDERMAND RD	255 T & NO				ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 131052	NOME	139557					
	5700 BLOCK NOLTE RD	4 JOHN BLAIR	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123896	NOME	124691	Appraisal district				
	3253 NOME SPUR RD		1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124088	NOME	138891	In field estimate				
	2700 BLOCK NOME SPUR RD	848 T & NO	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124098	NOME	142933, 344523	In field estimate				
	2000 BLOCK NORTH ST	SOUR LAKE TO NOME	1946	Nome Rice Dryer	Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 124068	NOME	103012	Research				
	4349 OLD GRAYBURG RD	231 T & NO	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 123985	NOME	139430	Appraisal district				
	4400 BLOCK OLD GRAYBURG RD	380 JNO. VANNESS	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123986	NOME	140180	In field estimate				
	17070 OLD NOME RD	30 S. HORTON	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No photo due to dogs
HHM ID: 124456	NOME	130415	Appraisal district				
	18406 OLD NOME RD	29 A. HORTON	1968			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 124141	NOME	130349	Appraisal district				
	PIGNUT ISLAND RD	264 T & NO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131054	NOME	139716	Appraisal district				
	1675 TEXAS ST	380 JNO. VANNESS	1937	Nome Gym	Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 123901	NOME	140107	Research				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1945 TEXAS ST	380 JNO. VANNESS	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123927	NOME	140176	In field estimate				
	10844 WILLIS RD	596 T & NO	1968			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 131063	NOME	141608	Appraisal district				
	A. J. Maubaules	A. J. Maubaules	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124126	NOME		In field estimate				
	BRIARGROVE	BRIARGROVE	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124036	NOME		In field estimate				
	GONER ACRES 2	GONER ACRES 2	1950 - 1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 124003	NOME		In field estimate				
	JNO VANNESS	JNO VANNESS	1950 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 124046	NOME		In field estimate				
	MOON TO NOME	MOON TO NOME	1960 - 1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123905	NOME		In field estimate				
	SOUR LAKE TO NOME	SOUR LAKE TO NOME	1930 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123891	NOME		In field estimate				
	2827 18TH ST	PORT ARTHUR CITY	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121771	PORT ARTHUR	91293	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	6745 BACKRIDGE RD	124 SARAH GLEN	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131340	PORT ARTHUR	137224	Appraisal district				
	5000 BLOCK BACKRIDGE RD	197 A. REUSS	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131343	PORT ARTHUR	138918	Appraisal district				
	CLAM LAKE RD	783 SARAH H. PACE				ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 131150	PORT ARTHUR	142645					
	1200 BLOCK HIGHWAY 365	PALCO - P.A.	1965		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 129054	PORT ARTHUR	74008	In field estimate				
	13256 HIGHWAY 87	167 JNO. MCGAFFEY	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	House actually on CAD 138039
HHM ID: 131346	PORT ARTHUR	138038	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2555 SAVANNAH AVE	MOTIVA	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 126415	PORT ARTHUR	264115	In field estimate				
	2555 SAVANNAH AVE	MOTIVA		Port Arthur Works Refinery/Motiva		ROE needed	Large complex with minimal visibility
HHM ID: 126351	PORT ARTHUR	264114					
	PARK PLACE 2 TO PORT ARTHUR	PARK PLACE 2 TO PORT ARTHUR	1945 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 130948	PORT ARTHUR		In field estimate				
	PARK PLACE 3 TO PORT ARTHUR	PARK PLACE 3 TO PORT ARTHUR	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 130945	PORT ARTHUR		In field estimate				
	PARK PLACE MANOR	PARK PLACE MANOR	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 130942	PORT ARTHUR		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	PARK PLACE MANOR EXT	PARK PLACE MANOR EXT	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 130939	PORT ARTHUR		In field estimate				
	2120 15TH		1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129365	PORT NECHES	19591	In field estimate				
	2401 8TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130757	PORT NECHES	74992	In field estimate				
	2407 8TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No photo - day care with kids out
HHM ID: 130760	PORT NECHES	74991	Appraisal district				
	2621 8TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130930	PORT NECHES	74987	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2625 8TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130927	PORT NECHES	74984	In field estimate				
	2629 8TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130924	PORT NECHES	74983	In field estimate				
	2711 8TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130921	PORT NECHES	74977	Appraisal district				
	2741 8TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130893	PORT NECHES	74976	Appraisal district				
	2801 8TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130896	PORT NECHES	75086	In field estimate				
	2805 8TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130899	PORT NECHES	75093	Appraisal district				
	2823 8TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130902	PORT NECHES	75100	Appraisal district				
	2827 8TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130905	PORT NECHES	75088	Appraisal district				
	2847 8TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130908	PORT NECHES	75085	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2901 8TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130911	PORT NECHES	75074	In field estimate				
	3001 8TH ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 128912	PORT NECHES	75058	Appraisal district				
	2134 ARMSTRONG AVE	TIPPEN	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129355	PORT NECHES	107207	Appraisal district				
	2146 ARMSTRONG AVE	TIPPEN	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129352	PORT NECHES	107210	Appraisal district				
	1 AUDUBON PL	AUDUBON PLACE TOWNHOMES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130400	PORT NECHES	2947	Appraisal district				
	314 AVE B		1930	St. Elizabeth Catholic Church School	Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 130009	PORT NECHES	94480	In field estimate				
	633 AVE C	111-YA	1920	Old Port Neches Jail	Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 129409	PORT NECHES	132201	In field estimate				
	733 AVE C		1920	Church of Christ		Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 129543	PORT NECHES	132046	In field estimate				
	326 AVE D	RACHFORD AND DEARING	1910		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 130003	PORT NECHES	94528	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	706 AVENUE C	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129573	PORT NECHES	132167	Appraisal district				
	710 AVENUE C	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129570	PORT NECHES	132237	Appraisal district				
	720 AVENUE C	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129566	PORT NECHES	132033	Appraisal district				
	722 AVENUE C	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129563	PORT NECHES	132034	In field estimate				
	816 AVENUE C	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129560	PORT NECHES	132030	In field estimate				
	712 AVENUE D	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129615	PORT NECHES	132038	In field estimate				
	718 AVENUE D	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129612	PORT NECHES	132039	In field estimate				
	728 AVENUE D	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129609	PORT NECHES	132040	In field estimate				
	732 AVENUE D	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129603	PORT NECHES	132041	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	736 AVENUE D	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129597	PORT NECHES	132042	Appraisal district				
	101 BLOCK ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1868-present	Oak Bluff Memorial Park	Eligible as a district (Old Bluff Memorial Park)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 129705	PORT NECHES	132235	Oldest grave per FindAGrave.com				
	201 BLOCK ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129707	PORT NECHES	132224	Appraisal district				
	626 BLOCK ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129991	PORT NECHES	132218	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	628 BLOCK ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129994	PORT NECHES	131992	Appraisal district				
	630 BLOCK ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129847	PORT NECHES	131991	In field estimate				
	702 BLOCK ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129844	PORT NECHES	131989	Appraisal district				
	718 BLOCK ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129841	PORT NECHES	131971	Appraisal district				
	722 BLOCK ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129835	PORT NECHES	131972	Appraisal district				
	818 BLOCK ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129803	PORT NECHES	131983	Appraisal district				
	830 BLOCK ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129806	PORT NECHES	131984	In field estimate				
	1031 BLOCK		1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129505	PORT NECHES	8554	In field estimate				
	210 CANAL ST	PORT NECHES	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129544	PORT NECHES	93836	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	313 CANAL ST	HOLLAND TO PORT NECHES	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129625	PORT NECHES	47574	In field estimate				
	315 CANAL ST	HOLLAND TO PORT NECHES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129629	PORT NECHES	47573	Appraisal district				
	499 CENTRAL DR	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130055	PORT NECHES	132227	In field estimate				
	500 CENTRAL AVE	PORT NECHES	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130063	PORT NECHES	93807	In field estimate				
	503 CENTRAL DR	PORT NECHES	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130045	PORT NECHES	93795	In field estimate				
	515 CENTRAL DR	PORT NECHES	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130042	PORT NECHES	93797	In field estimate				
	700 CENTRAL DR	PALCO - P.N.	1961		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130448	PORT NECHES	76333	Appraisal district				
	717 CENTRAL DR	PALCO - P.N.	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130445	PORT NECHES	76332	Appraisal district				
	721 CHEROKEE AVE	INDIAN VILLAGE ESTATES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130829	PORT NECHES	49239	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	831 CHEROKEE AVE	INDIAN VILLAGE ESTATES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130372	PORT NECHES	49217	Appraisal district				
	836 CHEROKEE AVE	INDIAN VILLAGE ESTATES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130377	PORT NECHES	49192	In field estimate				
	109 CYPRESS	PORT NECHES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129727	PORT NECHES	93801	Appraisal district				
	112 CYPRESS	ADCOCK & PEARSALL	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129706	PORT NECHES	49	In field estimate				
	125 CYPRESS	PORT NECHES	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129724	PORT NECHES	93805	In field estimate				
	149 CYPRESS	ADCOCK & PEARSALL	1910		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129720	PORT NECHES	50	In field estimate				
	1218 DALLAS ST	HASSLER	1959		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129462	PORT NECHES	43678	Appraisal district				
	1024 DEARING ST	RACHFORD AND DEARING	1945	First Baptist Church	Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 130010	PORT NECHES	94495	Aerial images				
	1423 DIEU		1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129530	PORT NECHES	9519	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2210 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130163	PORT NECHES	131961	Appraisal district				
	2212 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130164	PORT NECHES	131960	Appraisal district				
	2214 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130171	PORT NECHES	131959	Appraisal district				
	2216 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130174	PORT NECHES	131958	Appraisal district				
	2218 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130177	PORT NECHES	131957	Appraisal district				
	2222 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130180	PORT NECHES	131955	Appraisal district				
	2226 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130184	PORT NECHES	131954	Appraisal district				
	2230 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130187	PORT NECHES	131953	Appraisal district				
	2234 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1976		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130190	PORT NECHES	131952	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2258 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130192	PORT NECHES	131950	Appraisal district				
	2262 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1977		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130194	PORT NECHES	131949	Appraisal district				
	2270 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130196	PORT NECHES	131947	Appraisal district				
	2302 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130199	PORT NECHES	131945	Appraisal district				
	2310 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1976		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130202	PORT NECHES	131944	Appraisal district				
	2320 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130207	PORT NECHES	131942	Appraisal district				
	2334 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130210	PORT NECHES	131934	Appraisal district				
	2338 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130213	PORT NECHES	131939	Appraisal district				
	2348 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130218	PORT NECHES	131937	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2352 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130225	PORT NECHES	131936	Appraisal district				
	2356 EARLE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130228	PORT NECHES	131935	Appraisal district				
	234 GRIGSBY AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 130035	PORT NECHES	132209	Appraisal district				
	236 GRIGSBY AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 130039	PORT NECHES	132211	In field estimate				
	511 GRIGSBY AVE	41 T. F. McKinney	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129425	PORT NECHES	132205	In field estimate				
	601 GRIGSBY AVE		1920 (park); 1985-1990 (La Maison Beausoleil moved)		Eligible as a district (River Front Park)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 129405	PORT NECHES		Estimates based on research				
	701 GRIGSBY AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129880	PORT NECHES	132028	Appraisal district				
	713 GRIGSBY AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129883	PORT NECHES	132027	In field estimate				
	714 GRIGSBY AVE	WILLIAMS, J. L.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129871	PORT NECHES	115479	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	722 GRIGSBY AVE	WILLIAMS, J. L.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129873	PORT NECHES	115481	In field estimate				
	800 GRIGSBY AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129874	PORT NECHES	132022	In field estimate				
	806 GRIGSBY AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129876	PORT NECHES	132151	In field estimate				
	820 GRIGSBY AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129888	PORT NECHES	132018	Appraisal district				
	1105 GRIGSBY AVE	10 OAKS	1925		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129691	PORT NECHES	71100	In field estimate				
	714 GULF AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130467	PORT NECHES	132187	Appraisal district				
	722 GULF AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130464	PORT NECHES	132190	Appraisal district				
	726 GULF AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130453	PORT NECHES	132188	Appraisal district				
	801 GULF AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130789	PORT NECHES	132148	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	809 GULF AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1972		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130786	PORT NECHES	132226	Appraisal district				
	817 GULF AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130780	PORT NECHES	132234	Appraisal district				
	826 GULF AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130783	PORT NECHES	132239	Appraisal district				
	830 GULF AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130777	PORT NECHES	132181	Appraisal district				
	1419 HEISLER ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129836	PORT NECHES	131979	In field estimate				
	1522 HEISLER ST	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	1950	Woodcrest Elementary School	Individually eligible for NRHP (Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 129799	PORT NECHES	416888	https://www.pngisd.org/domain/865				
	702 HESS ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129853	PORT NECHES	132012	Appraisal district				
	714 HESS ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129856	PORT NECHES	132013	Appraisal district				
	718 HESS ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129858	PORT NECHES	132014	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	722 HESS ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129860	PORT NECHES	132015	Appraisal district				
	726 HESS ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129863	PORT NECHES	132016	Appraisal district				
	808 HESS ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129868	PORT NECHES	132008	Appraisal district				
	803 JACKSON AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129911	PORT NECHES	132003	Appraisal district				
	1002 JOHNSON AVE	CLUB INVESTMENT COMPANY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129654	PORT NECHES	22768	Appraisal district				
	1010 JOHNSON AVE	CLUB INVESTMENT COMPANY	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129649	PORT NECHES	22769	Appraisal district				
	1110 JOHNSON AVE	CLUB INVESTMENT COMPANY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129632	PORT NECHES	22770	Appraisal district				
	1116 JOHNSON AVE	CLUB INVESTMENT COMPANY	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129635	PORT NECHES	22771	In field estimate				
	1126 JOHNSON AVE	CLUB INVESTMENT COMPANY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129647	PORT NECHES	22774	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1132 JOHNSON AVE	CLUB INVESTMENT COMPANY	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129639	PORT NECHES	22772	In field estimate				
	1416 JOHNSON		1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129818	PORT NECHES	131985	In field estimate				
	1422 JOHNSON AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129809	PORT NECHES	131986	In field estimate				
	1502 JOHNSON AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129810	PORT NECHES	132228	Appraisal district				
	1506 JOHNSON AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129815	PORT NECHES	131977	Appraisal district				
	1526 JOHNSON AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129831	PORT NECHES	131976	Appraisal district				
	1207 LILLIE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129578	PORT NECHES	132045	Appraisal district				
	1215 LILLIE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129580	PORT NECHES	132198	In field estimate				
	1219 LILLIE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129592	PORT NECHES	132043	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	801 LLANO ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129908	PORT NECHES	132002	Appraisal district				
	813 LLANO ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129905	PORT NECHES	132005	In field estimate				
	819 LLANO ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129900	PORT NECHES	132007	In field estimate				
	825 LLANO ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129899	PORT NECHES	132006	In field estimate				
	831 LLANO ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129896	PORT NECHES	132152	In field estimate				
	835 LLANO ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129893	PORT NECHES	132009	Appraisal district				
	1125 LLANO ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1958		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129556	PORT NECHES	132029	Appraisal district				
	2040 LLANO ST	PALCO - P.N.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130427	PORT NECHES	76406	Appraisal district				
	2101 LLANO ST	PALCO PT NECHES MIDDLE & ELEMENTARY	1958	Port Neches Middle School	Individually eligible for NRHP (Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 130075	PORT NECHES	76343	School website				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	716 MAGNOLIA AVE	PALCO - P.N.	1973		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130822	PORT NECHES	76341	Appraisal district				
	852 MAGNOLIA AVE	PALCO - P.N.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130393	PORT NECHES	76410	Appraisal district				
	860 MAGNOLIA AVE	PALCO - P.N.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130407	PORT NECHES	76402	Appraisal district				
	1615 MAIN ST		1942 - 2020	Former United States Rubber Co.		ROE needed	Security issues
HHM ID: 131328	PORT NECHES	132257, 132137	In field estimate				
	110 MAPLE ST	PORT NECHES	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129531	PORT NECHES	93839	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	114 MAPLE ST	PORT NECHES	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129526	PORT NECHES	93838	In field estimate				
	115 MAPLE ST	PORT NECHES	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129520	PORT NECHES	93847	In field estimate				
	120 MAPLE ST	PORT NECHES	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129523	PORT NECHES	93837	In field estimate				
	1030 MARION ST	BIGELOW	1925		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 129498	PORT NECHES	8566	In field estimate				
	1109 MARION		1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129495	PORT NECHES	8584	In field estimate				
	300-699 MEADOWGREEN DR	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130266	PORT NECHES	132299	In field estimate				
	912 MERRIMAN ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129850	PORT NECHES	132011	In field estimate				
	1230 MERRIMAN ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129618	PORT NECHES	132037	Appraisal district				
	1400 MERRIMAN ST		1953	Port Neches-Groves High School	Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 130095	PORT NECHES	132206	School website				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1402 MERRIMAN ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1925		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129621	PORT NECHES	132047	In field estimate				
	1916 MERRIMAN ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130815	PORT NECHES	132175	In field estimate				
	1924 MERRIMAN ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130812	PORT NECHES	132186	In field estimate				
	1926 MERRIMAN ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130809	PORT NECHES	132184	In field estimate				
	1942 MERRIMAN ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130470	PORT NECHES	132191	Appraisal district				
	2152 MERRIMAN ST	PALCO - P.N.	1974		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130818	PORT NECHES	76338	Appraisal district				
	2221 MERRIMAN ST	PALCO - P.N.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130246	PORT NECHES	76328	Appraisal district				
	2229 MERRIMAN ST	PALCO - P.N.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130251	PORT NECHES	76329	Appraisal district				
	2305 MERRIMAN ST	PALCO - P.N.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130254	PORT NECHES	76327	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2323 MERRIMAN ST	PALCO - P.N.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130263	PORT NECHES	76321	In field estimate				
	2339 MERRIMAN ST	PALCO - P.N.	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130269	PORT NECHES	76315	In field estimate				
	2341 MERRIMAN ST	PALCO - P.N.	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130831	PORT NECHES	76317	In field estimate				
	2402 MERRIMAN ST	PALCO - P.N.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130291	PORT NECHES	76569	Appraisal district				
	2414 MERRIMAN ST	PALCO - P.N.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130311	PORT NECHES	76568	Appraisal district				
	2425 MERRIMAN ST	PALCO - P.N.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130855	PORT NECHES	409093	Appraisal district				
	2426 MERRIMAN ST	PALCO - P.N.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130852	PORT NECHES	76567	Appraisal district				
	2427 MERRIMAN ST	PALCO - P.N.	1940			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 130858	PORT NECHES	76544	In field estimate				
	2434 MERRIMAN ST	PALCO - P.N.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130849	PORT NECHES	76564	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2450 MERRIMAN ST	PALCO - P.N.	1935		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 130436	PORT NECHES	76566	In field estimate				
	2605 MERRIMAN ST	PALCO - P.N.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130864	PORT NECHES	76507	Appraisal district				
	2607 MERRIMAN ST	PALCO - P.N.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130867	PORT NECHES	76508	Appraisal district				
	2820 MERRIMAN ST	PALCO - P.N.	1958	Ridgewood Elementary School	Individually eligible for NRHP (Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 130338	PORT NECHES	76617	School website				
	2901 MERRIMAN ST	PALCO - P.N.	1925		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130301	PORT NECHES	76615	In field estimate				
	805 MONTGOMERY ST	BIGELOW	1925		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 129501	PORT NECHES	8507	In field estimate				
	1826 NALL ST	HEISLER HOMESTEAD	1950 (church), 1961 (education building)	United Methodist Church	Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 129976	PORT NECHES	44426	Marker				
	1945 NALL ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130775	PORT NECHES	132180	Appraisal district				
	2001 NALL ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1974		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130773	PORT NECHES	132145	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	2027 NALL ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130770	PORT NECHES	132147	Appraisal district				
	2048 NALL ST	PETERSON TO PORT NECHES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130767	PORT NECHES	82835	Appraisal district				
	2054 NALL ST	PETERSON TO PORT NECHES	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130764	PORT NECHES	82836	Appraisal district				
	2114 NALL ST	PETERSON TO PORT NECHES	1969		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130761	PORT NECHES	82838	Appraisal district				
	2345 NALL ST	PALCO - P.N.	1963		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130339	PORT NECHES	76384	Appraisal district				
	2905 NALL ST	RIDGEMONT UNIT 4	1977		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130384	PORT NECHES	96072	Appraisal district				
	3135 NALL ST	PALCO - NED.	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130378	PORT NECHES	74932	Appraisal district				
	117 OAK	PORT NECHES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129508	PORT NECHES	93835	Appraisal district				
	128 OAK	PORT NECHES	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129549	PORT NECHES	93830	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	304 OAK	PORT NECHES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129552	PORT NECHES	93833	Appraisal district				
	103 ORCHARD AVE	NECHES GARDEN	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130118	PORT NECHES	66913	In field estimate				
	201 ORCHARD AVE	NECHES GARDEN	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130125	PORT NECHES	66916	Appraisal district				
	413 ORCHARD AVE	NECHES GARDEN	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130157	PORT NECHES	66928	In field estimate				
	511 ORCHARD AVE	NECHES GARDEN	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130140	PORT NECHES	66937	In field estimate				
	516 ORCHARD AVE A	NECHES GARDEN	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130146	PORT NECHES	66938	In field estimate				
	101 PECAN	PORT NECHES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129569	PORT NECHES	93825	Appraisal district				
	102 PECAN	PORT NECHES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129673	PORT NECHES	93824	Appraisal district				
	106 PECAN	PORT NECHES	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129604	PORT NECHES	93823	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	112 PECAN	PORT NECHES	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129598	PORT NECHES	328146	In field estimate				
	116 PECAN	PORT NECHES	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129590	PORT NECHES	93822	In field estimate				
	124 PECAN	PORT NECHES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129584	PORT NECHES	93829	Appraisal district				
	106 PINE ST	PORT NECHES	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129985	PORT NECHES	93769	In field estimate				
	115 PINE ST	ADCOCK & PEARSALL	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129742	PORT NECHES	53	Appraisal district				
	120 PINE ST		1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129972	PORT NECHES	93771	In field estimate				
	202 PINE ST	PORT NECHES	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129969	PORT NECHES	93772	In field estimate				
	203 PINE ST	PORT NECHES	1910		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129745	PORT NECHES	93783	In field estimate				
	207 PINE ST	PORT NECHES	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129748	PORT NECHES	93784	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	209 PINE ST	PORT NECHES	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129751	PORT NECHES	93785	In field estimate				
	222 PINE ST	PORT NECHES	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129952	PORT NECHES	93775	In field estimate				
	301 PINE ST	PORT NECHES	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129754	PORT NECHES	93786	Appraisal district				
	305 PINE ST	PORT NECHES	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129757	PORT NECHES	93787	In field estimate				
	306 PINE ST	PORT NECHES	1920			Intensive survey needed - within possible historic district (Pine Street)	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129951	PORT NECHES	93777	In field estimate				
	307 PINE ST	PORT NECHES	1930			Intensive survey needed - within possible historic district (Pine Street)	
HHM ID: 129760	PORT NECHES	93788	In field estimate				
	308 PINE ST	PORT NECHES	1950			Intensive survey needed - within possible historic district (Pine Street)	
HHM ID: 129948	PORT NECHES	93778	In field estimate				
	311 PINE ST	PORT NECHES	1920			Intensive survey needed - within possible historic district (Pine Street)	
HHM ID: 129763	PORT NECHES	93789	In field estimate				
	312 PINE ST	PORT NECHES	1945			Intensive survey needed - within possible historic district (Pine Street)	
HHM ID: 129945	PORT NECHES	93779	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	316 PINE ST	PORT NECHES	1920			Intensive survey needed - within possible historic district (Pine Street)	
HHM ID: 129941	PORT NECHES	93780	In field estimate				
	319 PINE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130076	PORT NECHES	132213	Appraisal district				
	320 PINE ST	PORT NECHES	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129938	PORT NECHES	93781	In field estimate				
	324 PINE ST	PORT NECHES	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129766	PORT NECHES	93782	In field estimate				
	333 PINE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130084	PORT NECHES	132196	In field estimate				
	335 PINE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130087	PORT NECHES	132194	In field estimate				
	1509 PINE ST	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130917	PORT NECHES	74981	Appraisal district				
	422 PORT NECHES AVE	PALCO - P.N.	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129665	PORT NECHES	249606	In field estimate				
	1005 PORT NECHES AVE	HASSLER	1953		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129454	PORT NECHES	43677	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1107 PORT NECHES AVE	STAFFEN TO PORT NECHES	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129468	PORT NECHES	103912	In field estimate				
	1109 PORT NECHES AVE	STAFFEN TO PORT NECHES	1953		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129472	PORT NECHES	103913	Appraisal district				
	1113 PORT NECHES AVE	STAFFEN TO PORT NECHES	1953		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129475	PORT NECHES	103914	Appraisal district				
	1117 PORT NECHES AVE	STAFFEN TO PORT NECHES	1920		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 129478	PORT NECHES	103915	In field estimate				
	1130 PORT NECHES AVE	NECHES GARDEN	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130105	PORT NECHES	66912	In field estimate				
	1303 PORT NECHES AVE	Block, W. T.	1925		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 129488	PORT NECHES	9544	In field estimate				
	1309 PORT NECHES AVE	Block, W. T.	1920		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 129491	PORT NECHES	9545	In field estimate				
	1609 PORT NECHES AVE	PALCO - P.N.	1955			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 129773	PORT NECHES	76280	Appraisal district				
	1719 PORT NECHES AVE	PALCO - P.N.	1910		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129769	PORT NECHES	76288	In field estimate				
	2141 PORT NECHES AVE	TIPPEN	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	No photo due to kids and parking
HHM ID: 129351	PORT NECHES	107202	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1017 - 1019 PORT NECHES AVE	HASSLER	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129450	PORT NECHES	43674	In field estimate				
	100 PORT NECHES ATLANTIC RD	PALCO - P.N.	1915	Last extant Texaco Mid-County Works building	Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 131325	PORT NECHES	76193	In field estimate				
	101 PORT NECHES E AVE	PORT NECHES	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129536	PORT NECHES	93850	Appraisal district				
	207 PORT NECHES E AVE	PORT NECHES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129517	PORT NECHES	93834	Appraisal district				
	418 PORT NECHES E AVE	PALCO - P.N.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129679	PORT NECHES	76144	Appraisal district				
	504 PORT NECHES E AVE	PALCO - P.N.	1910		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129697	PORT NECHES	76143	In field estimate				
	508 PORT NECHES E AVE	PALCO - P.N.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129730	PORT NECHES	76142	In field estimate				
	612 PORT NECHES E AVE	PALCO - P.N.	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129739	PORT NECHES	76140	In field estimate				
	1008 PORT NECHES E AVE	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130099	PORT NECHES	132051	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1132 PORT NECHES E AVE	NECHES GARDEN	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130112	PORT NECHES	66910	In field estimate				
	881 RIDGEWOOD DR	RIDGEMONT UNIT 5	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130371	PORT NECHES	96078	Appraisal district				
	2702 SABA LN	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130869	PORT NECHES	132269	Appraisal district				
	2710 SABA LN	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130878	PORT NECHES	132270	Appraisal district				
	2797 SABA LN	WINDSOR VILLAGE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130872	PORT NECHES	117289	Appraisal district				
	2831 SABA LN	WINDSOR VILLAGE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130875	PORT NECHES	117281	Appraisal district				
	723 SANTEE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129666	PORT NECHES	132000	In field estimate				
	510 SASSER LN	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130935	PORT NECHES	132272	Appraisal district				
	890 SIERRA DR	RIDGEMONT UNIT 4	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130383	PORT NECHES	96073	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	1510 SOUTH AVE	PALCO - NED.	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131381	PORT NECHES	74988	Appraisal district				
	1500 BLOCK SOUTH AVE	PALCO - NED.	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130919	PORT NECHES	74985	In field estimate				
	103 SYCAMORE ST	PORT NECHES	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129662	PORT NECHES	93815	In field estimate				
	109 SYCAMORE ST	PORT NECHES	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129657	PORT NECHES	93816	In field estimate				
	111 SYCAMORE ST	PORT NECHES	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129648	PORT NECHES	93817	In field estimate				
	120 SYCAMORE ST	PORT NECHES	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129644	PORT NECHES	93810	In field estimate				
	125 SYCAMORE ST	PORT NECHES	1915		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129637	PORT NECHES	93819	In field estimate				
	132 SYCAMORE ST	PORT NECHES	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130068	PORT NECHES	93806	In field estimate				
	208 SYCAMORE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130011	PORT NECHES	132161	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	212 SYCAMORE ST	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130032	PORT NECHES	132216	In field estimate				
	838 TEXAS AVE	INDIAN VILLAGE ESTATES	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130361	PORT NECHES	49269	Appraisal district				
	845 TEXAS AVE	PALCO - P.N.	1920		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130358	PORT NECHES	347441	In field estimate				
	310 TWIN CITY HWY	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1974		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130233	PORT NECHES	132124	Appraisal district				
	350 TWIN CITY HWY	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130262	PORT NECHES	132119	Appraisal district				
	302 TWIN CITY S HWY	BOAT RAMP	1964		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130938	PORT NECHES	252897	Appraisal district				
	320 TWIN CITY S HWY	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130236	PORT NECHES	132121	In field estimate				
	330 TWIN CITY S HWY	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130239	PORT NECHES	132076	Appraisal district				
	332 TWIN CITY S HWY	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130242	PORT NECHES	132075	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	342 TWIN CITY S HWY	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130231	PORT NECHES	132073	Appraisal district				
	1013 WAGNER ST	Block, A. C.	1925		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 129776	PORT NECHES	9451	In field estimate				
	1110 WASHINGTON		1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129787	PORT NECHES	9435	In field estimate				
	1000-1200 BLOCK MERRIMAN ST	1000-1200 BLOCK MERRIMAN ST	1970 - 2010		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 131377	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	41 T. F. MCKINNEY	1950 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130801	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Bigelow	Bigelow	1920 - 1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129482	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Block Estates	Block Estates	1950 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130459	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Block, A. C.	Block, A. C.	1925 - 1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129784	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Block, E F	Block, E F	1945 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129917	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	Block, W. T.	Block, W. T.	1925 - 1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129485	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Boulevard	Boulevard	1940 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130705	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Campus to PN	Campus to PN	1950 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 130057	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Central	Central	1925 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129359	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Denver Heights	Denver Heights	1930 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130685	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	DRAWHORN PLACE 1	DRAWHORN PLACE 1	1970 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130418	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Droddy	Droddy	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130687	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Edwin Place	Edwin Place	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130415	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Fig Land	Fig Land	1935 - 2022		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130444	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	Grandview 1	Grandview 1	1955 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130701	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Grandview 2	Grandview 2	1960 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130686	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Hebert Place	Hebert Place	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129960	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Heisler 1	Heisler 1	1930 - 1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129930	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Heisler Acres	Heisler Acres	1935 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129929	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	HEISLER HOMESTEAD	HEISLER HOMESTEAD	1955 -1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130797	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	HIGHLAND PARK TO PORT NECHES	HIGHLAND PARK TO PORT NECHES	1940 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 130083	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	HUGHANN PLACE 1	HUGHANN PLACE 1	1965 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130328	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	HUGHANN PLACE 2	HUGHANN PLACE 2	1970 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130325	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	HUGHANN PLACE 3	HUGHANN PLACE 3	1970 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130321	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	HUGHANN PLACE 4	HUGHANN PLACE 4	1970 - 1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130316	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	HUGHANN PLACE 5	HUGHANN PLACE 5	1970 - 1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130310	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	HUGHANN PLACE 6	HUGHANN PLACE 6	1970 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130305	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	HUGHANN PLACE 7	HUGHANN PLACE 7	1965 - 1985		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130296	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	HUGHANN PLACE 8	HUGHANN PLACE 8	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130839	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	HUGHANN PLACE 9	HUGHANN PLACE 9	1970 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130840	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	KEITH 1	KEITH 1	1935 - 1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129990	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Keith Estates 1	Keith Estates 1	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 130404	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	Keith Estates 2	Keith Estates 2	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130403	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Kimwood	Kimwood	1970 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130149	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Magnolia to Port Neches	Magnolia to Port Neches	1945 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129336	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	MATTERHORN TOWNHOMES	MATTERHORN TOWNHOMES	1970 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130357	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	McBride Drive	McBride Drive	1970 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130419	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Meadowland	Meadowland	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130696	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Meeker	Meeker	1940 - 1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129915	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	New Texas	New Texas	1945 - 2010		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129772	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Oaks to Port Neches	Oaks to Port Neches	1925 - 1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129399	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	PALCO - P.N.	PALCO - P.N.				ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 128129	PORT NECHES	76306					

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	PALCO - P.N. (15TH Street)	PALCO - P.N. (15TH Street)	1960-1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130324	PORT NECHES		Appraisal district				
	PALCO - P.N. (Llano Street)	PALCO - P.N. (Llano Street)	1961-1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130435	PORT NECHES		Appraisal district				
	Palco P. N. (Eugene Ave)	Palco P. N. (Eugene Ave)	1945 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129983	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Palco P. N. (Harms Cir. and Goodwin Ct.)	Palco P. N. (Harms Cir. and Goodwin Ct.)	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130833	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Palco P. N. (Texas and Baker Ave.)	Palco P. N. (Texas and Baker Ave.)	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130824	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Palco P. N. (Victor Dr.)	Palco P. N. (Victor Dr.)	1960 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130844	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Palco-Ned (Bowlin Ave)	Palco-Ned (Bowlin Ave)	1960 - 2020		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130651	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Palco-Ned (Russel Ave)	Palco-Ned (Russel Ave)	1940 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130652	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Pine Lane	Pine Lane	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130154	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	Rachford and Dearing	Rachford and Dearing	1910 - 2000			Intensive survey needed - possible smaller districts	
HHM ID: 129996	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Ridgemont Annex	Ridgemont Annex	1970 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130349	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Ridgemont Unit 1	Ridgemont Unit 1	1970 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130386	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Ridgemont Unit 2	Ridgemont Unit 2	1970 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130385	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Ridgemont Unit 3	Ridgemont Unit 3	1970 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130354	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	RIDGEWOOD MANOR 1	RIDGEWOOD MANOR 1	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130285	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	RIDGEWOOD MANOR 2	RIDGEWOOD MANOR 2	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130281	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	RIDGEWOOD MANOR 3	RIDGEWOOD MANOR 3	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130280	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	RIDGEWOOD MANOR 4	RIDGEWOOD MANOR 4	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130273	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	RIDGEWOOD MANOR 5	RIDGEWOOD MANOR 5	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130270	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	RIDGEWOOD MANOR 6	RIDGEWOOD MANOR 6	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130290	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	River Side Terrace	River Side Terrace	1945 - 1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 130029	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Sleepy Hollow	Sleepy Hollow	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129968	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Smith C A	Smith C A	1940 - 2000		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 129583	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Spurlock	Spurlock	1935 - 1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129914	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Sunset Park	Sunset Park	1935 - 1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129672	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Van Breeman	Van Breeman	1959 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129827	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	VAN BREEMAN HOMESTEAD	VAN BREEMAN HOMESTEAD	1940 - 2010		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130794	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	VAN CROWDER	VAN CROWDER	1960 - 1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130129	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	VAN OOSTROM	VAN OOSTROM	1955 - 1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130127	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	VANDERWEG ACRES	VANDERWEG ACRES	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130394	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Welch	Welch	1930 - 1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129916	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	WINDSOR PLACE 1 TO PORT NECHES	WINDSOR PLACE 1 TO PORT NECHES	1965 - 1985		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 130248	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	WINDSOR PLACE 2 TO PORT NECHES	WINDSOR PLACE 2 TO PORT NECHES	1965 - 1985		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130247	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	Wood	Wood	1965 - 1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129388	PORT NECHES		In field estimate				
	100 COUNTRY CLUB DR	31 A. HOTCHKISS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130957	TAYLOR LANDING	130505	Appraisal district				
	112 COUNTRY CLUB DR	31 A. HOTCHKISS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130970	TAYLOR LANDING	130499	Appraisal district				
	15075 COUNTRY CLUB RD	31 A. HOTCHKISS	1978			ROE needed	Limited visibility from ROW
HHM ID: 130958	TAYLOR LANDING	130496	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	206 GREENWOOD DR	COUNTRY CLUB PARK EST. 1	1962		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 131382	TAYLOR LANDING	24645	Appraisal district				
	15844 LABELLE RD		1940 - 1990			ROE needed, Intensive survey needed	Large complex with minimal visibility
HHM ID: 130972	TAYLOR LANDING	386702	In field estimate				
	17724 M HALF CIRCLE	8 W. B. BURTON	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 131383	TAYLOR LANDING	256248	Appraisal district				
	16095 SABINE CONSOLIDATED RD	31 A. HOTCHKISS	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130955	TAYLOR LANDING	130504	Appraisal district				
	100 TWIN PINES CIR	COUNTRY CLUB PARK EST. 2	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130968	TAYLOR LANDING	24683	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	COUNTRY CLUB PARK EST. 1	COUNTRY CLUB PARK EST. 1	1960 - 1995		Eligible as a district (Country Club Park Estates)	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 130961	TAYLOR LANDING		In field estimate				
	3180 GUTHRIE RD	258 T & NO	1966		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121902	VITERBO	139616	Appraisal district				
	3285 GUTHRIE RD	258 T & NO	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121905	VITERBO	139626	In field estimate				
	3100 BLOCK GUTHRIE RD	258 T & NO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121904	VITERBO	329423	Appraisal district				
	12707 WEST PORT ARTHUR RD	258 T & NO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 121927	VITERBO	139596	Appraisal district				
	12737 WEST PORT ARTHUR RD	258 T & NO	1930			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 121926	VITERBO	139604	In field estimate				
	13023 WEST PORT ARTHUR RD	258 T & NO	1900		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 121916	VITERBO	139606, 139605, 139649, 26331, 139606	In field estimate				
	Beauxart Gardens	Beauxart Gardens	1940 - 2022		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 129062	VITERBO		In field estimate				
	CLOVERDALE TO PORT ARTHUR	CLOVERDALE TO PORT ARTHUR	1960 - 1980		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 121935	VITERBO		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	Country Side Estates	Country Side Estates	1960 - 1990		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129059	VITERBO		In field estimate				
	Shamrock Acres	Shamrock Acres	1945 - 2022		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 129070	VITERBO		In field estimate				
	13970 AUSTIN DR	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122489	WINNIE	52259	In field estimate				
	19500 BIG HILL RD	480 T & NO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131107	WINNIE	140804	Appraisal district				
	23347 BIG HILL RD	492 SETH DAVIS	1960 - 2010	The Lodge at Pipkin Ranch	Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 131114	WINNIE	140916	In field estimate				
	23777 BIG HILL RD	492 SETH DAVIS	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131113	WINNIE	140917	Appraisal district				
	18700 BLOCK BIG HILL RD	480 T & NO	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131098	WINNIE	140789, 140787	In field estimate				
	19500 BLOCK BIG HILL RD		1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131103	WINNIE	140802	In field estimate				
	BIG HILL RD	22 S. EATON				ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 131121	WINNIE	129108					
	14899 BRUSH ISLAND RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121602	WINNIE	53210	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	14947 BRUSH ISLAND RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121572	WINNIE	53205	Appraisal district				
	15046 BRUSH ISLAND RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121537	WINNIE	254889	Appraisal district				
	15182 BRUSH ISLAND RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121533	WINNIE	53229	Appraisal district				
	15532 BRUSH ISLAND RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1900		Individually eligible for NRHP	Possesses integrity and significance	
HHM ID: 121518	WINNIE	53240, 53241	In field estimate				
	15693 BRUSH ISLAND RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 121490	WINNIE	53255	Appraisal district				
	15869 BRUSH ISLAND RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122767	WINNIE	53282	Appraisal district				
	16700 BRUSH ISLAND RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122633	WINNIE	53290	Appraisal district				
	16849 BRUSH ISLAND RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122632	WINNIE	53320	Appraisal district				
	17624 BRUSH ISLAND RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122605	WINNIE	262586	In field estimate				
	17633 BRUSH ISLAND RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ				ROE needed	Security issue
HHM ID: 122579	WINNIE	246241					

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	17686 BRUSH ISLAND RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122603	WINNIE	52163	Appraisal district				
	17734 BRUSH ISLAND RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1976		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122602	WINNIE	52166	Appraisal district				
	17752 BRUSH ISLAND RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122601	WINNIE	52165	Appraisal district				
	1862 BUCCANEER E RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121565	WINNIE	52546	Appraisal district				
	1902 BUCCANEER E RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 121555	WINNIE	52551	Appraisal district				
	13325 COMEAUX LN	COMEAUX ADDN NO 1	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131311	WINNIE	414130	In field estimate				
	13359 COMEAUX LN	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131313	WINNIE	262626	In field estimate				
	13217 COON RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122297	WINNIE	53070	Appraisal district				
	13299 COON RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122304	WINNIE	53069	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13529 COON RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122312	WINNIE	53049	Appraisal district				
	13539 COON RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122326	WINNIE	52491	Appraisal district				
	14224 COON RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122348	WINNIE	52331	In field estimate				
	14229 COON RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122349	WINNIE	52462	Appraisal district				
	14326 COON RD A	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 122380	WINNIE	52342	In field estimate				
	14326 COON RD B	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122378	WINNIE	52344	In field estimate				
	14696 COON RD	KUNEFKE PLACE	1945		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122403	WINNIE	326396	In field estimate				
	14713 COON RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122404	WINNIE	52431	Appraisal district				
	14944 COON RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122405	WINNIE	52355	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	18972 COPELAND RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122270	WINNIE	53082	Appraisal district				
	17213 COUNTY LINE RD					ROE needed, Intensive survey needed	Limited visibility from ROW
HHM ID: 122657	WINNIE	52182					
	17261 COUNTY LINE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122649	WINNIE	52180	Appraisal district				
	17389 COUNTY LINE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122648	WINNIE	52169	In field estimate				
	18037 COUNTY LINE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 122651	WINNIE	52185	Appraisal district				
	18397 COUNTY LINE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121494	WINNIE	52401	In field estimate				
	18423 COUNTY LINE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121500	WINNIE	52388	Appraisal district				
	18483 COUNTY LINE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 121504	WINNIE	52392	Appraisal district				
	18601 COUNTY LINE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 121505	WINNIE	52350	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	18609 COUNTY LINE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121508	WINNIE	52372	Appraisal district				
	18797 COUNTY LINE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121527	WINNIE	249170	Appraisal district				
	18879 COUNTY LINE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121529	WINNIE	52421	Appraisal district				
	19015 COUNTY LINE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121543	WINNIE	52413	Appraisal district				
	19029 COUNTY LINE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 121544	WINNIE	52411	Appraisal district				
	19045 COUNTY LINE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121547	WINNIE	52410	Appraisal district				
	18600 BLOCK COUNTY LINE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1960			Intensive survey needed	
HHM ID: 121513	WINNIE	52363	Aerial images				
	17963 COUNTY LINE (REAR) RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 122650	WINNIE	52187	Appraisal district				
	16627 ENGLIN RD		1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122706	WINNIE	52845	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	16991 ENGLIN RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 138	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122886	WINNIE	52920	Appraisal district				
	17057 ENGLIN RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 138	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122887	WINNIE	52919	Appraisal district				
	17079 ENGLIN RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 138	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122888	WINNIE	52921	Appraisal district				
	17153 ENGLIN RD	KOCH T & NO SEC. 138	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122891	WINNIE	52922	Appraisal district				
	17382 ENGLIN RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 122870	WINNIE	52941	Appraisal district				
	17637 ENGLIN RD	THIBEAUX G & B ADDITION NO 1	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122868	WINNIE	404154	In field estimate				
	17670 ENGLIN RD A	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122865	WINNIE	52944	Appraisal district				
	17726 ENGLIN RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122840	WINNIE	52972	Appraisal district				
	17846 ENGLIN RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122841	WINNIE	52968	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	17883 ENGLIN RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122842	WINNIE	53013	Appraisal district				
	17938 ENGLIN RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122843	WINNIE	52992	Appraisal district				
	18657 ENGLIN RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122296	WINNIE	53025	Appraisal district				
	18843 ENGLIN RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122283	WINNIE	53092	In field estimate				
	19059 ENGLIN RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 122279	WINNIE	53079	Appraisal district				
	19150 ENGLIN RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122278	WINNIE	53078	Appraisal district				
	19151 ENGLIN RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 122276	WINNIE	53076	Appraisal district				
	19191 ENGLIN RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 122274	WINNIE	53075	Appraisal district				
	19417 ENGLIN RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 121665	WINNIE	53132	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	19443 ENGLIN RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1976		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121671	WINNIE	53135	Appraisal district				
	19509 ENGLIN RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121672	WINNIE	53133	Appraisal district				
	19803 ENGLIN RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121683	WINNIE	53144	Appraisal district				
	19845 ENGLIN RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121684	WINNIE	53148	In field estimate				
	19961 ENGLIN RD	STEWART, MACO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 121691	WINNIE	103983	Appraisal district				
	19989 ENGLIN RD	STEWART, MACO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121692	WINNIE	103986	Appraisal district				
	20047 ENGLIN RD	STEWART, MACO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121693	WINNIE	103984	Appraisal district				
	20075 ENGLIN RD	STEWART, MACO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121694	WINNIE	103985	Appraisal district				
	20080 ENGLIN RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121695	WINNIE	53155	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	21587 ENGLIN RD	BENSON SEC. 162-163-164	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131142	WINNIE	7954	Appraisal district				
	14631 FM 1406	642 T & NO - H. LEFLORE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131081	WINNIE	141890	Appraisal district				
	14648 FM 1406	642 T & NO - H. LEFLORE	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 131084	WINNIE	141911	Appraisal district				
	14761 FM 1406	642 T & NO - H. LEFLORE	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131076	WINNIE	141905	Appraisal district				
	14762 FM 1406	642 T & NO - H. LEFLORE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131086	WINNIE	141907	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	17789 FRENCH VILLAGE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122763	WINNIE	52273	Appraisal district				
	17822 FRENCH VILLAGE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1958		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122801	WINNIE	52306	Appraisal district				
	17831 FRENCH VILLAGE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122764	WINNIE	52302	Appraisal district				
	17836 FRENCH VILLAGE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122800	WINNIE	52256	Appraisal district				
	17839 FRENCH VILLAGE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1958		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 122770	WINNIE	52260	Appraisal district				
	17860 FRENCH VILLAGE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	Limited visibility from ROW
HHM ID: 122799	WINNIE	262594	In field estimate				
	17874 FRENCH VILLAGE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122798	WINNIE	52275	In field estimate				
	17879 FRENCH VILLAGE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1974		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122781	WINNIE	52300	Appraisal district				
	17904 FRENCH VILLAGE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122797	WINNIE	52309	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	17907 FRENCH VILLAGE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122782	WINNIE	52290	Appraisal district				
	17945 FRENCH VILLAGE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122783	WINNIE	52263	In field estimate				
	18043 FRENCH VILLAGE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122789	WINNIE	52233	Appraisal district				
	18070 FRENCH VILLAGE RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122790	WINNIE	52282	Appraisal district				
	18652 GEORGE BAUER RD	661 T & NO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 131071	WINNIE	142019	Appraisal district				
	13451 GLENN ST	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122488	WINNIE	52245	Appraisal district				
	16534 HAMSHIRE RD	591 T & NO	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 121554	WINNIE	386159	In field estimate				
	28281 HIGHWAY 124	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 122686	WINNIE	52093	Appraisal district				
	28363 HIGHWAY 124	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122685	WINNIE	52089	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	28978 HIGHWAY 124	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122552	WINNIE	52220	Appraisal district				
	28995 HIGHWAY 124	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122548	WINNIE	52227	Appraisal district				
	29028 HIGHWAY 124	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122551	WINNIE	52200	Appraisal district				
	29076 HIGHWAY 124	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122534	WINNIE	262587	Appraisal district				
	29100 BLOCK HIGHWAY 124	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 122533	WINNIE	52215	In field estimate				
	29300 BLOCK HIGHWAY 124	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1953		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122529	WINNIE	52228	Appraisal district				
	HIGHWAY 124		1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122680	WINNIE	52114	In field estimate				
	24282 HIGHWAY 73	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122447	WINNIE	53001	Appraisal district				
	24370 HIGHWAY 73 BLDG A	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122453	WINNIE	52996	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	24376 HIGHWAY 73	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122448	WINNIE	52993	Appraisal district				
	24618 HIGHWAY 73	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122462	WINNIE	52281	Appraisal district				
	24658 HIGHWAY 73	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122464	WINNIE	52294	Appraisal district				
	24700 HIGHWAY 73	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122465	WINNIE	52287	Appraisal district				
	24738 HIGHWAY 73	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 122469	WINNIE	52305	Appraisal district				
	24786 HIGHWAY 73	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122472	WINNIE	52304	Appraisal district				
	24848 HIGHWAY 73	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122511	WINNIE	52272	Appraisal district				
	25022 HIGHWAY 73	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122512	WINNIE	52267	Appraisal district				
	25184 HIGHWAY 73	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1958		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122513	WINNIE	52224	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	25735 HIGHWAY 73	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1977		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122422	WINNIE	52397	Appraisal district				
	25949 HIGHWAY 73 RD A	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121489	WINNIE	52390	Appraisal district				
	25949 HIGHWAY 73 RD B	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121493	WINNIE	52390	Appraisal district				
	24700 BLOCK HIGHWAY 73	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122490	WINNIE	52310	In field estimate				
	24800 BLOCK HIGHWAY 73	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 122487	WINNIE	52299	In field estimate				
	25100 BLOCK HIGHWAY 73	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1957		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122515	WINNIE	52225	Appraisal district				
	25900 BLOCK HIGHWAY 73	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122430	WINNIE	52384	In field estimate				
	18350 KIKER RD	VAN NOORD ESTS SEC 2	1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 122442	WINNIE	108962	In field estimate				
	18640 KIKER RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122379	WINNIE	52345	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	19031 KIKER RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122356	WINNIE	52466	Appraisal district				
	19088 KIKER RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122357	WINNIE	52438	Appraisal district				
	19260 KIKER RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122358	WINNIE	52437	Appraisal district				
	19617 KIKER RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 121617	WINNIE	52531	Appraisal district				
	19284 KOCH RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 121579	WINNIE	52563	Appraisal district				
	19291 KOCH RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121589	WINNIE	52552	Appraisal district				
	18271 KREBS RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122539	WINNIE	52229	Appraisal district				
	12205 LEAGUE RD	210 T & NO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130484	WINNIE	139348	Appraisal district				
	14248 LEAGUE RD	749 T & NO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131334	WINNIE	263858	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	14751 LEAGUE RD	217 T & NO	1935		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 131337	WINNIE	139377	In field estimate				
	9283 OLD BIG HILL RD	683 T & NO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123022	WINNIE	142141	Appraisal district				
	9364 OLD BIG HILL RD	64 E. H. ANDREWS	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123016	WINNIE	134685	Appraisal district				
	9367 OLD BIG HILL RD	683 T & NO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 123019	WINNIE	142140	Appraisal district				
	14526 POWERS RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 121642	WINNIE	53327	Appraisal district				
	14902 POWERS RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121655	WINNIE	53228	Appraisal district				
	14500 BLOCK POWERS RD	KOCH F. VALMORE	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121650	WINNIE	53343	In field estimate				
	13257 ROLLINS RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122726	WINNIE	52989	In field estimate				
	13371 ROLLINS RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122728	WINNIE	52986	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13383 ROLLINS RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122729	WINNIE	53000	Appraisal district				
	13443 ROLLINS RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122732	WINNIE	52985	Appraisal district				
	13487 ROLLINS RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122733	WINNIE	52974	Appraisal district				
	13658 ROLLINS RD		1940		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122740	WINNIE	408208	In field estimate				
	13715 ROLLINS RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1955		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 122741	WINNIE	264054	In field estimate				
	13767 ROLLINS RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122748	WINNIE	249982	In field estimate				
	13768 ROLLINS RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity	
HHM ID: 122747	WINNIE	52095	Appraisal district				
	13775 ROLLINS RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	No permanent primary building - mobile home(s)
HHM ID: 122761	WINNIE	52279	In field estimate				
	13817 ROLLINS RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122762	WINNIE	52278	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	13882 ROLLINS RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122813	WINNIE	52099	Appraisal district				
	13893 ROLLINS RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122814	WINNIE	52255	Appraisal district				
	13939 ROLLINS RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122815	WINNIE	52252	Appraisal district				
	13948 ROLLINS RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122816	WINNIE	52109	Appraisal district				
	14037 ROLLINS RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 122831	WINNIE	52249	Appraisal district				
	14322 ROLLINS RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1950			ROE needed	Large complex with minimal visibility
HHM ID: 122596	WINNIE	402431	Aerial images				
	14673 ROLLINS RD		1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122572	WINNIE	263621	In field estimate				
	15025 ROLLINS RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122647	WINNIE	52191	Appraisal district				
	17670 ROLLINS RD B	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122839	WINNIE	52945	In field estimate				
	14300 BLOCK ROLLINS RD A	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122681	WINNIE	52113	In field estimate				
	14300 BLOCK ROLLINS RD B	KOCH E. LOPEZ				ROE needed	Security issue

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 122599	WINNIE	52144					
	14300 BLOCK ROLLINS RD C	KOCH E. LOPEZ				ROE needed	Security issue
HHM ID: 122593	WINNIE	52137					
	14300 BLOCK ROLLINS D	KOCH E. LOPEZ				ROE needed	Security issue
HHM ID: 122594	WINNIE	52143					
	14300 BLOCK ROLLINS RD E	KOCH E. LOPEZ				ROE needed	Security issue
HHM ID: 122586	WINNIE	344826					
	14300 BLOCK ROLLINS RD F	KOCH E. LOPEZ				ROE needed	Security issue
HHM ID: 122591	WINNIE	52149					
	14300 BLOCK ROLLINS RD G	KOCH E. LOPEZ				ROE needed	Security issue
HHM ID: 122580	WINNIE	52146					
	14300 BLOCK ROLLINS RD H	KOCH E. LOPEZ				ROE needed	Security issue
HHM ID: 122592	WINNIE	344827					
	14300 BLOCK ROLLINS RD I	KOCH E. LOPEZ				ROE needed	Security issue
HHM ID: 122584	WINNIE	328026					
	14300 BLOCK ROLLINS RD J	KOCH E. LOPEZ				ROE needed	Security issue
HHM ID: 122585	WINNIE	52145					
	14300 BLOCK ROLLINS RD K	KOCH E. LOPEZ				ROE needed	Security issue
HHM ID: 122588	WINNIE	52149					
	14300 BLOCK ROLLINS RD L	KOCH E. LOPEZ				ROE needed	Security issue
HHM ID: 122583	WINNIE	52142					
	RUSSELL RD	537 H. W. SMITH	1962			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 131318	WINNIE	141051	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	RUSSELL RD	537 H. W. SMITH	1978			ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 131317	WINNIE	141055	Appraisal district				
	22200 BLOCK SATTLER RD	ELLSTROM, C. O.	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131300	WINNIE	31273	Appraisal district				
	12171 SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121736	WINNIE	53115	Appraisal district				
	12365 SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121735	WINNIE	53116	Appraisal district				
	12485 SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121734	WINNIE	53122	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	12508 SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121733	WINNIE	53107	Appraisal district				
	12887 SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121729	WINNIE	53139	Appraisal district				
	12933 SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121725	WINNIE	53138	Appraisal district				
	12944 SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121765	WINNIE	53085	Appraisal district				
	12949 SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 121712	WINNIE	53145	Appraisal district				
	13369 SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121654	WINNIE	53161	Appraisal district				
	13816 SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122361	WINNIE	52467	Appraisal district				
	13834 SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121628	WINNIE	262605	In field estimate				
	14159 SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121623	WINNIE	52525	Appraisal district				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	14415 SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121605	WINNIE	251087	Appraisal district				
	14899 SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1965		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121586	WINNIE	52560	In field estimate				
	14931 SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121580	WINNIE	52558	Appraisal district				
	15093 SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121571	WINNIE	52554	In field estimate				
	12600 BLOCK SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 121732	WINNIE	250949	In field estimate				
	13200 BLOCK SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH B. A. VOCOCU	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121658	WINNIE	53067	In field estimate				
	13500 BLOCK SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121649	WINNIE	52509	In field estimate				
	13500 BLOCK SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1960		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 121641	WINNIE	52502	In field estimate				
	14100 BLOCK SHELLHAMMER RD	KOCH E. LOPEZ	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	Address is Simon Dr in CAD
HHM ID: 121609	WINNIE	52526	In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
	22562 VINCENT RD	343 T & NO	1968		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131293	WINNIE	139951, 139950	Appraisal district				
	23074 VINCENT RD	343 T & NO	1978		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131296	WINNIE	139946	Appraisal district				
	22500 BLOCK VINCENT RD	343 T & NO	1975		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131145	WINNIE	139939	In field estimate				
	23800 BLOCK VINCENT RD	BENSON SEC. 162-163-164	1950		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 131299	WINNIE	8001, 8005	In field estimate				
	21600 BLOCK WILBER RD	379 T & NO	1965			Intensive survey needed	

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

Image / ID	Address / City, Unincorporated/Vicinity*	Subdivision / CAD PIDN**	Est. Year Built / Source	History Notes	NRHP Recommendations	Recommendation Justification	Survey Notes
HHM ID: 131127	WINNIE	140093	In field estimate				
	2600 BLOCK WILBER RD	442 WM. MCFADDIN	1975			ROE needed	Told not to take photos
HHM ID: 131122	WINNIE	140457, 129113	In field estimate				
	WILBER RD					ROE needed	No building visible from ROW
HHM ID: 131125	WINNIE	141212					
	18255 WILLIS RD	598 T & NO	1962		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130487	WINNIE	141626	Appraisal district				
	18200 BLOCK WILLIS RD	598 T & NO	1930		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 130490	WINNIE	141621	In field estimate				
	GANDY	GANDY	1955 - 1970		Not eligible for NRHP	Lacks integrity, Lacks known significance	
HHM ID: 122506	WINNIE		In field estimate				

* HHM prepopulated city information from CAD. While the survey boundaries exclude the city limits of Beaumont and Port Arthur, a number of resources outside these limits have Beaumont and Port Arthur addresses in CAD. Additionally, because the unincorporated towns are often listed in an incorporated city in CAD, some resources in these areas have Beaumont, Port Arthur, or Winnie addresses. In some instances, though, where no city was prepopulated in the database, surveyors added unincorporated area/vicinity information in the field. In these cases, city information reflects the unincorporated area rather than the city listed in CAD.

** Note that CAD PID Nos. are not listed for resources surveyed at the collective scale due to the large number of parcels typically within a subdivision. To locate the subdivision name for a parcel, search by owner, address, or PID on the Jefferson Central Appraisal District's website: https://esearch.jcad.org/.

APPENDIX D: RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL SURVEY INVENTORY

Appendix D presents the inventory of resources surveyed at the reconnaissance level and recommended individually eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The inventory is sorted by: City, Street name, Street number.

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

827 HILLEBRANDT ACRES

HHM ID No. 128304





IDENTIFICATION

Address	827 HILLEBRANDT ACRES	Subdivision	HILLEBRANDT ACRES UNRECORDED
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity/	BEAUMONT	CAD Parcel ID	47193

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Side-gabled
Stylistic Influence(s)	Colonial Revival
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1945
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Roof material replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1945

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

8505 LABELLE RD

HHM ID No. 126070





IDENTIFICATION

Address	8505 LABELLE RD	Subdivision	14 S. CORZINE
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	BEAUMONT	CAD Parcel ID	127289

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Center passage
Stylistic Influence(s)	Greek Revival
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1910
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1910

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

442 MEEKER RD

HHM ID No. 125750





IDENTIFICATION

Address	442 MEEKER RD	Subdivision	N/A
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	BEAUMONT	CAD Parcel ID	132920

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Structure
Property Type	Cistern
Form/Plan	Cylindrical
Stylistic Influence(s)	No stylistic influences visible
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Unknown
Historic Use	Agricultural
Approx. Year Built	1930
Source for Year Built	Aerial images
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Loss of associated buildings

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Engineering
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1930

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

16435 OLD SOUR LAKE RD

HHM ID No. 125131





IDENTIFICATION

Address	16435 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	Subdivision	60 T. D. YOAKUM
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	BEAUMONT	CAD Parcel ID	134587

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Ranch
Stylistic Influence(s)	Mid-century Modern
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1965
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1965

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

7679 SHADY LN

HHM ID No. 125217





IDENTIFICATION

Address	7679 SHADY LN	Subdivision	GARDEN VILLAS
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	BEAUMONT	CAD Parcel ID	35611

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Foursquare
Stylistic Influence(s)	Colonial Revival
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1930
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Bay window added

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1930

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

790 TODD ST

HHM ID No. 125548





IDENTIFICATION

Address	790 TODD ST	Subdivision	GULF TERRACE
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	BEAUMONT	CAD Parcel ID	42243

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman Eclectic
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1930
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Roof material possibly replaced in historic period

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1930

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

495 WEST RD

HHM ID No. 125060





IDENTIFICATION

Address	495 WEST RD	Subdivision	60 T. D. YOAKUM
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	BEAUMONT	CAD Parcel ID	134625

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Colonial Revival
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1930
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	All windows replaced, Doors replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Community Planning and Development, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1930

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

2000 BLOCK YORKSHIRE RD

HHM ID No. 125858





IDENTIFICATION

Address	2000 BLOCK YORKSHIRE RD	Subdivision	24 JAS. GERISH SR.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	BEAUMONT	CAD Parcel ID	409351

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Folk Victorian
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1920
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Roof material replaced, Rear addition, Porch altered

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1920

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

9889 BOYT RD

HHM ID No. 125838





IDENTIFICATION

Address	9889 BOYT RD	Subdivision	562 CHAISON & OGDEN
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	CHEEK	CAD Parcel ID	326078, 326050

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Site
Property Type	Agriculture complex
Form/Plan	N/A
Stylistic Influence(s)	Colonial Revival
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Agricultural
Historic Use	Agricultural
Approx. Year Built	1930 - 1960
Source for Year Built	Aerial images, In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Some non-historic buildings

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Agriculture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1930 - 1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

12895 HIGHWAY 124

HHM ID No. 123112





IDENTIFICATION

Address	12895 HIGHWAY 124	Subdivision	81 BBB & C RY.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	CHEEK	CAD Parcel ID	135537

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Site
Property Type	Agriculture complex
Form/Plan	House - square plan hipped-roof
Stylistic Influence(s)	No stylistic influences visible
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Commercial
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1925-1955
Source for Year Built	Aerial images
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Main house: Roof material replaced, Exterior wall materials replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Agriculture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1925-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

5702 INDUSTRY RD

HHM ID No. 122978





IDENTIFICATION

Address	5702 INDUSTRY RD	Subdivision	INDUSTRIAL SITES OF INDUST CITY
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	CHEEK	CAD Parcel ID	49280

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Structure
Property Type	Rice dryer
Form/Plan	Linear
Stylistic Influence(s)	No stylistic influences visible
Building Name	DOGUET'S RICE MILLING CO

HISTORY

Current Use	Industrial
Historic Use	Industrial
Approx. Year Built	1968
Source for Year Built	Appraisal district
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Industry
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1968

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

8600 BLOCK KIDD RD

HHM ID No. 126117





IDENTIFICATION

Address	8600 BLOCK KIDD RD	Subdivision	260 T & NO
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	CHEEK	CAD Parcel ID	139688

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Structure
Property Type	Water tower
Form/Plan	Tower
Stylistic Influence(s)	No stylistic influences visible
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Public works
Historic Use	Public works
Approx. Year Built	1975
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Engineering
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1975

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

110 BENOIT AVE

HHM ID No. 124320





IDENTIFICATION

Address	110 BENOIT AVE	Subdivision	16 S. DEAN
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	CHINA	CAD Parcel ID	127560

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Irregular
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1905
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Some exterior wall materials replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Community Planning and Development
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1905

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

600 BLANCH RD

HHM ID No. 124328





IDENTIFICATION

Address	600 BLANCH RD	Subdivision	16 S. DEAN
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	CHINA	CAD Parcel ID	127502, 127500

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	I-house
Stylistic Influence(s)	Classical Revival
Building Name	Blanch Estate

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1899
Source for Year Built	Owner
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Rear historic-age addition, Some windows and doors replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Exploration/Settlement, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1899

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

200 BROADWAY ST

HHM ID No. 124350





IDENTIFICATION

Address	200 BROADWAY ST	Subdivision	NASHLAND
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	CHINA	CAD Parcel ID	66779

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Train depot
Form/Plan	Linear
Stylistic Influence(s)	Italianate
Building Name	Old Southern Pacific Railroad depot

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Transportation
Approx. Year Built	1905
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Fenestration pattern altered

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Transportation, Community Planning and Development
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1905

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

305 BROADWAY ST

HHM ID No. 124988





IDENTIFICATION

Address	305 BROADWAY ST	Subdivision	NASHLAND
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	CHINA	CAD Parcel ID	66810

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Post office
Form/Plan	Rectangular
Stylistic Influence(s)	Modern
Building Name	U.S. Post Office

HISTORY

Current Use	Governmental
Historic Use	Governmental
Approx. Year Built	1960
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Canopy replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Politics/Government
Multiple Property Nomination Name	Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property	Period of Significance	1960-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

717 N BROADWAY ST

HHM ID No. 124300





IDENTIFICATION

Address	717 N BROADWAY ST	Subdivision	NASHLAND
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	CHINA	CAD Parcel ID	66872

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	School
Form/Plan	L-plan
Stylistic Influence(s)	No stylistic influences visible
Building Name	China School

HISTORY

Current Use	Vacant
Historic Use	Educational
Approx. Year Built	1920
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	New buildings added in 1950s, 1970s, and 1990s

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Education
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1920

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

400 BLOCK N BROADWAY ST

HHM ID No. 124757





IDENTIFICATION

Address	400 BLOCK N BROADWAY ST	Subdivision	NASHLAND
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	CHINA	CAD Parcel ID	66820

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Structure
Property Type	Water tower
Form/Plan	Tower
Stylistic Influence(s)	No stylistic influences visible
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Public works
Historic Use	Public works
Approx. Year Built	1978
Source for Year Built	Aerial images
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Engineering
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1978

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

4017 CHINA N RD

HHM ID No. 125220





IDENTIFICATION

Address	4017 CHINA N RD	Subdivision	550 MRS. P. J. CHILES
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	CHINA	CAD Parcel ID	141158

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Center passage
Stylistic Influence(s)	Greek Revival
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1910
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Currently under renovation

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1910

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

245 HIGHWAY 90

HHM ID No. 124243





IDENTIFICATION

Address	245 HIGHWAY 90	Subdivision	36 M. F. LAZARIN
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	CHINA	CAD Parcel ID	131276

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Church
Form/Plan	Rectangular
Stylistic Influence(s)	Mission Revival
Building Name	Our Lady of Sorrows Catholic Church

HISTORY

Current Use	Religious
Historic Use	Religious
Approx. Year Built	1935
Source for Year Built	Cornerstone
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C, Criterion Consideration A
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1935

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

20921 HIGHWAY 90

HHM ID No. 124191





IDENTIFICATION

Address	20921 HIGHWAY 90	Subdivision	36 M. F. LAZARIN
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	CHINA	CAD Parcel ID	131291

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Center passage
Stylistic Influence(s)	National Folk
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1915
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Some exterior wall materials replaced, Some windows replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1915

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

500 BLOCK MAINE W AVE

HHM ID No. 124926





IDENTIFICATION

Address	500 BLOCK MAINE W AVE	Subdivision	NASHLAND
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	CHINA	CAD Parcel ID	66848

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Store
Form/Plan	One-part commercial block
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Commercial
Approx. Year Built	1925
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Commerce, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1925

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

9894 OLD GILBERT RD

HHM ID No. 126316





IDENTIFICATION

Address	9894 OLD GILBERT RD	Subdivision	35 J. C. LAWHON
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	FANNETT	CAD Parcel ID	131099

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Church
Form/Plan	Rectangular
Stylistic Influence(s)	Mid-century Modern
Building Name	St. Mary's Catholic Church

HISTORY

Current Use	Religious
Historic Use	Religious
Approx. Year Built	1965
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Side addition

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion Consideration A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1965

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

5601 39TH ST

HHM ID No. 127490





IDENTIFICATION

Address	5601 39TH ST	Subdivision	PALCO - P.N.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	GROVES	CAD Parcel ID	76467

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Funeral home
Form/Plan	Rectangular
Stylistic Influence(s)	Mid-century Modern
Building Name	Levingston Funeral Home

HISTORY

Current Use	Funerary
Historic Use	Funerary
Approx. Year Built	1958
Source for Year Built	Appraisal district
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Windows and doors boarded

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Commerce
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1958

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

3901 CLEVELAND AVE

HHM ID No. 127429





IDENTIFICATION

Address	3901 CLEVELAND AVE	Subdivision	GROVES PRIMARY CAMPUS
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	GROVES	CAD Parcel ID	422269

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	School
Form/Plan	I-plan
Stylistic Influence(s)	Art Deco
Building Name	Groves Elementary School

HISTORY

Current Use	Educational
Historic Use	Educational
Approx. Year Built	1948
Source for Year Built	https://www.pngisd.org/domain/637
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	All windows replaced, Multiple additions

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Education, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name	Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property	Period of Significance	1948-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

6246 JEFFERSON BLVD

HHM ID No. 130219





IDENTIFICATION

Address	6246 JEFFERSON BLVD	Subdivision	PECAN GROVES
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	GROVES	CAD Parcel ID	81625

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1920
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Gable end window boarded

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1920

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

6301 JEFFERSON BLVD

HHM ID No. 130170





IDENTIFICATION

Address	6301 JEFFERSON BLVD	Subdivision	PECAN GROVES
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	GROVES	CAD Parcel ID	81420

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1920
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1920

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

6523 JEFFERSON BLVD

HHM ID No. 130169





IDENTIFICATION

Address	6523 JEFFERSON BLVD	Subdivision	PECAN GROVES
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	GROVES	CAD Parcel ID	81484

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1920
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Porch railing replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1920

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

5801 JEFFERSON W BLVD

HHM ID No. 127753





IDENTIFICATION

Address	5801 JEFFERSON W BLVD	Subdivision	THE GROVES
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	GROVES	CAD Parcel ID	41230

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Church
Form/Plan	Cruciform
Stylistic Influence(s)	Mid-century Modern
Building Name	St. Paul Lutheran Church

HISTORY

Current Use	Religious
Historic Use	Religious
Approx. Year Built	1970
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion Consideration A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1970

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

6498 JEFFERSON BLVD

HHM ID No. 127800





IDENTIFICATION

Address	6498 JEFFERSON BLVD	Subdivision	PECAN GROVES
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	GROVES	CAD Parcel ID	81685

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman, Tudor Revival
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1930
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1930

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

3947 LINCOLN AVE

HHM ID No. 127868





IDENTIFICATION

Address	3947 LINCOLN AVE	Subdivision	C C ESTATES
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	GROVES	CAD Parcel ID	24137

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Bank, City Hall
Form/Plan	Rectangular
Stylistic Influence(s)	Mid-century Modern
Building Name	First State Bank, Groves City Hall

HISTORY

Current Use	Governmental
Historic Use	Commercial
Approx. Year Built	1950
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Government, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name	Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property	Period of Significance	1950-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

5000 MAIN AVE

HHM ID No. 127426





IDENTIFICATION

Address	5000 MAIN AVE	Subdivision	PECAN GROVES
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	GROVES	CAD Parcel ID	81144

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Tudor Revival, Dutch Colonial
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1930
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1930

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

5600 MONROE BLVD

HHM ID No. 127625





IDENTIFICATION

Address	5600 MONROE BLVD	Subdivision	PALCO - P.N.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	GROVES	CAD Parcel ID	76487

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1935
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1935

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

5700 MONROE BLVD

HHM ID No. 127680





IDENTIFICATION

Address	5700 MONROE BLVD	Subdivision	PALCO - P.N.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	GROVES	CAD Parcel ID	76491

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Tudor Revival
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1935
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Door replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1935

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

6150 SHORT ST

HHM ID No. 127441





IDENTIFICATION

Address	6150 SHORT ST	Subdivision	C C ESTATES
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	GROVES	CAD Parcel ID	24132

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Fire station
Form/Plan	Garage
Stylistic Influence(s)	Mid-century Modern
Building Name	Groves Central Fire Station

HISTORY

Current Use	Governmental
Historic Use	Governmental
Approx. Year Built	1950
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Government, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name	Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property	Period of Significance	1950-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

5500 SONNIER LN

HHM ID No. 128088





IDENTIFICATION

Address	5500 SONNIER LN	Subdivision	PALCO - P.N.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	GROVES	CAD Parcel ID	76495

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Structure
Property Type	Water tower
Form/Plan	Tower
Stylistic Influence(s)	No stylistic influences visible
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Public works
Historic Use	Public works
Approx. Year Built	1950
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Engineering
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1950

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

6400 VAN BUREN ST

HHM ID No. 127787





IDENTIFICATION

Address	6400 VAN BUREN ST	Subdivision	JOSEPH GRIGSBY VAN BUREN ELEM & GROVES MIDDLE
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	GROVES	CAD Parcel ID	130026

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	School
Form/Plan	Axial
Stylistic Influence(s)	Mid-century Modern
Building Name	Van Buren Elementary School

HISTORY

Current Use	Educational
Historic Use	Educational
Approx. Year Built	1955
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Education, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name	Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property	Period of Significance	1955-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

VINCENT DR

HHM ID No. 126739



IDENTIFICATION

Address	VINCENT DR	Subdivision	PALCO - P.A.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	GROVES	CAD Parcel ID	72913

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Structure
Property Type	Water tower
Form/Plan	Tower
Stylistic Influence(s)	No stylistic influences visible
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Public works
Historic Use	Public works
Approx. Year Built	1938
Source for Year Built	On 1938 aerial
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Engineering
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1938

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

6170 WASHINGTON ST

HHM ID No. 130161





IDENTIFICATION

Address	6170 WASHINGTON ST	Subdivision	PECAN GROVES
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	GROVES	CAD Parcel ID	81865

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1925
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Door replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1925

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

4849 WILSON ST

HHM ID No. 127821





IDENTIFICATION

Address	4849 WILSON ST	Subdivision	LEE TO GROVES
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	GROVES	CAD Parcel ID	57476

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Dutch Colonial
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1930
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Roof material replaced, Exterior wall materials replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1930

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

12702 2ND ST

HHM ID No. 121903





IDENTIFICATION

Address	12702 2ND ST	Subdivision	HAMSHIRE
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	HAMSHIRE	CAD Parcel ID	43201

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	School
Form/Plan	Irregular
Stylistic Influence(s)	Mid-century Modern
Building Name	Hamshire-Fannett High School

HISTORY

Current Use	Educational
Historic Use	Educational
Approx. Year Built	1966
Source for Year Built	Appraisal district
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Porch materials replaced, Multiple additions

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Education, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name	Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property	Period of Significance	1966-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

14876 BOONDOCKS RD

HHM ID No. 131279





IDENTIFICATION

Address	14876 BOONDOCKS RD	Subdivision	68 D. BURRELL
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	HAMSHIRE	CAD Parcel ID	135118

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1920
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Rear addition, Exterior wall materials replaced in historic period

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1920

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

15882 WISE RD

HHM ID No. 122248





IDENTIFICATION

Address	15882 WISE RD	Subdivision	620 T & NO
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	HAMSHIRE	CAD Parcel ID	141694, 141701, 141775, 141766

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Center passage
Stylistic Influence(s)	National Folk
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1910
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Porch materials replaced, Windows replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1910

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

800 S 12TH ST

HHM ID No. 127412





IDENTIFICATION

Address	800 S 12TH ST	Subdivision	HOLLAND
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	43184

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	School
Form/Plan	H-shape
Stylistic Influence(s)	Prairie
Building Name	Langham Elementary School

HISTORY

Current Use	Educational
Historic Use	Educational
Approx. Year Built	1939
Source for Year Built	Research/Aerial images
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	All windows replaced, Multiple additions

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Education
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1939-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

904 S 12TH ST

HHM ID No. 127627





IDENTIFICATION

Address	904 S 12TH ST	Subdivision	WAGNER 2
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	110164

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1930
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Exterior wall materials in gable covered

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1930

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

319 15TH ST

HHM ID No. 126740





IDENTIFICATION

Address	319 15TH ST	Subdivision	PALCO - NED.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	75375

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1920
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Exterior wall materials replaced in historic period

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1920

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

200 N 17TH ST

HHM ID No. 126765





IDENTIFICATION

Address	200 N 17TH ST	Subdivision	PALCO CENTRAL MIDDLE SCH
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	75393

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	School
Form/Plan	Central block with wings
Stylistic Influence(s)	Art Deco
Building Name	Central Middle School

HISTORY

Current Use	Educational
Historic Use	Educational
Approx. Year Built	1950
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	All windows replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Government, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name	Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property	Period of Significance	1950-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

200 S 6TH ST

HHM ID No. 128973





IDENTIFICATION

Address	200 S 6TH ST	Subdivision	PALCO - NED.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	75198

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	School
Form/Plan	Axial
Stylistic Influence(s)	Mid-century Modern
Building Name	Highland Park Elementary School

HISTORY

Current Use	Educational
Historic Use	Educational
Approx. Year Built	1965
Source for Year Built	Aerial images
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	All windows replaced, Additions

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Education, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name	Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property	Period of Significance	1965-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

2304 AVE B

HHM ID No. 127567





IDENTIFICATION

Address	2304 AVE B	Subdivision	HILLCREST 1
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	46097

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1920
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Doors replaced, Exterior wall materials replaced in historic period

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1920

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

2611 AVE H

HHM ID No. 128130





IDENTIFICATION

Address	2611 AVE H	Subdivision	PALCO - NED.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	75151

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	School
Form/Plan	Courtyard
Stylistic Influence(s)	Mid-century Modern
Building Name	Hillcrest Elementary School

HISTORY

Current Use	Educational
Historic Use	Educational
Approx. Year Built	1965
Source for Year Built	Aerial images
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	All windows replaced, Doors replaced, Additions

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Education, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name	Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property	Period of Significance	1965-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1403 AVENUE H

HHM ID No. 127603





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1403 AVENUE H	Subdivision	PALCO - NED.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	75111

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1930
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Porch materials replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1930

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

923 BOSTON AVE

HHM ID No. 128323





IDENTIFICATION

Address	923 BOSTON AVE	Subdivision	NEDERLAND
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	67266

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Library
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	Nederland Public Library (formerly)

HISTORY

Current Use	Social
Historic Use	Government
Approx. Year Built	1932
Source for Year Built	Newspaper research
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Door replaced, Non-historic buildings added to site

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Politics/Government
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1932-1963

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1500 BOSTON AVE

HHM ID No. 126666





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1500 BOSTON AVE	Subdivision	PALCO - NED.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	75390

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Site
Property Type	Museum
Form/Plan	Windmill
Stylistic Influence(s)	Dutch
Building Name	Tex Ritter Historical Park/Dutch Windmill Museum

HISTORY

Current Use	Recreational
Historic Use	Recreational
Approx. Year Built	1969
Source for Year Built	Research
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP, Within district eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Entertainment/Recreation, Architecture
Potential Historic District Name	Downtown Nederland	Period of Significance	1969-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

3500 BLOCK CANAL AVE

HHM ID No. 130602





IDENTIFICATION

Address	3500 BLOCK CANAL AVE	Subdivision	PALCO - NED.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	75621

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Structure
Property Type	Water tower
Form/Plan	Tower
Stylistic Influence(s)	No stylistic influences visible
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Public works
Historic Use	Public works
Approx. Year Built	1978
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Engineering
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1978

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1298 DIXIE BLVD

HHM ID No. 128300





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1298 DIXIE BLVD	Subdivision	HOLLYWOOD
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	47687

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Tudor Revival
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1930
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1930

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1508 FRANKLIN AVE

HHM ID No. 127041





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1508 FRANKLIN AVE	Subdivision	11 D. CHOATE
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	53382

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1925
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Windows replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1925

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

2800 HELENA AVE

HHM ID No. 130566





IDENTIFICATION

Address	2800 HELENA AVE	Subdivision	PALCO - NED.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	75572

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	School
Form/Plan	Irregular
Stylistic Influence(s)	Mid-century Modern
Building Name	Helena Park Elementary School

HISTORY

Current Use	Educational
Historic Use	Educational
Approx. Year Built	1965
Source for Year Built	Aerial images
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	All windows replaced, Doors replaced, Additions

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Education, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name	Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property	Period of Significance	1965-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1143 JACKSON AVE

HHM ID No. 127968





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1143 JACKSON AVE	Subdivision	HUMPHREY HEIGHTS 1
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	49000

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Duplex house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1930
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Some windows boarded

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1930

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

844 NEDERLAND AVE

HHM ID No. 128351





IDENTIFICATION

Address	844 NEDERLAND AVE	Subdivision	HAIZLIP
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	43074

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Telephone exchange
Form/Plan	Rectangular
Stylistic Influence(s)	Art Deco
Building Name	Southwestern Bell Telephone Co.

HISTORY

Current Use	Commercial
Historic Use	Commercial
Approx. Year Built	1948
Source for Year Built	Sanborn map, 1949, sheet 5
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Some windows covered, Side addition (historic age)

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Community Planning and Development
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1948

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1300 NEDERLAND AVE

HHM ID No. 126868





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1300 NEDERLAND AVE	Subdivision	NEDERLAND
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	67307

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Church
Form/Plan	Irregular
Stylistic Influence(s)	Gothic Revival, Mid-century Modern
Building Name	First Methodist Church

HISTORY

Current Use	Religious
Historic Use	Religious
Approx. Year Built	1963
Source for Year Built	Cornerstone
Architect and/or Builder	Edward Bodet (Houston, Architect)

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Doors replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion Consideration A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1963

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1911 NEDERLAND AVE

HHM ID No. 126680





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1911 NEDERLAND AVE	Subdivision	PALCO - NED.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	75302

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Church
Form/Plan	Rectangular
Stylistic Influence(s)	Classical Revival
Building Name	First Baptist Church

HISTORY

Current Use	Religious
Historic Use	Religious
Approx. Year Built	1955
Source for Year Built	Newspaper
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Multiple addtions

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion Consideration A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1955

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

2310 NEDERLAND AVE

HHM ID No. 127850





IDENTIFICATION

Address	2310 NEDERLAND AVE	Subdivision	HILLTOP 2ND
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	47427

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Church
Form/Plan	Irregular
Stylistic Influence(s)	Tudor Revival
Building Name	Nederland Avenue Church of Christ

HISTORY

Current Use	Religious
Historic Use	Religious
Approx. Year Built	1951
Source for Year Built	Newspaper article
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion Consideration A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1951

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

203 N TWIN CITY HWY

HHM ID No. 126859





IDENTIFICATION

Address	203 N TWIN CITY HWY	Subdivision	NEDERLAND
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	67250

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Modified L-plan
Stylistic Influence(s)	Queen Anne
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Unknown
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1910
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Roof material replaced, Porch altered, Side carport added

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1910

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

703 TWIN CITY N HWY

HHM ID No. 126967





IDENTIFICATION

Address	703 TWIN CITY N HWY	Subdivision	HOLLAND TO NEDERLAND
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NEDERLAND	CAD Parcel ID	47555

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Gas station
Form/Plan	Box with Canopy
Stylistic Influence(s)	Modern
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Commercial
Historic Use	Commercial
Approx. Year Built	1948
Source for Year Built	Appraisal district
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Some windows replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Commerce
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1948

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1460 2ND ST

HHM ID No. 123960





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1460 2ND ST	Subdivision	SOUR LAKE TO NOME
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NOME	CAD Parcel ID	103022

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Front gable
Stylistic Influence(s)	Folk Victorian
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1910
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Some exterior wall materials replaced, Windows replaced, Some window patterns changed

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1910

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1000 BLOCK N 3RD ST

HHM ID No. 124057





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1000 BLOCK N 3RD ST	Subdivision	SOUR LAKE TO NOME
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NOME	CAD Parcel ID	102946

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	School
Form/Plan	Rectangular
Stylistic Influence(s)	No stylistic influences visible
Building Name	Nome Colored School

HISTORY

Current Use	Vacant
Historic Use	Educational
Approx. Year Built	1948
Source for Year Built	Appraisal district
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Windows and doors boarded

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Ethnic Heritage - Black, Education
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1948 - TBD

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1669 AVE C

HHM ID No. 123919





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1669 AVE C	Subdivision	MOON TO NOME
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NOME	CAD Parcel ID	66597

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1920
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Canopy replaced, Some exterior wall materials replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1920

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

2000 BLOCK NORTH ST

HHM ID No. 124068





IDENTIFICATION

Address	2000 BLOCK NORTH ST	Subdivision	SOUR LAKE TO NOME
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NOME	CAD Parcel ID	103012

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Structure
Property Type	Rice dryer
Form/Plan	Cylindrical
Stylistic Influence(s)	No stylistic influences visible
Building Name	Nome Rice Dryer

HISTORY

Current Use	Industrial
Historic Use	Industrial
Approx. Year Built	1946
Source for Year Built	Research
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Loss of associated buildings

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Industry
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1946-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1675 TEXAS ST

HHM ID No. 123901





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1675 TEXAS ST	Subdivision	380 JNO. VANNESS
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	NOME	CAD Parcel ID	140107

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	School gymnasium
Form/Plan	Rectangular
Stylistic Influence(s)	No stylistic influences visible
Building Name	Nome Gym

HISTORY

Current Use	Recreational
Historic Use	Recreational
Approx. Year Built	1937
Source for Year Built	Research
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Doors replaced, All windows replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Entertainment/Recreation, Education
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1937-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1200 BLOCK HIGHWAY 365

HHM ID No. 129054



IDENTIFICATION

Address	1200 BLOCK HIGHWAY 365	Subdivision	PALCO - P.A.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	PORT ARTHUR	CAD Parcel ID	74008

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Structure
Property Type	Water tower
Form/Plan	Tower
Stylistic Influence(s)	No stylistic influences visible
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Public works
Historic Use	Public works
Approx. Year Built	1965
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Engineering
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1965

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

633 AVE C

HHM ID No. 129409





IDENTIFICATION

Address	633 AVE C	Subdivision	111-YA
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	PORT NECHES	CAD Parcel ID	132201

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Jail
Form/Plan	Rectangular
Stylistic Influence(s)	Mission Revival
Building Name	Old Port Neches Jail

HISTORY

Current Use	Vacant
Historic Use	Governmental
Approx. Year Built	1920
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Community Planning and Development
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1920-TBD

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

326 AVE D

HHM ID No. 130003





IDENTIFICATION

Address	326 AVE D	Subdivision	RACHFORD AND DEARING
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	PORT NECHES	CAD Parcel ID	94528

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Modified L-plan
Stylistic Influence(s)	Queen Anne
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1910
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Some windows replaced, Doors replaced, Some exterior wall materials replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1910

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1024 DEARING ST

HHM ID No. 130010





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1024 DEARING ST	Subdivision	RACHFORD AND DEARING
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	PORT NECHES	CAD Parcel ID	94495

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Church
Form/Plan	Rectangular
Stylistic Influence(s)	Colonial Revival
Building Name	First Baptist Church

HISTORY

Current Use	Religious
Historic Use	Religious
Approx. Year Built	1945
Source for Year Built	Aerial images
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Exterior wall materials replaced, Windows replaced, Doors replaced, Some windows infilled - many within historic period

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C, Criterion Consideration A
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture, Community Planning and Development
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1945

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1105 GRIGSBY AVE

HHM ID No. 129691





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1105 GRIGSBY AVE	Subdivision	10 OAKS
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	PORT NECHES	CAD Parcel ID	71100

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1925
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Door replaced, Rear addition

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1925

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1522 HEISLER ST

HHM ID No. 129799





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1522 HEISLER ST	Subdivision	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	PORT NECHES	CAD Parcel ID	416888

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	School
Form/Plan	Linear
Stylistic Influence(s)	Art Deco
Building Name	Woodcrest Elementary School

HISTORY

Current Use	Educational
Historic Use	Educational
Approx. Year Built	1950
Source for Year Built	https://www.pngisd.org/domain/865
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	New covered walkway, Some additions

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Education, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name	Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property	Period of Significance	1950-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

2101 LLANO ST

HHM ID No. 130075





IDENTIFICATION

Address	2101 LLANO ST	Subdivision	PALCO PT NECHES MIDDLE & ELEMENTARY
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	PORT NECHES	CAD Parcel ID	76343

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	School
Form/Plan	Irregular
Stylistic Influence(s)	Mid-century Modern
Building Name	Port Neches Elementary School

HISTORY

Current Use	Educational
Historic Use	Educational
Approx. Year Built	1958
Source for Year Built	School website
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Additions

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Education, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name	Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property	Period of Significance	1958-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1030 MARION ST

HHM ID No. 129498





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1030 MARION ST	Subdivision	BIGELOW
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	PORT NECHES	CAD Parcel ID	8566

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1925
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Windows replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1925

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

2450 MERRIMAN ST

HHM ID No. 130436





IDENTIFICATION

Address	2450 MERRIMAN ST	Subdivision	PALCO - P.N.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	PORT NECHES	CAD Parcel ID	76566

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Side-gabled
Stylistic Influence(s)	Greek Revival
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1935
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Exterior wall materials replaced in historic period, Windows replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1935

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

2820 MERRIMAN ST

HHM ID No. 130338





IDENTIFICATION

Address	2820 MERRIMAN ST	Subdivision	PALCO - P.N.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	PORT NECHES	CAD Parcel ID	76617

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	School
Form/Plan	Rectangular
Stylistic Influence(s)	Mid-century Modern
Building Name	Ridgewood Elementary School

HISTORY

Current Use	Educational
Historic Use	Educational
Approx. Year Built	1958
Source for Year Built	School website
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Education, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name	Post-War Public Buildings of Jefferson Co. Multi-Property	Period of Significance	1958-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

2901 MERRIMAN ST

HHM ID No. 130301





IDENTIFICATION

Address	2901 MERRIMAN ST	Subdivision	PALCO - P.N.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	PORT NECHES	CAD Parcel ID	76615

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1925
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Exterior wall materials replaced, Rear addition

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1925

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

805 MONTGOMERY ST

HHM ID No. 129501





IDENTIFICATION

Address	805 MONTGOMERY ST	Subdivision	BIGELOW
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	PORT NECHES	CAD Parcel ID	8507

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1925
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Some porch columns replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1925

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1826 NALL ST

HHM ID No. 129976





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1826 NALL ST	Subdivision	HEISLER HOMESTEAD
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	PORT NECHES	CAD Parcel ID	44426

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Church
Form/Plan	Irregular
Stylistic Influence(s)	Modern Gothic Revival
Building Name	United Methodist Church

HISTORY

Current Use	Religious
Historic Use	Religious
Approx. Year Built	1950 (church), 1961 (education building)
Source for Year Built	Marker
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion Consideration A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1950, 1961

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1117 PORT NECHES AVE

HHM ID No. 129478





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1117 PORT NECHES AVE	Subdivision	STAFFEN TO PORT NECHES
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	PORT NECHES	CAD Parcel ID	103915

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Store
Form/Plan	Two-part commercial block
Stylistic Influence(s)	Commercial
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Vacant
Historic Use	Commercial
Approx. Year Built	1920
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Some windows replaced or boarded, Some doors replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Commerce, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1920-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1303 PORT NECHES AVE

HHM ID No. 129488





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1303 PORT NECHES AVE	Subdivision	Block, W. T.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	PORT NECHES	CAD Parcel ID	9544

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Store
Form/Plan	One-part commercial block
Stylistic Influence(s)	Commercial
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Commercial
Historic Use	Commercial
Approx. Year Built	1925
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Exterior wall materials covered/slip cover

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Commerce, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1925-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1309 PORT NECHES AVE

HHM ID No. 129491





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1309 PORT NECHES AVE	Subdivision	Block, W. T.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	PORT NECHES	CAD Parcel ID	9545

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Store
Form/Plan	One-part commercial block
Stylistic Influence(s)	Modern
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Commercial
Historic Use	Commercial
Approx. Year Built	1920
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	1960s rehab

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Commerce, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1920-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

100 PORT NECHES ATLANTIC RD

HHM ID No. 131325





IDENTIFICATION

Address	100 PORT NECHES ATLANTIC RD	Subdivision	PALCO - P.N.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	PORT NECHES	CAD Parcel ID	76193

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Office
Form/Plan	Rectangular
Stylistic Influence(s)	Italianate
Building Name	Texaco Mid-County Works Building

HISTORY

Current Use	Commercial
Historic Use	Commercial
Approx. Year Built	1915
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	All windows replaced, Exterior wall materials replaced, Doors replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Industry, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1915-1973

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

1013 WAGNER ST

HHM ID No. 129776





IDENTIFICATION

Address	1013 WAGNER ST	Subdivision	Block, A. C.
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	PORT NECHES	CAD Parcel ID	9451

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Bungalow
Stylistic Influence(s)	Craftsman
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1925
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	None noted

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1925

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

206 GREENWOOD DR

HHM ID No. 131382



IDENTIFICATION

Address	206 GREENWOOD DR	Subdivision	COUNTRY CLUB PARK EST. 1
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	TAYLOR LANDING	CAD Parcel ID	24645

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Ranch
Stylistic Influence(s)	Mid-century Modern
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1962
Source for Year Built	Appraisal district
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Doors replaced, Windows replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1962

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

13023 WEST PORT ARTHUR RD

HHM ID No. 121916





IDENTIFICATION

Address	13023 WEST PORT ARTHUR RD	Subdivision	258 T & NO
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	VITERBO	CAD Parcel ID	139606, 139605, 139649, 26331, 139606

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Square plan hipped-roof
Stylistic Influence(s)	No stylistic influences visible
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1900
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Exterior wall materials replaced, Windows replaced, Porch columns covered

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1900

RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL INVENTORY

15532 BRUSH ISLAND RD

HHM ID No. 121518





IDENTIFICATION

Address	15532 BRUSH ISLAND RD	Subdivision	KOCH F. VALMORE
City/Unincorporated Area/Vicinity	WINNIE	CAD Parcel ID	53240, 53241

DESCRIPTION

Resource Type	Building
Property Type	Single-family house
Form/Plan	Center passage
Stylistic Influence(s)	National Folk
Building Name	

HISTORY

Current Use	Residential
Historic Use	Residential
Approx. Year Built	1900
Source for Year Built	In field estimate
Architect and/or Builder	

INTEGRITY

Alterations and Additions	Exterior wall materials replaced, Windows replaced

NATIONAL REGISTER (NRHP) RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Individually eligible for NRHP	Criteria	Criterion A, Criterion C
Justification	Possesses integrity and significance	Area of Significance	Exploration/Settlement, Architecture
Multiple Property Nomination Name		Period of Significance	1900

APPENDIX E: DESKTOP-LEVEL SURVEY CSV

The 478 records surveyed at the desktop-level only are provided in the attached CSV file. Records are sorted by: City, Street name, Street number. All addresses are pulled from CAD.

Desktop-Level Survey CSV: https://dmoore.egnyte.com/dl/RtIN9jr931



Jefferson County Historic Resources Survey Plan, Historic Resources Survey, and Historic Preservation Plan

Volume III - Historic Preservation Plan

Prepared for the

Jefferson County Historical Commission





Prepared by HHM & Associates, Inc.

March 2024

Photos courtesy of University of North Texas Libraries and the Texas Historical Commission.

Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan aims to provide direction for the County Historical Commission (CHC) and Certified Local Government (CLG) over the next ten years by identifying goals, priorities, and concrete action items. The plan received funding from a National Park Service (NPS) grant targeted toward preservation planning in communities impacted by Hurricane Harvey, administered by the Texas Historical Commission. In 2021, the Austin-based preservation consulting firm HHM & Associates, Inc. (HHM) received the contract award for completion of the grant project. Other components of the grant project included development of a countywide historic context statement, completion of a countywide historic resources survey, and facilitation of a series of public meetings, as summarized in Table i below. Throughout the project, HHM collaborated with the CHC, CLG, and preservation stakeholders to understand Jefferson County's vision for preservation and to ensure that this plan reflected the county's values. This plan represents the culmination of outreach and engagement efforts conducted between April 2022 and May 2023. Public outreach efforts identified three core goals for Jefferson County's preservation program:

- Preparing for floods and natural disasters,
- Advocating for rehabilitation, and
- Minimizing neglect and vacancy.

To achieve these goals, the plan defines a series of action items, grouped into three priorities:

- Developing educational materials and events,
- Commenting on development, and
- Listing properties in the National Register.

The plan herein lists specific action items associated with each of these priorities, as well as an implantation timeline for each action item. The timeframe for implementation spans 10 years – from fiscal year 2025 through fiscal year 2034.

Table i. Abbreviated project task list and schedule.

Task	Timeframe
Task 1. Project Management Plan	May 2021
Task 2. Draft Investigative Study Research Design, Draft Public Involvement Plan, and Draft Fieldwork Methodology	July 2021
Task 3. Final Investigative Study Research Design and Final Public Involvement Plan	August 2021
Task 4. Research and Analysis	October 2021
Task 5. Draft Historic Context	December 2021
Task 6. Draft Countywide Survey Plan	February 2022
Task 7. First Stakeholder Meeting, Final Countywide Survey Plan, and Final Fieldwork Methodology	May 2022
Task 8. Field Survey and Data Analysis	December 2022
Task 9. Draft Historic Resources Survey Report	March 2023
Task 10. Draft Historic Preservation Plan	June 2023
Task 11. Second Stakeholder Meeting, Pre-Final Historic Contexts, Pre-Final Historic Resources Survey Report, and Pre-Final Historic Preservation Plan	November 2023
Task 12. Final Historic Contexts, Final Historic Resources Survey Report, and Final Historic Preservation Plan	March 2024

VOLUME III TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume III Historic Preservation Plan ..... III-i

Acknowledgements ..... III-iii

List of Acronyms ..... III-iv

Key Terms and Definitions ..... III-v

Introduction III-1

Vision and Guiding Principles III-9

Criteria for Setting Principles III-9

Goals, Priorities, and Action Items III-10

- Goals III-10
- Priorities and Action Items III-11

Implementation Plan and Timeline III-18

Bibliography III-19

Appendices .....

Appendix III-A: List of Stakeholders A-1

Appendix III-B: Public Outreach Results B-1

Appendix III-C: Preservation Resources Toolkit C-1

Appendix III-D: Prioritized National Register Recommendations D-1

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this plan has relied on the efforts and contributions of many, and the authors wish to extend their sincere appreciation for their assistance through the duration of the project.

Jefferson County Judge Jeff Branick and Jefferson County Commissioners provided the support necessary to apply for NPS grant funding for the project and to implement the project. Their support for the project demonstrates the County's continued commitment to historic preservation. The Jefferson County Historical Commission provided invaluable input and support for the project as well. Chair Theresa Goodness especially provided critical assistance seeking grant funding and implementing the project. The Jefferson County Certified Local Government coordinator, Jennifer Trenbeath, additionally provided crucial input and assistance in bringing this project to life. Texas Historical Commission staff also worked closely with the county and the consulting team throughout the project, and Historic Resources Survey Coordinator Leslie Wolfenden-Guidry and Disaster Assistance Program Coordinator Lisa Hart both deserve special thanks for their guidance throughout the project.

The authors also would like to recognize the many volunteers and individuals who took the time from their busy schedules to attend the public meetings at the outset of the project and then shared their insights into the state of historic preservation in Jefferson County. They also gave much-needed input and feedback to help identify and refine broad goals and priorities that provided greater clarity and direction in support of future preservation planning-related efforts. Their assistance is greatly appreciated.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

The following are acronyms that are commonly used throughout the document.

ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
CHC	County Historical Commission
CLG	Certified Local Government
DOE	Determination of Eligibility
DOI	Department of the Interior
FLHP	Family Land Heritage Property
FY	Fiscal Year
HHM	HHM & Associates, Inc.
HOT	Hotel Occupancy Tax
HPO	Historic Preservation Officer
HTC	Historic Texas Cemetery
HUD	(US Department of) Housing and Urban Development
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHL	National Historic Landmark
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NPI	National Preservation Institute
NPS	National Park Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NTHP	National Trust for Historic Preservation
OTHM	Official Texas Historical Markers
RTHL	Recorded Texas Historic Landmark
SAL	State Antiquities Landmark
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SOI	Secretary of the Interior (*Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards*)
TARL	Texas Archeological Research Laboratory
TCM	Texas Centennial Marker
THC	Texas Historical Commission
THSC	Texas Health and Safety Code
THT	Texas Heritage Trail
TMSP	Texas Main Street Program
TPTF	Texas Preservation Trust Fund
TxDOT	Texas Department of Transportation
USACE	US Army Corps of Engineers

Key Terms and Definitions

The following are among the most commonly used terms for a variety of preservation-related activities. Each term is briefly defined, and readers can get more information by accessing the website location listed in the applicable endnote or, when using an electronic copy, by clicking the embedded link for terms that are underlined and in blue text. To access the embedded link, place the mouse or cursor over the phrase and click the left mouse button. This action will open a web browser and navigate to the identified website that provides more detailed information. Please note that these links are subject to change. Please note that terms in italics are listed and defined in this section.

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)[1] – an independent federal agency that promotes the preservation, enhancement, and productive use of our nation's historic resources and advises the president and congress on national historic preservation policy

Building[2] – an edifice that is created principally to shelter any type of human activity, such as a house, barn, church, hotel, or similar construction

Certificate of Appropriateness[3] – a step undertaken by some local governments with preservation ordinances that allows commissions and boards to review and approve proposed changes to designated historic buildings; such a review is only authorized by local law and ordinances

Certified Historic Structure[4] – a term used in the *Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives Program* that refers to a building that is listed in the *National Register of Historic Places*, either individually or as a *Contributing* resource within a historic district

Certified Local Government[5] – a program established by the *National Park Service* and overseen at the state level by the *Texas Historical Commission* to help local governments promote historic preservation within their jurisdiction

Chapter 26[6] of the Parks and Wildlife Code of Texas State Statutes – a state law that is similar to *Section 4(f)* of the Federal Transportation Act that requires state agencies and political subdivisions within the state to consider how their actions may affect public lands that include historic properties, park and recreation lands, scientific areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges

Contributing[7] – a feature that adds to or enhances a sense of the past within an associated historic property or historic district

County Historical Commission[8] – a group, established by state law, that oversees a variety of history- and preservation-related activities and serves as a liaison between the *Texas Historical Commission* at the state-level and the county-level government and residents at the local level

Cultural Landscape[9] – a geographic area that includes a cohesive grouping of both natural and man-made features that constitutes a distinct and integrated unit, such as a park, ranch, farm, or groupings of such places

Cultural Resource[10] – a term commonly used in preservation-related compliance procedures (e.g., Section 106) that includes both historic resources and archaeological sites

Design Standards and Guidelines[11] – recommendations that inform property owners and occupants of buildings of appropriate design methods, materials, and approaches that are consistent with, or compatible to, the overall physical and architectural character of a place, city, downtown, or neighborhood

Family Land Heritage[12] – a program operating within the Texas Department of Agriculture that honors families who have owned and operated a continuous agricultural operation for at least 100 years

Federal Tax Credits[13] – a federal tax credit that is worth 20 percent of the eligible rehabilitation costs for buildings that are listed in the *National Register of Historic Places*; the *Texas Historical Commission* oversees the program in Texas

Historic Context[14] – a narrative that examines the broad historical themes, patterns, and events within a geographic area that influenced the physical manmade environment and is related specifically to defined *Property Types*

Historic District[15] – a cohesive grouping of historic buildings, structures, sites, and objects within a well-defined area that is distinct from its surroundings

Historic Integrity – see *Seven Aspects of Integrity*

Historic Resource – a building, structure, site, or object that is at least 50 years old

Historic Resources Survey[16] – the process of identifying, documenting, and assessing historic resources within a defined area

Historical Markers – a common term for *State Historical Markers*

Keeper of the National Register[17] – the official at the *National Park Service* who certifies that a property meets established standards to be listed officially in the *National Register of Historic Places*

National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)[18] – federal legislation that was enacted in 1966 to establish the *National Register of Historic Places* and oversee the nation's historic preservation programs

National Park Service (NPS)[19] – the federal agency tasked to supervise and help implement the nation's preservation programs and work with *State Historic Preservation Offices*

National Register Criteria[20] – the four attributes used to assess the quality of significance for inclusion in the *National Register of Historic Places* that considers association with historical events, trends, and patterns (Criterion A); significant individuals of the past (Criterion B); physical attributes or design qualities (Criterion C); or information potential (Criterion D)

National Register – a common term that is short for *National Register of Historic Places*

National Register Nomination[21] – a form that presents the necessary documentation to have a historic place listed in the *National Register of Historic Places*; the nomination form adheres to the standards stipulated in the *NHPA*

National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)[22] – the official list of historic buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that are worthy of preservation; the NRHP is maintained by the *National Park Service*

Noncontributing[23] – a feature that detracts from or diminishes a sense of the past within an associated historic property or historic district; it can either be a non-historic resource or a historic resource so severely altered that it no longer retains its *Historic Integrity*

Object[24] – a construction that is primarily artistic in nature or is relatively small in scale and simply constructed; although it may be, by nature or design, movable or a feature that is associated with a specific setting or environment, such as a sculpture, fountain, or marker

Parcel – a tract or plot of land

Polygon – a term used to describe groupings of parcels

Preservation[25] – within the context of the treatment of historic properties, one of the four guiding principles that focuses on the maintenance and repair of existing historic materials and retention of a property's form as it has evolved over time

Property Types[26] – the physical representation of the themes, trends, and patterns identified in a historic context, usually grouped by their shared physical characteristics, associative qualities, and geographic location/distribution

Reconstruction[27] – one of the four guiding principles of the treatment of historic properties that recreates vanished or non-surviving portions of a property for interpretive purposes

Rehabilitation[28] – one of the four guiding principles of the treatment of historic properties that acknowledges the need to alter or add to a historic property to meet continuing or changing uses while retaining the property's *Historic Integrity* and character

Restoration[29] – one of the four guiding principles of the treatment of historic properties that depicts a property at a particular period of time in its history, while removing evidence of other periods.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties[30] – a *National Park Service* publication, commonly referred to as "The Standards," that defines the core principles for historic preservation; they are used by *SHPOs* and many local preservation programs to promote the continued use and viability of historic properties while protecting their important salient features

Section 106[31] – a provision of the *National Historic Preservation Act* that requires any federally funded, licensed, or permitted project to consider impact to properties that are listed in, or are eligible for, inclusion in the *NRHP* and to seek comments from the public

Section 4(f)[32] – a provision of the Transportation Act of 1966 that requires projects that receive funding from or require approval from a governmental agency affiliated with the US Department of Transportation to consider and avoid or minimize impacts to historic properties, park and recreation lands, and wildlife and waterfowl refuges before a project begins; in Texas, projects undertaken or approved by the Texas Department of Transportation typically trigger compliance with the Section 4(f) process

Seven Aspects of Integrity[33] – the qualities that enable a historic place to convey its significance through its location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association

Site[34] – the location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure, whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself possesses historic, cultural, or archaeological value regardless of the value of any existing structure

State Antiquities Landmark[35] – a designation authorized by state law that gives legal protection to cultural resources (historic buildings and archaeological sites) on non-federal public lands

State Board of Review[36] – a group of professionals and experts in history, architecture, and archaeology and related fields who review *National Register nominations* to ensure that the forms provide sufficient documentation to meet the *National Register Criteria* and integrity standards; the SBR meets three to four times per year

State Historic Preservation Officer/State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)[37] – the individual and associated staff that oversee the implementation of provisions of the *National Historic Preservation Act* at the state level; in Texas, the Executive Director and staff of the *Texas Historical Commission* fulfill these roles

State Historical Markers[38] – a program that the *Texas Historical Commission* administers to commemorate important places, individuals, events, trends, and other subjects throughout Texas

State Historic Tax Credits[39] – a state law enacted in 2015 that allows 25 percent of the eligible rehabilitation costs for buildings that are listed in the *National Register of Historic Places*; the *Texas Historical Commission* oversees the program

Structure[40] – similar to a building but distinguished by its functional construction that is usually made for purposes other than creating human shelter such as a bridge, dam, levee, railroad, or gazebo

Texas Historical Commission (THC)[41] – the state agency that administers and oversees a variety of programs to celebrate the state's history and to promote a better understanding and appreciation of the past; the THC is the leading proponent of historic preservation at the state level

Undertaking[42] – a term used in the *National Historic Preservation Act* to describe a federally funded, licensed, or permitted project that is subject to review and comment in accordance with provisions stated in *Section 106* of the Act

[1] https://www.achp.gov/
[2] https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB16A-Complete.pdf
[3] https://www.nps.gov/crps/tps/workingonthepast/toolbox6.htm
[4] https://www.nps.gov/subjects/taxincentives/eligibility-requirements.htm
[5] https://www.nps.gov/subjects/historicpreservationfund/certified-local-government-program.htm
[6] https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/Docs/PW/htm/PW.26.htm#26.001
[7] https://www.thc.texas.gov/nrhp-faq#contributing
[8] https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/county-historical-commission-outreach/what-are-ounty-historical
[9] https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/buildings-and-property/cultural-landscapes
[10] https://www.npi.org/what-are-cultural-resources
[11] https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/secretary-standards-treatment-historic-properties.htm
[12] https://www.texasagriculture.gov/NewsEvents/FamilyLandHeritage.aspx
[13] https://www.thc.texas.gov/federal-rehabilitation-tax-credit-program
[14] https://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/guidance/NR_workshop_3-11-09/White_paper_on_historic_context_4-09.doc
[15] "Appendix IV: Glossary of National Register Terms," https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB16A-Complete.pdf
[16] https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/historic-resources-survey/what-historic-resources-survey
[17] https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/what-is-the-national-register.htm
[18] https://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/nhpa1966.htm
[19] https://www.nps.gov/index.htm
[20] https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB-15_web508.pdf
[21] https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/designate-historic-properties/national-register-historic-places/national-register
[22] https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/designate-historic-properties/national-register-historic-places
[23] https://www.thc.texas.gov/nrhp-faq#noncontributing
[24] https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB16A-Complete.pdf
[25] https://www.nps.gov/articles/000/treatment-standards-preservation.htm
[26] https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB16B-Complete.pdf
[27] https://www.nps.gov/articles/000/treatment-standards-reconstruction.htm
[28] https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/four-treatments/treatment-rehabilitation.htm
[29] https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/four-treatments/treatment-restoration.htm
[30] https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards.htm
[31] https://www.thc.texas.gov/review/federal-project-review/section-106-review-process
[32] https://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/env_topics/4f_tutorial/overview.aspx
[33] https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB-15_web508.pdf
[34] https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB16A-Complete.pdf
[35] https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/designate-historic-properties/state-antiquities-landmarks
[36] https://www.thc.texas.gov/sbrmeeting
[37] https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/state-historic-preservation-offices.htm
[38] https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/preservation-programs/historical-markers
[39] https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/grants-tax-credits-and-funding/historic-preservation-tax-credits
[40] https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB16A-Complete.pdf
[41] https://www.thc.texas.gov/
[42] https://www.achp.gov/digital-library-section-106-landing/section-106-applicant-toolkit

INTRODUCTION

This countywide preservation plan will guide efforts to identify, designate, preserve, and celebrate significant historic properties. To this end, the plan provides action items for the Jefferson County Historical Commission (CHC) to implement, as well as appendices with information to share with other preservation stakeholders.

The many successes of past historic preservation efforts in Jefferson County demonstrate the ability of preservation advocates and development proponents to work together in a meaningful, cooperative, and mutually beneficial manner. The Jefferson County Historical Commission was founded in 1967, and participating Certified Local Governments within Jefferson County include the county itself, Beaumont, and Port Arthur.[1] Across Jefferson County, past efforts have listed 93 properties in the National Register and as Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks (Table 1). The past work of the Jefferson County Historical Commission has also resulted in 139 Official Texas Historical Markers (OTHMs) countywide (Table 2).

However, these previously designated resources reflect just a fraction of the diversity of properties in the county that illustrate architectural trends, broad historical themes, and the cultural legacy of individuals and groups that influenced the development of Jefferson County. The historic context and historic resources survey completed from 2022 through 2023 identified a wide array of significant themes, as well as an additional 14 historic districts and 90 individual resources that are eligible for listing in the National Register. Additional action is needed to broaden awareness about preservation in Jefferson County and guide preservation of a larger and more diverse inventory of historic resources. To that end, this Historic Preservation Plan includes the following sections:

- Vision and Guiding Principles
- Criteria for Setting Priorities
- Goals and Priorities
- Implementation Plan and Timeline
- Bibliography
- Appendices
    - Appendix A: List of Stakeholders
    - Appendix B: Public Outreach Results
    - Appendix C: Preservation Resources Toolkit
    - Appendix D: Prioritized National Register Recommendations

Table 1. Properties and districts designated as Recorded Texas Historical Markers (RTHLS) and/or in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in Jefferson County. Sources: Texas Historic Sites Atlas and Historic Resources of Texas Aggregator.

City (Jefferson County)	National Register Historic District	Address	Resource	Resource Type	National Register Designation
Beaumont			War Memorial	Object	NRHP Eligible
Beaumont			City of Beaumont	Object	Centennial Marker
Beaumont			The Lucas Gusher	Object	Centennial Marker
Beaumont		2050 Spindletop Rd	Site of Spindle Top Hill	Object	Centennial Marker

[1] "Jefferson County Historical Commission," Jefferson County, Texas, accessed Jul 13, 2023, https://co.jefferson.tx.us/historical_commission/home.html; "Certified Local Government Communities," Texas Historical Commission, accessed Jul. 13, 2023, https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/certified-local-government/certified-local-government-communities.

City (Jefferson County)	National Register Historic District	Address	Resource	Resource Type	National Register Designation
			Confederate Camp		
Beaumont		345 Fannin St	Jefferson Theatre	Building	NRHP Listed
Beaumont		400 Walnut St	Central Fire Station	Building	RTHL
Beaumont		401 Main St	Site of the Home of Noah Tevis	Object	Centennial Marker
Beaumont		479 Pine St	Sanders House	Building	NRHP Listed
Beaumont		5400 Stivers Dr	Hebert Home	Building	RTHL
Beaumont		575 Magnolia Ave	Woman's Club of Beaumont Clubhouse	Building	NRHP Listed
Beaumont		694 Forrest St	Duke, Holmes, House	Building	NRHP Listed
Beaumont		934 Calder St	Beaumont Y.M.C.A.	Building	NRHP Listed
Beaumont		Jefferson and Wall St	Saint Anthony's Cathedral	Building	RTHL
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	200 Willow St	U.S. Postal Office and Federal Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	210-220 Willow St	Commercial Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	215-281 Orleans St	Kyle Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	234-236 Crockett St	Dixie Hotel	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	240-246 Crockett St	Commercial Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	260 Crockett St	Littlejohn Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	270 Pearl St	Commercial Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	278 Pearl St	Commercial Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	290 Crockett St	Wilson Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	296 Crockett St	Commercial Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	301 Pearl St	Edson Hotel	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	336 Orleans St	J.J. Nathan's	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	340 Bowie St	Hotel Sabine	Building	Contributing

City (Jefferson County)	National Register Historic District	Address	Resource	Resource Type	National Register Designation
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	341 Pearl St	Harrel's News Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	390 Park St	Friedman Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	390 Park St (Ste. 100)	Hegele Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	390 Park St (Ste. 500)	Downtown Spirits	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	398 Pearl St	Goodhue Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	417 Neches St	Stedman Fruit Company	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	441 Orleans St	New Rosemont Hotel	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	447 Orleans St	Commercial Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	448 Orleans St	Bruce Irvine and Associates	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	459 Fannin St	E.L. Boykin Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	465 Bowie St	Coale Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	470 Orleans St	Beaumont Savings and Loan	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	475-485 Orleans St	First National Bank (addition)	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	485-499 Pearl St	Rotan-Mosle, Inc.	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	488 Pearl St	Gilbert Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	495 Orleans St	First National Bank Building	Building	RTHL
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	505 Orleans St	First Security National Bank	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	527 Forsythe	Antioch Baptist Church	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	595 Orleans St	San Jacinto Building	Building	Contributing

City (Jefferson County)	National Register Historic District	Address	Resource	Resource Type	National Register Designation
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	609 Crockett St	Santa Fe Warehouse	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	615-635 Park St	Fertitta Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	625 Orleans St	Hotel Beaumont	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	651-657 Park St	Commercial Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	695 Pearl St	Tyrrell Public Library	Building	RTHL
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	698 Pearl St	Neches Electric	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	700 Orleans St	The White House	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	700 Pearl St	City Hall and Auditorium	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	715 Orleans St	Security State Bank and Trust	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	730-732 Liberty Ave	Quality Cafe	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	735 Liberty Ave	Shepherd's Laundry	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	790 Orleans St	Goodwill	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	801 Laurel Ave	Old Southern Pacific Warehouse[2]	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	900 Laurel Ave	Old Santa Fe Depot	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	905 Orleans St	Commercial Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Beaumont Commercial Historic District	967 Orleans St	Commercial Building	Building	Contributing
Beaumont	Lucas Gusher, Spindletop Oil Field (National Historic Landmark)		Lucas Gusher Monument	Object	Contributing
Beaumont	Lucas Gusher, Spindletop Oil		Lucas Gusher Site	Site	Contributing

[2] Alternate name "Railway Express Agency ."

City (Jefferson County)	National Register Historic District	Address	Resource	Resource Type	National Register Designation
	Field (National Historic Landmark)				
Fannett		11916 Dugat Rd	Dugat-Hamshire House	Building	RTHL
Hamshire			Boudreaux House	Building	RTHL
Nome			Pivoto-Robinson House	Building	RTHL
Port Arthur		1500 Procter	Marconi Tower at Port Arthur College	Structure	NRHP Listed
Port Arthur		1831 Lakeshore Dr	Vuylsteke House	Building	RTHL
Port Arthur		2545 Lakeshore Dr	Morris-Booz-White House	Building	RTHL
Port Arthur		300 Stilwell Blvd	Ruby Ruth Fuller Building	Building	RTHL
Port Arthur		317 Stilwell Blvd	Gates Memorial Library	Building	NRHP Listed
Port Arthur	Eddingston Court	3300 Proctor St	Apartment 1-NW	Building	Contributing
Port Arthur	Eddingston Court	3300 Proctor St	Apartment 2-SW	Building	Contributing
Port Arthur	Eddingston Court	3300 Proctor St	Apartment 3-SE	Building	Contributing
Port Arthur	Eddingston Court	3300 Proctor St	Apartment 4- NE	Building	Contributing
Port Arthur	Eddingston Court	3300 Proctor St	Eddingston Court Lot	Building	Contributing
Port Arthur	Eddingston Court	3300 Proctor St	Residence	Building	Contributing
Port Arthur	Port Arthur Downtown Historic District	320 Austin Ave	Port Arthur–Beaumont Interurban Railway Station	Building	Contributing
Port Arthur	Port Arthur Downtown Historic District	444 4th St	City Hall	Building	Contributing
Port Arthur	Port Arthur Downtown Historic District	445 Austin Ave	Merchant's National Bank[3]	Building	Contributing
Port Arthur	Port Arthur Downtown Historic District	448 Austin Ave	John R. Adams Building[4]	Building	Contributing
Port Arthur	Port Arthur Downtown Historic District	500 Austin Ave	US Post Office and Federal Building	Building	NRHP Listed
Port Arthur	Port Arthur Downtown Historic District	500 Block 4th St	Port Arthur News Building[5]	Building	Contributing
Port Arthur	Port Arthur Downtown Historic District	501 Austin Ave	John R. Adams & Co. Department Store	Building	Contributing
Port Arthur	Port Arthur Downtown Historic District	501 Proctor St	First National Bank of Port Arthur	Building	NRHP Listed

[3] Currently houses City of Port Arthur Health Clinic.

[4] Alternate name "A. E. Scott Furniture," ca. 1980s.

[5] Refurbished/occupied; no longer houses the Port Arthur News.

City (Jefferson County)	National Register Historic District	Address	Resource	Resource Type	National Register Designation
Port Arthur	Port Arthur Downtown Historic District	525 Lakeshore Dr	South County Office Building	Building	RTHL
Port Arthur	Port Arthur Downtown Historic District	526 Austin Ave	Fred Miller Bicycle & Gun Repair/Paint Shop	Building	Contributing
Port Arthur	Port Arthur Downtown Historic District	600 Procter St	Vaughn Hotel[6]	Building	Contributing
Port Arthur	Port Arthur Downtown Historic District	608 Procter St	Commercial Building	Building	Contributing
Port Arthur	Port Arthur Downtown Historic District	631 Austin Ave	Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company Passenger Depot	Building	Contributing
Port Arthur	Port Arthur Downtown Historic District	631 Austin Ave	Railway Express Agency, Inc. Office and Warehouse	Building	Contributing
Port Neches		0.965 Miles S of SH 87	Bridge	Structure	NRHP Eligible
Sabine Pass		6100 Dick Dowling Rd	Richard Dowling Statue	Object	Centennial Marker

*Table 2. Official Texas Historical Markers (OTHMs) in Jefferson County. OTHMs with an * are identified as missing per the Texas Historic Sites Atlas. Source: Texas Historic Sites Atlas.*

OTHM Name	City	OTHM No.
1886 Hurricane at Sabine Pass	Sabine Pass	5245012425
Andrew F. Smyth	Beaumont	5245010564
Arceneaux House	Hamshire	5000022358
Arthur Edward Stilwell	Port Arthur	5245010572
Aubrey Wilson "Moon" Mullican	Beaumont	5507017146
Beach Road	Sabine Pass	5507013645
Beaumont	Beaumont	5245010493, 5245010494
Beaumont Enterprise	Beaumont	5245010513
Beaumont: Lumber Mill City of the Nineteenth Century*	Beaumont	5245010496
Beauxart Gardens	Nederland	5507015932
Benjamin Johnson	Sabine Pass	5245010538
Birthplace of Babe Didrikson Zaharias	Port Arthur	5245010586
Blind Willie Johnson	Beaumont	5507016386
Boudreaux House	Hamshire	5507014513
C. Homer and Edith Fuller Chambers Home (marker pending)	Beaumont	5000023298
Capture of the USS Morning Light and USS Velocity	Sabine Pass	5507013429
Caroline Gilbert Hinchee House	Beaumont	5245010534
Central Baptist Church	Groves	5507017106
Central Fire Station	Beaumont	5245010498
City of Beaumont	Beaumont	5245010495
City of Nederland	Nederland	5245010546
City of Sabine and Sabine Pass	Sabine Pass	5245010500
Clubhouse of the Federated Women's Clubs of Port Arthur	Port Arthur	5245010515
Commodore Leon Smith	Sabine Pass	5507015458
Community Retirement Home	Port Arthur	5507017107
Congregation Temple Emanuel	Beaumont	5245010503

[6] Alternate name "Sabine Hotel."

OTHM Name	City	OTHM No.
Dr. Charles F. L. N. Graham	Beaumont	5245010531
Early Oil Tanker Service	Port Arthur	5245010548
Early Texas Oil Pipelines*	Port Arthur	5245012672
Ellwood-Craig House	Port Arthur	5245010512
Evergreen Cemetery	Beaumont	5507016150
Federal Fatalities at the Battle of Sabine Pass	Sabine Pass	5245010558
Federated Women's Clubs of Port Arthur	Port Arthur	5245010514
First Baptist Church of Beaumont	Beaumont	5245010516
First Baptist Church of Nederland	Nederland	5245010517
First Baptist Church of Port Neches	Port Neches	5507016350
First Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) of Port Arthur	Port Arthur	5245010519
First Christian Church of Beaumont	Beaumont	5245010518
First National Bank Building	Beaumont	5245010521
First Security National Bank	Beaumont	5245010522
First United Methodist Church of Beaumont	Beaumont	5245010523
First United Methodist Church of Port Neches	Port Neches	5245010524
Fort Manhassett	Sabine Pass	5245010526
Fort Sabine	Sabine Pass	5507017600
Francis John (Frank) Trost (June 24, 1868 - August 4, 1944)	Port Arthur	5245012784
French Trading Post	Beaumont	5245010527
Gates Memorial Library	Port Arthur	5245010529
Grigsby's Bluff	Port Neches	5245010532
Hamshire House	Hamshire	5245010533
Harry Henry Choates	Port Arthur	5507014022
Harry James' Childhood Homesite	Beaumont	5507017185
Henry Millard	Beaumont	5245010544
Holmes Duke House	Beaumont	5245010511
Israel Chapel A. M. E. Church	Port Arthur	5245010535
J.P. Richardson, Jr: The Big Bopper	Beaumont	5507013668
Jacob Harmon Garner	Sabine Pass	5245010528
Janis Lyn Joplin	Port Arthur	5507013885
Jean Baptiste Chaison	Beaumont	5245010499
Jefferson County Courthouse	Beaumont	5245010536
Jefferson Theatre	Beaumont	5245010537
John Warne Gates	Port Arthur	5245012501
Kate Dorman	Sabine Pass	5245010506
Lakeshore/Lions Park*	Port Arthur	5245010539
Leo Edward Craigen	Fannett	5245010504
Magnolia Cemetery	Beaumont	5245010543
Magnolia Missionary Baptist Church	Beaumont	5507017280
McFaddin-Ward House	Beaumont	5245010542
Mildred "Babe" Didrikson Zaharias	Beaumont	5245010587
Mildred Buildings	Beaumont	5245011946
Morris-Booz-White House	Port Arthur	5245010545
Nancy Tevis*	Beaumont	5245010573
New Hope Missionary Baptist Church	Port Arthur	5245011947
Niles F. Smith	Sabine Pass	5245010563
North End Methodist Church	Beaumont	5507017105
O'Brien Oak	N/A	5245010547
Opelousas Trail	China	5245010549
Pivoto-Robinson Cemetery	Nome	5245010551
Pivoto-Robinson House	Nome	5245010552
Police Chief Reid Tevis	Beaumont	5245010575
Pompeiian Villa	Port Arthur	5245010553
Port Arthur College	Port Arthur	5507014688
Port Arthur College Radio Tower	Port Arthur	5507015011
Port Arthur-Beaumont Interurban Railway	Port Arthur	5245012783

OTHM Name	City	OTHM No.
Port of Beaumont	Beaumont	5245010554
Prater Cemetery	Beaumont	5507016418
Presbyterian Church of the Covenant	Nederland	5245011948
Rainbow Bridge	Port Arthur	5245010555
Richard Dowling	Sabine Pass	5245010509
Rock Island Baptist Church	Port Arthur	5507016998
Ruby Ruth Fuller Building	Port Arthur	5507015944
Sabine Pass Cemetery	Sabine Pass	5245011949
Sabine-Neches Canal	Port Arthur	5507014028
Saint Anthony's Cathedral	Beaumont	5245010560
Sanders House	Beaumont	5245010561
Site of Collier's Ferry	Beaumont	5245010502
Site of First Mercantile Building	Nederland	5245010520
Site of Fort Griffin	Sabine Pass	5245010525
Site of Old Aurora (marker in storage)	Port Arthur	5245010492
Site of Santa Anna	Beaumont	5245010562
Site of Spindle Top Hill Confederate Camp (marker in storage)	Beaumont	5245010571
Site of the Home of Noah Tevis	Beaumont	5245010574
Site of World War II Prisoner of War Camp (marker damaged)	China	5245011954
South County Office Building	Port Arthur	5245010565
South Park High School	Beaumont	5245010566
Southeast Texas Regional Airport	Port Arthur	5507015372
Spaight's 11th Battalion	Sabine Pass	5245010567
Spanish-American War Fortifications	Sabine Pass	5245010568
Sparks Settlement Cemetery	Port Arthur	5245010569
Spell Cemetery	Beaumont	5245010570
Spindletop to Port Arthur Oil Pipeline Corridor*	Port Arthur	5245013118
St. Elizabeth Catholic Community (marker pending)	Port Neches	5000023352
St. Paul United Methodist Church	Port Arthur	5507018716
Tex Ritter	Port Neches	5245010556
Texas Company Refinery at Port Arthur (Port Arthur Works)	Port Arthur	5245012334
Texas' First Rice Mill	Beaumont	5245010576
The Clubhouse, The Woman's Club of Beaumont	Beaumont	5245010501
The Hughen School	Port Arthur	5507016295
The Kansas City Southern Railway in Port Arthur	Port Arthur	5507016026
The Lucas Gusher	Beaumont	5245010540
The Mayumi Legacy	Beaumont	5507013440
The Methodist Church in China	China	5000022758
The Port Arthur Refinery	Port Arthur	5245012562
The Woman's Club of Beaumont	Beaumont	5245010581
Travis Street Substation	Beaumont	5245010577
Trinity Lutheran Church	Groves	5245011953
Tyrrell Public Library	Beaumont	5245010578
United States Forces at the Battle of Sabine Pass	Sabine Pass	5245010559
Visit Historic Sabine Pass*[7]	Sabine Pass	5245010557
Vuylsteke House	Port Arthur	5245010579
West Beulah Missionary Baptist Church	Beaumont	5507017835
Westminster Presbyterian Church of Beaumont	Beaumont	5245010580
William G. "Bill" Hall (marker pending)	Beaumont	5000022767
William McFaddin	Beaumont	5245010541
Woodworth House (Rose Hill)	Port Arthur	5245010582, 5245010583
World War II Coastal Defenses at Sabine Pass	Sabine Pass	5245013116
Young Men's Christian Association of Beaumont	Beaumont	5245010584
Young Woman's Christian Association of Beaumont	Beaumont	5245010585

[7] OTHMs with an * are identified as missing per the Texas Historic Sites Atlas. The marker is still listed in the Atlas on their website. Source: Texas Historic Sites Atlas, https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/Details/5245010557.

VISION AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The recommendations within this Historic Preservation Plan reflect comments received from the CHC and the public between April 2022 and May 2023. During that time, HHM and the CHC communicated with stakeholders countywide through a series of meetings, as well as a questionnaire. Key stakeholders are listed in Appendix A, and detailed findings from public outreach are reproduced in Appendix B. Several noteworthy themes arose during public outreach. The first is a deep respect for the CHC's legacy and appreciation for past successes. Many of the action items recommended in this plan represent continuations of longstanding CHC actions, sometimes with incremental enhancements. Another key takeaway was the widespread emphasis on the *holistic* value for all of the action items working together. Questionnaire results and meetings identified three key preservation goals for Jefferson County – preparing for floods and natural disasters, advocating for reuse and rehabilitation, and minimizing neglect and vacancy (each discussed in detail beginning on page 10). Among these, all three ranked equally in terms of importance and urgency. As a result, the implementation timeline within this plan initiates all action items as soon as possible, with staggered implementation only recommended if necessary given logistics. The long-term vision shared by preservation stakeholders in Jefferson County seems to focus on a manageable number of action items, most of which can be implemented concurrently and sustained over a long period of time.

CRITERIA FOR SETTING PRIORITIES

The priorities and action items set forth within this plan are organized according to criteria derived from CHC input, combined with HHM's experience preparing and implementing similar preservation plans across Texas. The first two criteria are fiscal feasibility and political feasibility. Ideas generated during brainstorming sessions were only incorporated into this plan if they were *both* fiscally feasible based on the current CHC budget and CLG grant opportunities *and* politically feasible given current Texas state law and Jefferson County law and policy. Jefferson County approaches preservation from an incentive-based, advocacy-minded perspective rather than a regulatory stance, and this plan embraces that approach. Ideas that met both of these criteria were then grouped together into three identified priorities – developing educational materials and events, commenting on development, and listing properties in the National Register (each discussed in detail beginning on page 11). These priorities then were ordered according to how many goals they met. Within each priority, specific action items were ordered based on the logistics of implementation. Action items necessary to facilitate or streamline future actions were recommended for implementation soonest, followed by other action items. As noted above, though, many action items are recommended for concurrent implementation given the holistic value for a broad preservation program expressed during public outreach.

GOALS, PRIORITIES, AND ACTION ITEMS

GOALS

During public outreach, the CHC and stakeholders expressed their aim to achieve the following goals through future preservation efforts in Jefferson County:

- Prepare for floods and natural disasters,
- Advocate for rehabilitation, and
- Minimize neglect and vacancy.

Each of these goals arises from the decades of experience that the CHC and CLG have gained implementing preservation efforts in Jefferson County. These three goals are interrelated, and making progress toward one goal inevitably will help advance the other goals also.



The impacts of recent hurricanes and tropical storms indelibly impacted the historic resources of Jefferson County, as well as the mindset of the county's preservation advocates. Most recently, Hurricane Harvey in 2017 caused widespread flooding that resulted in water infiltration and severe deterioration of historic resources countywide. This historic preservation plan received funding from a special National Park Service grant for communities affected by Hurricane Harvey, and stakeholders across the county consistently noted preparing to better withstand future floods and natural disasters as a key goal. During the course of fieldwork for the historic resources survey that accompanied this preservation plan, property owners echoed support for this goal and reiterated the need for documentation of historic resources prior to the next big storm.

The next goal—advocating for rehabilitation—has long been essential to the missions of the CHC and CLG. The devastating impacts of Hurricane Harvey in 2017 and Hurricane Rita in 2005 underscored the importance of this goal. Numerous buildings were abandoned or demolished that likely could have accessed preservation incentives for reuse and rehabilitation. This plan aims to enhance future advocacy for reuse and rehabilitation, hopefully resulting in fewer demolitions of historic resources in turn.

The plan's final, related goal—minimizing neglect and vacancy—acknowledges the relationship between continued use of historic buildings and their ongoing maintenance and preservation. By aiming to keep historic buildings occupied, the plan aims to support continued investment for maintenance and rehabilitation. Keeping buildings in use also helps preserve communities and maintain cultural and ethnic links that have cultural significance in their own right. A value for understanding the connections between people and historic places permeates each goal within this preservation plan, and the priorities and action items outlined below all aim to respect and promote that value.

PRIORITIES AND ACTION ITEMS

Careful consideration of stakeholder feedback, the financial and political realities of preservation in Jefferson County, and the plan's underlying goals yielded three primary priorities for preservation efforts over the next ten years – developing educational materials and events, commenting on development, and listing properties in the National Register. Each of these priorities supports two or more of the goals defined by Jefferson County, as indicated in Table 3 below. Each of these priorities is described in greater detail below, followed by a list of concrete, measurable action items that will help advance the priority and take steps toward achieving the county's preservation goals.

Table 3. Comparison of Jefferson County's preservation goals and priorities for achieving those goals.

Priorities	Preservation Goals		
	Prepare for Floods and Natural Disasters	Discourage Demolition	Minimize Neglect and Vacancy
1. Develop Educational Materials and Events	✓	✓	✓
2. Comment on Development	✓	✓	✓
3. List Properties in the National Register		✓	✓

Priority 1. Develop Educational Materials and Events

Goals supported by this priority:



Developing educational materials and events will help broaden public understanding of preservation goals in Jefferson County, aiding to expand the team of preservation partners who will work together to implement later priorities. Action items needed to implement this priority are listed below. Action items were selected based on their effectiveness at supporting *all three* goals listed above – preparing for floods and natural disasters, advocating for reuse and rehabilitation, *and* minimizing neglect and vacancy. Selection of action items also considered the audience that would be reached – with educational materials and events targeting key decision-makers placed first, followed by those that would reach a large public audience, followed by those that might reach a smaller audience but still remain important.

- Action Item 1-1. Share survey data online.
  - Post PDFs of the final countywide historic resources survey and preservation plan on the Jefferson County Historical Commission website.
  - Work with Jefferson County GIS staff to upload the GIS data submitted with the survey to an interactive ESRI ArcGIS Story Map.
  - Post a link to the GIS Story Map on the Jefferson County Historical Commission website.
  - Encourage municipalities and libraries within Jefferson County to add links to the countywide historic resources survey, preservation plan, and GIS Story Map to their websites.
  - If necessary, seek assistance from students, volunteers, or consultants to maintain the online files.

- Action Item 1-2. Train other commissions and agencies about how to use survey data for proactive planning.
    - Develop a video tutorial for how to use the online files and host a link to the video on the Jefferson County Historical Commission website.
    - Share the video tutorial via email and social media. (Also refer to Action Item 1-3 below.)
    - Present the online files, GIS story map, and video tutorial at Jefferson County board and commission meetings.
    - Present the online files, GIS story map, and video tutorial at relevant municipal board and commission meetings.
    - Host a series of "office hours" at local libraries to answer questions and provide hands-on assistance navigating the online files and GIS story map.
- Action Item 1-3. Maintain survey data routinely.
    - When the CHC becomes aware of rehabilitations, alterations, or demolitions, update the GIS Story Map.
    - As necessary, create and update a memo of demolitions of surveyed resources, to be posted on the Jefferson County Historical Commission website alongside the PDF of the survey report.
    - Create a second GIS Story Map of the "Lost Historic Resources of Jefferson County," moving resources from the survey map to this map if/when they are demolished.
    - If necessary, seek assistance from students, volunteers, or consultants to maintain the online files.
- Action Item 1-4. Continue maintaining CHC social media.
    - Develop social media outreach.
    - Continue to maintain the CHC Facebook page.
    - Duplicate Facebook postings on other social media platforms—such as Twitter, Instagram, and LinkedIn—revisiting the list of platforms annually.
    - Establish and enforce community guidelines for social media, aiming to maintain positive and welcoming messaging that broadens the CHC's audience as much as possible.
    - Share online survey files and GIS Story Maps via email and social media – including updates celebrating when surveyed resources are rehabilitated or sharing when historic resources are lost.
    - Create overlap between the CHC's email newsletter and social media postings – posting newsletter information on social media and also including a social media digest summarizing postings within newsletters.
    - Repost information from partner organizations and encourage them to repost CHC information.
    - Create a new collection in the Jefferson County Historical Commission Archives to gather and protect social media postings and newsletters in a format that will ensure preservation of the information for future generations.
- Action Item 1-5. Continue creating new state historical markers.
    - Review themes from the countywide historic context and select priorities.
    - Create a list of potential markers associated with each selected theme, using examples in the historic context and historic survey data.
    - Update the list of potential markers annually to incorporate newly identified themes and places.

  - For identified places on private property, coordinate with property owners for permission to place a marker on the property or nearby.
  - Continue to maintain close communications with the THC marker staff.
  - Create a list of funding sources for markers, such as grants, and update the list annually.
  - Proactively maintain relationships with County Commissioners to streamline the process of funding and installing markers. (Refer to Action Item 2-3.)
- Action Item 1-6. Continue and enhance tours of historic places.
  - Continue to provide cemetery tours, adding themed tours for holidays like Halloween, *Dia de Los Muertos*, Juneteenth, Indigenous Peoples Day, Labor Day, and Memorial Day.
  - Continue to provide County Courthouse tours, coordinating with County Commissioners and other County officials.
  - Record videos of tours and post them on social media to help expand the audience. (Refer to Action Item 1-3: Continue maintaining CHC social media.)
  - Work with partner organizations and tours—like Beaumont Main Street's walking tour—to enhance participation and help reach new audiences.
  - Work with professional groups like realtors, architects, and interior designers to organize special tours of building interiors.
  - Publicize tours using social media and the CHC newsletter.
- Action Item 1-7. Routinely update printed and digital educational materials.
  - Share printed copies of the CHC newsletter with local libraries, archives, museums, universities, and other individuals/groups upon request.
  - Print copies of the Preservation Resource Toolkit (Appendix C) and share upon request.
  - Host booths with printed copies of the newsletter and Resource Toolkit at events like the South Texas State Fair, and routinely communicate with local tourism groups about events that would be a good fit.[8]
- Action Item 1-8. Support archives and museums.
  - Assign members of the CHC to serve as liaisons on the boards of libraries and museums across Jefferson County.
  - Invite staff and board members from libraries and museums to all CHC events.
  - Publicize archive and museum events using the CHC newsletter and social media network.
  - Recognize and thank museum and archives representatives for successes using the CHC newsletter and social media network.

Priority 2. Comment on Development

Goals supported by this priority:



Balancing historic preservation with the need for new development requires thoughtful planning and careful balance. The members of the Jefferson County CHC collectively hold a wealth of knowledge, experience, skill, and insight that can help guide decisions about development projects with potential to

[8] See "Beaumont's Annual Events," Beaumont Convention and Visitors Bureau," accessed July 10, 2023, https://www.beaumontcvb.com/events/annual-events/.

impact historic resources. The role of the CHC is advisory only—not regulatory—but judicious advice can help the CHC achieve *all three* goals listed above – preparing for floods and natural disasters, advocating for reuse and rehabilitation, *and* minimizing neglect and vacancy. Action items needed to implement this priority are listed below. Selection of action items prioritizes the responsibilities of the CHC – Section 106 review and input on County development projects. Action items that entail review of municipal or grassroots development follow, structured with a focus on information-sharing and advocacy.

- Action Item 2-1. Develop a triage plan for review of development projects that considers CHC members' areas of expertise and also aims to distribute responsibility for review so that no single member becomes overwhelmed.
- Action Item 2-2. Continue to review Section 106 undertakings.
    - Assign the County HPO to review each Section 106 undertaking with potential to adversely impact a designated historic resource (listed in the THC Atlas or as a local landmark), an identified eligible historic resource (recommended in the survey report and online survey map), *or* a property flagged as needing right-of-entry and/or intensive-level research for eligibility evaluation in the survey report.
    - Assign the County HPO to provide notice to commission appointees to participate in a 10-day review period before the HPO responds to the applicant.
    - Discuss Section 106 reviews at each bi-monthly CHC meeting. If the HPO/commission members have identified eligible historic resources that might be adversely impacted, call special meeting if necessary to vote on whether to comment and/or request consulting party status.
    - If agreed upon by a majority of CHC members, have the assigned CHC member write a letter providing comments and/or requesting consulting party status.
    - Recognize and thank THC and federal government representatives for successes using the CHC newsletter and social media network.
- Action Item 2-3. Begin reviewing and commenting on County development projects.
    - Meet informally with County staff and officials to encourage them to brief the CHC proactively when new development projects are planned.
    - Hold annual training sessions for County staff and officials to educate them about this preservation plan and the benefits of preservation.
    - Establish a communication protocol between the County Engineer's office, the HPO, and the CHC to ensure timely notification as soon as new subdivision plats are submitted for approval.
    - Attend County commission meetings and develop a list of upcoming development projects that require County funding or approval.
    - Using the triage plan, assign a CHC member to review each County project with potential to adversely impact a designated historic resource (listed in the THC Atlas or as a local landmark), an identified eligible historic resource (recommended in the survey report and online survey map), *or* a property flagged as needing right-of-entry and/or intensive-level research for eligibility evaluation in the survey report.
    - Discuss County project reviews at each bi-monthly CHC meeting and vote on whether to comment and/or speak at an upcoming hearing.
    - If agreed upon by a majority of CHC members, have the assigned CHC member write a letter to the County Commissioners commenting on the project and/or speak at an upcoming County Commission meeting.
    - Recognize and thank County representatives for successes using the CHC newsletter and social media network.

- Action Item 2-4. Support municipal preservation programs.
    - Meet informally with representatives from the South East Regional Planning Commission,
      municipal planning departments, economic development organizations, chambers of commerce, and landmarks commissioners to encourage them to brief the CHC proactively when new development potentially may affect historic resources.
    - Hold annual training sessions for the stakeholders listed above to educate them about this preservation plan and the benefits of preservation.
    - Work with the THC to develop a template for a local preservation ordinance that non-CLG municipalities may adopt.
    - Continue to have CHC members serve as liaisons to the Beaumont and Port Arthur landmarks commission (as well as other municipal landmarks commissions if created).
    - Have liaisons review demolition permit requests and certificate of appropriateness applications.
    - Using the triage plan, assign a CHC member to review each demolition or alteration with potential to adversely impact a designated historic resource (listed in the THC Atlas or as a local landmark), an identified eligible historic resource (recommended in the survey report and online survey map), *or* a property flagged as needing right-of-entry and/or intensive-level research for eligibility evaluation in the survey report.
    - Discuss local development reviews at each bi-monthly CHC meeting and vote on whether to comment and/or speak at an upcoming landmarks commission meeting.
    - If agreed upon by a majority of CHC members, have the assigned CHC member write a letter providing comments and/or speak at an upcoming landmarks commission meeting.
    - Recognize and thank municipal representatives for successes using the CHC newsletter and social media network.
- Action Item 2-5. Consolidate and amplify grassroots comments.
    - Use social media and the CHC newsletter to solicit feedback about development projects.
    - Compile grassroots feedback as an attachment to CHC letters commenting on development.
    - Help notify the public about upcoming public hearings to discuss development projects with preservation implications.
    - Monitor grassroots organizations' concerns about development projects and vote on whether to lend support at bi-monthly CHC meetings.
    - If agreed upon by a majority of CHC members, use social media and the CHC newsletter to help spread the message about grassroots preservation issues and solicit support.

Priority 3. List Properties in the National Register

Goals supported by this priority:



- Action Item 3-1. Review and maintain the prioritized list of recommended National Register nominations included in Appendix D. This list is prioritized based on the following:
    - Tier A: Commercial, industrial, and non-profit properties are given highest priority since National Register listing will enable access to federal and/or state preservation tax credits (as further detailed in Appendix C).
        - Tier A-i: Multi-property district nominations are prioritized first, in order to provide access for the greatest number of property owners.
        - Tier A-ii: Individual properties are prioritized next.
    - Tier B: Public properties are given second priority for National Register nomination. Although typically not able to access federal or state tax credits, these properties often hold value for a large number of people, and National Register nomination can have significant benefits for education and public engagement.
        - Tier B-i: District nominations are prioritized first within this tier.
        - Tier B-ii: A multi-property submission for Post-World War II Public Buildings of Jefferson County is given second priority within this tier.
        - Tier B-iii: Individual properties are prioritized next.
    - Tier C: Residential properties are placed within the third priority level for National Register nomination. Although owner-occupied residences are not eligible for federal and/or state preservation tax credits, rental residences or home offices may be eligible (as further detailed in Appendix C).
        - Tier C-i: District nominations are prioritized first within this tier.
        - Tier C-ii: Individual properties are prioritized next.
- Action Item 3-2. Coordinate with stakeholders about National Register nominations.
    - Work with the THC to develop a fact sheet and brief informational video about the National Register (NR) and associated historic tax credits, to be posted on the CHC website and distributed via social media.
    - Work with the THC to host a meeting explaining the National Register and associated tax credits, and invite owners of NR-eligible properties, as well as representatives from associated municipalities, economic development corporations, chambers of commerce, and the Southeast Texas Economic Development Foundation.
    - Distribute a follow-up survey to owners of NR-eligible properties to gauge interest in NR nominations, revisiting the survey annually since ownership may change.
    - Update the list of NR priorities every two years, based on owner support.
- Action Item 3-3. Seek partnerships to fund and complete National Register nominations.
    - Annually, coordinate with qualified preservation consultants to select nomination(s) that have owner support and can be completed within the limits of the CLG grant program (currently around $80,000).
    - Coordinate with the qualified preservation consultant to identify tasks suitable for volunteer labor, which can supply an in-kind match for CLG grants. Request volunteer assistance to complete identified tasks. Opportunities for outreach include annual

stakeholder training sessions (described in Action Item 2-4 above), as well as annual surveys gauging support among owners of NR-eligible properties (described under Action Item 3-2 above).

- If volunteer labor commitments are not sufficient to provide the 50 percent match required for the CLG grant, consolidate cash matching funds from County government appropriations, municipal government appropriations, or partnering private organizations. If a private organization will be a financial partner in the potential project, contact the THC's CLG coordinator to discuss necessary contractual arrangements.
- Apply annually for CLG grants from THC to complete the selected nomination(s), documenting the consolidated matching labor/funds to demonstrate commitment to the project.
- Complete the nomination(s) according to all THC and NPS requirements.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND TIMELINE

The table below sets forth a ten-year implementation plan and timeline for all action items identified above. Based on feedback received in meetings, the CHC prefers to keep the implementation plan simple and flexible. As a result, the plan does not assign responsible individuals for action items, nor does it specify anticipated costs. The CHC may use this document as a baseline, modifying the document to add details like responsible individuals and costs gradually over the next ten years.

Table 4. Implementation plan and timeline for historic preservation plan action items.

	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	FY 2030	FY 2031	FY 2032	FY 2033	FY 2034
Priority 1. Develop Educational Materials and Events										
Action Item 1-1. Share survey data online.	✓									
Action Item 1-2. Train other commissions and agencies about how to use survey data for proactive planning.		✓								
Action Item 1-3. Maintain survey data routinely.			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Action Item 1-4. Continue maintaining CHC social media.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Action Item 1-5. Continue creating new historic markers.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Action Item 1-6. Continue and enhance tours of historic places.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Action Item 1-7. Routinely update printed and digital educational materials.				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Action Item 1-8. Support archives and museums.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Priority 2. Comment on Development										
Action Item 2-1. Develop a triage plan for review of development projects.				✓						
Action Item 2-2. Continue to review Section 106 undertakings.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Action Item 2-3. Begin reviewing and commenting on County development projects.					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Action Item 2-4. Support municipal preservation programs.						✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Action Item 2-5. Consolidate and amplify grassroots comments.							✓	✓	✓	✓
Priority 3. List Properties in the National Register										
Action Item 3-1. Review and maintain the prioritized list of recommended National Register nominations.	✓									
Action Item 3-2. Coordinate with stakeholders about National Register nominations.		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Action Item 3-3. Seek partnerships to fund and complete National Register nominations.			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. https://www.achp.gov/.

"Certified Local Government." Texas Historical Commission, accessed Feb. 27, 2024, https://thc.texas.gov/review/certified-local-government.

"Understand Cultural Landscapes." National Park Service, https://www.nps.gov/subjects/culturallandscapes/understand-cl.htm .

"Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credit Program." Texas Historical Commission, https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/grants-tax-credits-and-funding/historic-preservation-tax-credits/federal-rehabilitation.

"Historic Resources of Texas Aggregator: A TxDOT Environmental Affairs Application." Texas Department of Transportation. Accessed Jul. 13, 2023, https://txdot.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=e13ba0aa78bf4548a8e98758177a8dd5.

"Historic Resources Survey." Texas Historical Commission, https://www.thc.texas.gov/learn/historic-resources-survey.

"Jefferson County Historical Commission." Jefferson County, Texas. Accessed Jul 13, 2023, https://co.jefferson.tx.us/historical_commission/home.html.

"National Historic Preservation Act of 1966." Archeology. National Park Service, https://www.nps.gov/subjects/archeology/national-historic-preservation-act.htm

"National Register FAQ." Texas Historical Commission, https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/designate-historic-properties/national-register-historic-places/national-register-faq.

"National Register Publications and Forms." Texas Historical Commission, https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/designate-historic-properties/national-register-historic-places/national-register.

National Parks Service. National Register Bulletin – How to Complete the National Register Registration Form. Appendix IV: Glossary of National Register Terms. https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB16A-Complete.pdf.

Parks and Wildlife Code. Title 3. Parks Chapter 26. Protection of Public Parks and Recreational Lands, https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/Docs/PW/htm/PW.26.htm#26.001.

"Section 106 Applicant Toolkit." Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, https://www.achp.gov/digital-library-section-106-landing/section-106-applicant-toolkit.

"Section 4(f) Overview." Section 4(f) Tutorial. Environmental Review Toolkit. U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration, https://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/env_topics/4f_tutorial/overview.aspx.

"State Antiquities Landmarks." Texas Historical Commission, https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/designate-historic-properties/state-antiquities-landmarks.

"State Board of Review Meeting." Texas Historical Commission, https://www.thc.texas.gov/sbrmeeting.

"State Historic Preservation Offices." National Register of Historic Places. National Park Service, https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/state-historic-preservation-offices.htm.

"State Historical Markers." Texas Historical Commission, https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/preservation-programs/historical-markers.

"Texas Historic Sites Atlas." Texas Historical Commission. Accessed Jul. 13, 2023, https://atlas.thc.state.tx.us/.

"Texas Historic Preservation Tax Credits." Texas Historical Commission, https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/grants-tax-credits-and-funding/historic-preservation-tax-credits.

"The Family Land Heritage Program." Texas Department of Agriculture, https://www.texasagriculture.gov/News-Events/Family-Land-Heritage.

"The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation." Historic Preservation Tax Incentives. National Park Service, https://www.nps.gov/subjects/taxincentives/secretarys-standards-rehabilitation.htm.

"The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties." Technical Preservation Services. National Park Service, https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/secretary-standards-treatment-historic-properties.htm.

"The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties: Restoration as a Treatment and Standards for Restoration." National Park Service, https://www.nps.gov/articles/000/treatment-standards-restoration.htm.

"The Section 106 Review Process." Texas Historical Commission, https://www.thc.texas.gov/review/federal-project-review/section-106-review-process.

"What are CHCs?" Texas Historical Commission. https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/preservation-programs/county-historical-commission-outreach.

"What are 'Cultural Resources'?" National Preservation Institute, https://www.npi.org/what-are-cultural-resources.

"What is the National Register of Historic Places?" National Parks Service, https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/what-is-the-national-register.htm.

Wyatt, Barbara. "The Components of a Historic Context." April 9, 2009, https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwiypbD14o6AAxUTnGoFHXMwB04QFnoECBEQAQ&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.nps.gov%2Fsubjects%2Fnationalregister%2Fupload%2FWhite_paper_on_historic_context_508_200904.docx&usg=AOvVaw2TIe_bZ6l0G0vgeBWDbtRH&opi=89978449

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS

- Jefferson County
    - County Historical Commission (CHC)
        - Theresa Goodness, Chair
        - Jen Trenbeath, Secretary
        - Dr. Steven P. Lewis, 1st Vice Chair
        - Don Smart, 2nd Vice Chair
    - Certified Local Government (CLG)
        - Jen Trenbeath, CLG Coordinator
- City of Port Arthur
    - Pamela D. Langford, CLG Coordinator
- City of Bevil Oaks
    - Sabrenna Crain, Office Manager
- Hardin-Jefferson Independent School District
    - Sandra Sherman
- Port Arthur Convention and Visitors Bureau
    - Tammy K. Kotzur, Director
- Beaumont Heritage Society
    - Shelby Brannan, Director
- The Beaumont Convention and Visitor's Bureau
- Beaumont Chamber of Commerce
- The McFaddin Ward House
- Texas Energy Museum
- Gladys City Museum
- Beaumont Police Museum
- Fire Museum
- Tyrrell Historical Library and THLA
- Hinchee House Preservation Group
- Rob Clarke, Architect
- Daughters of the American Revolution
- Sons of the Republic of Texas
- Museum of the Gulf Coast, Port Arthur
    - Thomas "Tom" G. Neal
- Lamar University, Port Arthur
    - Lamar University History Department
    - Center for History and Culture at Lamar University
- The LaBiche Architectural Group, Beaumont
    - Dohn LaBiche, Architect

APPENDIX B: PUBLIC OUTREACH RESULTS

Summary

1 Questionnaire Findings



Questionnaire Results, May 17, 2020



Questionnaire Results, May 17, 2020

What municipality or area do you represent?

26 responses



Questionnaire Results, May 17, 2020



Questionnaire Results, May 17, 2020



Questionnaire Results, May 17, 2020



Questionnaire Results, May 17, 2020



2 Key Takeaways



Key Takeaways

- Wholistic perspective – not huge differences in priorities
- Primary goals include:
  - Minimizing neglect and vacancy
  - Preventing demolition
  - Preparing for floods and natural disasters
- Top priorities include:
  - Commenting on development
  - Creating new markers
  - Supporting archives and museums
  - Helping support local ordinances
- More survey is not a big priority
- Other observations?

Detailed Results

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

The respondent's email ([redacted] was recorded on submission of this form.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [x] Board or commission member
- [x] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [ ] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [ ] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Jefferson County

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	◉	○
Historic districts	○	○	◉
Religious institutions	○	◉	○
Educational institutions	○	◉	○
Cultural gathering places	○	◉	○
Agricultural complexes	○	◉	○
Industrial complexes	◉	○	○
Landscapes	○	◉	○
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	○	○	◉
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	○	○	◉

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	○	◉
Urban sprawl	○	◉	○
Highway development	○	◉	○
Flood control projects	○	○	◉
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	◉	○	○
Inappropriate alterations	○	◉	○
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	○	◉
More designations	○	◉	○
Fewer demolitions	○	○	◉
Fewer vacancies	○	○	◉
More rehabilitation	○	◉	○
More awareness	○	○	◉

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	◉	○	○	○	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	◉	○	○	○	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	◉

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

The respondent's email ([redacted]) was recorded on submission of this form.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [x] City or county staff
- [ ] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [ ] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [ ] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Jefferson County

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	○	◉
Historic districts	○	○	◉
Religious institutions	○	◉	○
Educational institutions	○	◉	○
Cultural gathering places	○	○	◉
Agricultural complexes	○	◉	○
Industrial complexes	○	◉	○
Landscapes	○	◉	○
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	○	◉	○
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	○	◉	○

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	○	◉
Urban sprawl	○	○	◉
Highway development	○	◉	○
Flood control projects	○	◉	○
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	○	◉	○
Inappropriate alterations	○	○	◉
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	◉	○
More designations	○	○	◉
Fewer demolitions	○	○	◉
Fewer vacancies	○	○	◉
More rehabilitation	○	○	◉
More awareness	○	○	◉

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	◉	○	○

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

The respondent's email [redacted] was recorded on submission of this form.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [x] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [x] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [ ] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Beaumont

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	○	◉
Historic districts	○	○	◉
Religious institutions	○	○	◉
Educational institutions	○	○	◉
Cultural gathering places	○	○	◉
Agricultural complexes	○	○	◉
Industrial complexes	○	○	◉
Landscapes	○	○	◉
Engineering structures	○	○	◉
Archeology	○	○	◉
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	○	○	◉

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	◉	○
Urban sprawl	○	◉	○
Highway development	○	○	◉
Flood control projects	○	○	◉
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	○	◉	○
Inappropriate alterations	○	◉	○
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	◉	○
More designations	○	○	◉
Fewer demolitions	○	○	◉
Fewer vacancies	○	○	◉
More rehabilitation	○	○	◉
More awareness	○	○	◉

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	◉	○

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

Become more visible to the community

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

The respondent's email ([redacted]) was recorded on submission of this form.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [x] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [ ] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [ ] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Jefferson

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	○	◉
Historic districts	○	○	◉
Religious institutions	○	○	◉
Educational institutions	○	○	◉
Cultural gathering places	○	○	◉
Agricultural complexes	○	○	◉
Industrial complexes	○	○	◉
Landscapes	○	◉	○
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	○	○	◉
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	○	○	◉

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	○	◉
Urban sprawl	○	○	◉
Highway development	○	○	○
Flood control projects	○	○	◉
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	○	○	◉
Inappropriate alterations	○	○	◉
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	○	◉
More designations	○	○	◉
Fewer demolitions	○	○	◉
Fewer vacancies	○	○	◉
More rehabilitation	○	○	◉
More awareness	○	○	◉

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	◉

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

The respondent's emai [redacted] was recorded on submission of this form.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [x] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [ ] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [ ] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Mid county

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	○	◉
Historic districts	○	○	◉
Religious institutions	○	○	◉
Educational institutions	○	○	◉
Cultural gathering places	○	○	◉
Agricultural complexes	○	○	◉
Industrial complexes	○	○	◉
Landscapes	○	○	◉
Engineering structures	○	○	◉
Archeology	○	○	◉
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	○	○	◉

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	◉	○
Urban sprawl	○	○	◉
Highway development	○	○	◉
Flood control projects	○	◉	○
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	○	○	◉
Inappropriate alterations	○	○	◉
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	○	◉
More designations	○	○	◉
Fewer demolitions	○	○	◉
Fewer vacancies	○	○	◉
More rehabilitation	○	○	◉
More awareness	○	○	◉

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	◉

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

The respondent's email ([redacted] was recorded on submission of this form.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [x] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [ ] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [ ] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Jefferson County

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	○	◉
Historic districts	○	○	◉
Religious institutions	○	◉	○
Educational institutions	○	◉	○
Cultural gathering places	○	◉	○
Agricultural complexes	◉	○	○
Industrial complexes	◉	○	○
Landscapes	◉	○	○
Engineering structures	◉	○	○
Archeology	○	◉	○
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	○	○	◉

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	○	◉
Urban sprawl	○	◉	○
Highway development	◉	○	○
Flood control projects	◉	○	○
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	◉	○	○
Inappropriate alterations	○	◉	○
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	◉	○
More designations	○	◉	○
Fewer demolitions	○	○	◉
Fewer vacancies	○	○	◉
More rehabilitation	○	○	◉
More awareness	○	○	◉

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	◉

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

Actually involve local historic preservationist.

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

The respondent's email [redacted] was recorded on submission of this form.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [ ] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [ ] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [x] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Hamshire

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	◉	○
Historic districts	○	◉	○
Religious institutions	◉	○	○
Educational institutions	◉	○	○
Cultural gathering places	○	◉	○
Agricultural complexes	○	◉	○
Industrial complexes	◉	○	○
Landscapes	○	◉	○
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	○	○	◉
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	○	○	◉

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	○	◉
Urban sprawl	○	◉	○
Highway development	◉	○	○
Flood control projects	◉	○	○
Demolition	◉	○	○
New development	○	○	◉
Inappropriate alterations	◉	○	○
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	◉	○
More designations	○	○	◉
Fewer demolitions	○	◉	○
Fewer vacancies	○	○	◉
More rehabilitation	○	◉	○
More awareness	○	◉	○

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	◉	○	○	○

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

The respondent's email [redacted] was recorded on submission of this form.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [ ] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [x] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [x] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Beaumont

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	◉	○
Historic businesses	◉	○	○
Historic districts	○	○	◉
Religious institutions	◉	○	○
Educational institutions	◉	○	○
Cultural gathering places	○	○	◉
Agricultural complexes	◉	○	○
Industrial complexes	◉	○	○
Landscapes	○	○	○
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	◉	○	○
Archives	◉	○	○
Interpretive markers	○	○	○

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	◉	○	○
Urban sprawl	○	◉	○
Highway development	◉	○	○
Flood control projects	◉	○	○
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	◉	○	○
Inappropriate alterations	◉	○	○
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	◉	○

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	◉	○
More designations	○	◉	○
Fewer demolitions	○	○	◉
Fewer vacancies	○	○	◉
More rehabilitation	○	○	◉
More awareness	○	◉	○

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	◉	○	○	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	◉

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No
- ○ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

The respondent's email [redacted] was recorded on submission of this form.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [ ] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [x] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [ ] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Beaumont

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	◉	○
Historic businesses	○	◉	○
Historic districts	○	○	◉
Religious institutions	◉	○	○
Educational institutions	○	◉	○
Cultural gathering places	○	○	◉
Agricultural complexes	○	○	◉
Industrial complexes	○	◉	○
Landscapes	○	○	◉
Engineering structures	◉	○	○
Archeology	○	○	◉
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	○	○	◉

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	○	◉
Urban sprawl	○	◉	○
Highway development	○	◉	○
Flood control projects	○	◉	○
Demolition	○	◉	○
New development	○	○	◉
Inappropriate alterations	○	◉	○
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	◉	○	○
More designations	○	◉	○
Fewer demolitions	○	○	◉
Fewer vacancies	○	○	◉
More rehabilitation	○	○	◉
More awareness	○	◉	○

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	◉

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

The respondent's email [redacted] was recorded on submission of this form.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [ ] Board or commission member
- [x] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [x] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [ ] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Jefferson County

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	○	◉
Historic districts	○	○	◉
Religious institutions	○	○	◉
Educational institutions	○	○	◉
Cultural gathering places	○	○	◉
Agricultural complexes	○	◉	○
Industrial complexes	○	◉	○
Landscapes	○	○	◉
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	○	○	◉
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	○	○	◉

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	○	◉
Urban sprawl	○	◉	○
Highway development	○	◉	○
Flood control projects	○	◉	○
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	○	◉	○
Inappropriate alterations	○	◉	○
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	◉	○
More designations	○	◉	○
Fewer demolitions	○	○	◉
Fewer vacancies	○	○	◉
More rehabilitation	○	○	◉
More awareness	○	○	◉

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	◉

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

No specific suggestions--just increase public awareness and solicit feedback.

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

The respondent's email [redacted] was recorded on submission of this form.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [x] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [ ] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [ ] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Cemetery Chair

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	◉	○
Historic districts	○	◉	○
Religious institutions	○	◉	○
Educational institutions	◉	○	○
Cultural gathering places	◉	○	○
Agricultural complexes	◉	○	○
Industrial complexes	◉	○	○
Landscapes	◉	○	○
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	○	○	◉
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	○	○	◉

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	○	◉
Urban sprawl	○	◉	○
Highway development	○	◉	○
Flood control projects	○	◉	○
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	○	◉	○
Inappropriate alterations	○	◉	○
Neglect	○	◉	○
Vacancy	○	◉	○

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	◉	○
More designations	○	◉	○
Fewer demolitions	○	◉	○
Fewer vacancies	○	◉	○
More rehabilitation	○	◉	○
More awareness	○	○	◉

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	◉

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

The respondent's email [redacted] was recorded on submission of this form.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [ ] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [x] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [ ] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Beaumont

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	◉	○
Historic districts	○	○	◉
Religious institutions	○	◉	○
Educational institutions	○	○	◉
Cultural gathering places	○	○	◉
Agricultural complexes	○	○	◉
Industrial complexes	◉	○	○
Landscapes	○	○	◉
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	◉	○	○
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	◉	○	○

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	◉	○
Urban sprawl	○	◉	○
Highway development	○	○	◉
Flood control projects	◉	○	○
Demolition	◉	○	○
New development	○	○	◉
Inappropriate alterations	◉	○	○
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	◉	○	○
More designations	◉	○	○
Fewer demolitions	○	◉	○
Fewer vacancies	○	○	◉
More rehabilitation	○	○	◉
More awareness	○	○	◉

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	◉	○	○	○	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	◉

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

Yes, a lot

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

The respondent's email ([redacted]) was recorded on submission of this form.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [ ] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [ ] Property owner
- [x] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [x] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Jefferson co

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	◉	○
Historic districts	○	○	◉
Religious institutions	○	◉	○
Educational institutions	○	○	◉
Cultural gathering places	○	◉	○
Agricultural complexes	◉	○	○
Industrial complexes	◉	○	○
Landscapes	◉	○	○
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	○	◉	○
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	○	◉	○

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	◉	○
Urban sprawl	○	○	◉
Highway development	○	○	◉
Flood control projects	○	◉	○
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	○	◉	○
Inappropriate alterations	○	◉	○
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	◉	○
More designations	○	◉	○
Fewer demolitions	○	○	◉
Fewer vacancies	○	○	◉
More rehabilitation	○	○	◉
More awareness	○	○	◉

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	◉

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

The respondent's email [redacted] was recorded on submission of this form.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [ ] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [x] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [ ] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Beaumont

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	○	◉
Historic districts	○	○	◉
Religious institutions	○	◉	○
Educational institutions	○	◉	○
Cultural gathering places	○	○	◉
Agricultural complexes	◉	○	○
Industrial complexes	◉	○	○
Landscapes	○	○	◉
Engineering structures	◉	○	○
Archeology	○	○	◉
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	○	○	◉

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	○	◉
Urban sprawl	○	○	◉
Highway development	○	○	◉
Flood control projects	○	○	◉
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	○	○	◉
Inappropriate alterations	○	○	◉
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	◉	○
More designations	○	○	◉
Fewer demolitions	○	◉	○
Fewer vacancies	◉	○	○
More rehabilitation	○	○	◉
More awareness	○	○	◉

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	◉

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

The respondent's email [redacted] was recorded on submission of this form.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [ ] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [ ] Property owner
- [x] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [x] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Jefferson County/Beaumont

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	○	◉
Historic districts	○	○	◉
Religious institutions	○	○	◉
Educational institutions	○	○	◉
Cultural gathering places	○	◉	○
Agricultural complexes	○	◉	○
Industrial complexes	○	◉	○
Landscapes	○	◉	○
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	○	○	◉
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	○	◉	○

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	○	◉
Urban sprawl	○	○	◉
Highway development	○	○	◉
Flood control projects	○	◉	○
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	○	○	◉
Inappropriate alterations	○	○	◉
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	◉	○
More designations	○	◉	○
Fewer demolitions	○	○	◉
Fewer vacancies	○	○	◉
More rehabilitation	○	○	◉
More awareness	○	○	◉

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	◉

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [x] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [ ] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [ ] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Port Arthur

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	○	◉
Historic districts	○	◉	○
Religious institutions	○	◉	○
Educational institutions	○	◉	○
Cultural gathering places	○	◉	○
Agricultural complexes	◉	○	○
Industrial complexes	◉	○	○
Landscapes	◉	○	○
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	○	◉	○
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	○	○	◉

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	◉	○
Urban sprawl	○	○	◉
Highway development	○	◉	○
Flood control projects	◉	○	○
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	○	◉	○
Inappropriate alterations	○	◉	○
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	◉	○
More designations	○	◉	○
Fewer demolitions	○	○	◉
Fewer vacancies	○	○	◉
More rehabilitation	○	◉	○
More awareness	○	◉	○

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	◉

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

Public meetings at a time conducive to attendance by a wide audience (ie, late afternoon or early evening)

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [x] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [ ] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [ ] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Port Arthur

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	○	◉
Historic districts	○	◉	○
Religious institutions	○	◉	○
Educational institutions	○	◉	○
Cultural gathering places	◉	○	○
Agricultural complexes	◉	○	○
Industrial complexes	◉	○	○
Landscapes	◉	○	○
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	○	◉	○
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	○	○	◉

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	◉	○
Urban sprawl	○	○	◉
Highway development	○	◉	○
Flood control projects	○	○	◉
Demolition	○	◉	○
New development	○	◉	○
Inappropriate alterations	○	○	◉
Neglect	○	◉	○
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	◉	○
More designations	○	◉	○
Fewer demolitions	○	○	◉
Fewer vacancies	○	○	◉
More rehabilitation	○	◉	○
More awareness	○	◉	○

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	◉

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

Have meetings at more convenient times - late afternoon to early evenings

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [ ] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [ ] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [x] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Port Arthur

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	◉	○
Historic businesses	○	◉	○
Historic districts	○	◉	○
Religious institutions	○	◉	○
Educational institutions	○	◉	○
Cultural gathering places	○	◉	○
Agricultural complexes	◉	○	○
Industrial complexes	○	◉	○
Landscapes	○	◉	○
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	◉	○	○
Archives	○	◉	○
Interpretive markers	○	◉	○

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	○	◉
Urban sprawl	○	◉	○
Highway development	○	○	◉
Flood control projects	○	○	◉
Demolition	○	◉	○
New development	○	◉	○
Inappropriate alterations	◉	○	○
Neglect	○	◉	○
Vacancy	○	◉	○

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	◉	○
More designations	○	◉	○
Fewer demolitions	○	◉	○
Fewer vacancies	○	◉	○
More rehabilitation	○	◉	○
More awareness	○	◉	○

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	◉	○	○	○	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	◉	○

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No
- ○ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [ ] Board or commission member
- [x] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [ ] Property owner
- [x] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [ ] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Beaumont

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	○	◉
Historic districts	○	○	◉
Religious institutions	○	◉	○
Educational institutions	○	○	◉
Cultural gathering places	○	◉	○
Agricultural complexes	◉	○	○
Industrial complexes	○	◉	○
Landscapes	◉	○	○
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	○	○	◉
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	○	○	◉

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	○	◉
Urban sprawl	◉	○	○
Highway development	○	◉	○
Flood control projects	○	◉	○
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	◉	○	○
Inappropriate alterations	○	◉	○
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	◉	○

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	◉	○
More designations	○	○	◉
Fewer demolitions	○	○	◉
Fewer vacancies	○	◉	○
More rehabilitation	○	○	◉
More awareness	○	○	◉

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	◉	○

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [ ] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [x] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [ ] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Beaumont

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	○	◉
Historic districts	○	○	◉
Religious institutions	○	○	◉
Educational institutions	○	○	◉
Cultural gathering places	○	○	◉
Agricultural complexes	○	◉	○
Industrial complexes	○	◉	○
Landscapes	○	◉	○
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	◉	○	○
Archives	◉	○	○
Interpretive markers	○	◉	○

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	○	◉
Urban sprawl	○	○	◉
Highway development	◉	○	○
Flood control projects	◉	○	○
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	○	○	◉
Inappropriate alterations	○	○	◉
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	○	◉
More designations	○	◉	○
Fewer demolitions	○	◉	○
Fewer vacancies	○	◉	○
More rehabilitation	○	○	◉
More awareness	○	○	◉

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	◉

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [ ] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [ ] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [x] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Beaumont

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	○	◉
Historic districts	○	○	◉
Religious institutions	○	○	◉
Educational institutions	○	○	◉
Cultural gathering places	○	○	◉
Agricultural complexes	◉	○	○
Industrial complexes	◉	○	○
Landscapes	○	◉	○
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	○	◉	○
Archives	○	◉	○
Interpretive markers	○	◉	○

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	○	◉
Urban sprawl	◉	○	○
Highway development	○	◉	○
Flood control projects	○	◉	○
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	○	◉	○
Inappropriate alterations	○	○	◉
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	○	◉
More designations	○	○	◉
Fewer demolitions	○	○	◉
Fewer vacancies	○	○	◉
More rehabilitation	○	○	◉
More awareness	○	○	◉

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	◉

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [ ] Board or commission member
- [x] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [x] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [x] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Beaumont

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	◉	○
Historic districts	○	◉	○
Religious institutions	○	◉	○
Educational institutions	○	◉	○
Cultural gathering places	○	○	◉
Agricultural complexes	◉	○	○
Industrial complexes	○	◉	○
Landscapes	○	◉	○
Engineering structures	○	○	◉
Archeology	○	◉	○
Archives	○	◉	○
Interpretive markers	○	◉	○

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	○	◉
Urban sprawl	○	◉	○
Highway development	○	○	◉
Flood control projects	○	◉	○
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	○	○	◉
Inappropriate alterations	○	◉	○
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	○	◉
More designations	○	○	◉
Fewer demolitions	○	○	◉
Fewer vacancies	○	◉	○
More rehabilitation	○	◉	○
More awareness	○	◉	○

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	◉

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [ ] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [x] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [x] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Beaumont

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	◉	○
Historic districts	○	○	◉
Religious institutions	○	○	◉
Educational institutions	○	◉	○
Cultural gathering places	○	◉	○
Agricultural complexes	○	◉	○
Industrial complexes	○	◉	○
Landscapes	○	○	◉
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	○	○	◉
Archives	○	◉	○
Interpretive markers	○	◉	○

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	○	◉
Urban sprawl	○	◉	○
Highway development	○	◉	○
Flood control projects	○	○	◉
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	○	◉	○
Inappropriate alterations	○	◉	○
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	◉	○
More designations	○	◉	○
Fewer demolitions	○	◉	○
Fewer vacancies	○	◉	○
More rehabilitation	○	○	◉
More awareness	○	○	◉

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	◉	○	○

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [x] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [x] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [x] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Jefferson cty

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	◉	○
Historic businesses	○	○	○
Historic districts	○	◉	○
Religious institutions	○	○	○
Educational institutions	○	◉	○
Cultural gathering places	○	◉	○
Agricultural complexes	○	○	○
Industrial complexes	○	○	○
Landscapes	○	◉	○
Engineering structures	○	○	○
Archeology	○	○	○
Archives	○	○	○
Interpretive markers	○	○	○

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	◉	○
Urban sprawl	○	○	○
Highway development	○	○	○
Flood control projects	○	◉	○
Demolition	○	◉	○
New development	○	◉	○
Inappropriate alterations	○	○	○
Neglect	○	◉	○
Vacancy	○	○	○

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	○	○
More designations	○	○	○
Fewer demolitions	○	○	○
Fewer vacancies	○	○	○
More rehabilitation	○	◉	○
More awareness	○	◉	○

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	◉	○	○

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No
- ○ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [ ] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [ ] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [x] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

_____

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	○	◉
Historic districts	○	○	◉
Religious institutions	◉	○	○
Educational institutions	○	◉	○
Cultural gathering places	○	○	◉
Agricultural complexes	○	◉	○
Industrial complexes	◉	○	○
Landscapes	○	○	◉
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	○	◉	○
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	○	◉	○

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	○	◉
Urban sprawl	○	○	◉
Highway development	○	○	◉
Flood control projects	○	◉	○
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	○	◉	○
Inappropriate alterations	○	○	◉
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	○	◉
More designations	○	○	○
Fewer demolitions	○	○	◉
Fewer vacancies	○	○	◉
More rehabilitation	○	○	◉
More awareness	○	○	◉

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	◉	○

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No
- ○ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [ ] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [ ] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [ ] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [x] Other: Academic

What municipality or area do you represent?

Lamar University

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	◉	○
Historic businesses	○	◉	○
Historic districts	○	◉	○
Religious institutions	○	◉	○
Educational institutions	○	◉	○
Cultural gathering places	○	◉	○
Agricultural complexes	◉	○	○
Industrial complexes	○	◉	○
Landscapes	○	○	◉
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	○	○	◉
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	○	○	◉

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	◉	○
Urban sprawl	○	○	◉
Highway development	○	○	◉
Flood control projects	○	◉	○
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	○	○	◉
Inappropriate alterations	○	◉	○
Neglect	○	◉	○
Vacancy	○	◉	○

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	◉	○	○
More designations	○	○	◉
Fewer demolitions	○	○	◉
Fewer vacancies	○	○	◉
More rehabilitation	○	○	◉
More awareness	○	○	◉

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	◉

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

Questionnaire: Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan

The questions below aim to gather information to inform the draft Jefferson County Historic Preservation Plan. Please submit comments no later than **Friday, May 5, 2023**. The draft Historic Preservation Plan will be shared with stakeholders for review and comment in July 2023.

What is your involvement in preservation in Jefferson County?

- [ ] City or county staff
- [x] Board or commission member
- [ ] Nonprofit member or volunteer
- [ ] Property owner
- [ ] Tenant
- [ ] Realtor
- [ ] Developer
- [ ] Interested citizen, otherwise unaffiliated
- [ ] Other: _____

What municipality or area do you represent?

Jefferson County

What are your priorities for preservation?

What types of historic resources concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Historic homes	○	○	◉
Historic businesses	○	◉	○
Historic districts	○	◉	○
Religious institutions	○	○	◉
Educational institutions	○	○	◉
Cultural gathering places	○	◉	○
Agricultural complexes	○	◉	○
Industrial complexes	○	◉	○
Landscapes	○	◉	○
Engineering structures	○	◉	○
Archeology	○	○	◉
Archives	○	○	◉
Interpretive markers	○	○	◉

What threats to historic preservation concern you most?

	Low Concern	Medium Concern	High Concern
Floods and natural disasters	○	○	◉
Urban sprawl	○	◉	○
Highway development	○	◉	○
Flood control projects	○	◉	○
Demolition	○	○	◉
New development	○	○	◉
Inappropriate alterations	○	◉	○
Neglect	○	○	◉
Vacancy	○	○	◉

What are the most important measures of success for a preservation plan?

	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance
More survey	○	◉	○
More designations	○	◉	○
Fewer demolitions	○	○	◉
Fewer vacancies	○	○	◉
More rehabilitation	○	◉	○
More awareness	○	○	◉

How can the Jefferson County Historical Commission effectively support preservation?

Conduct follow-up surveys

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Share and update survey data using an online system

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Create new Official Texas Historical Markers

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help list historic properties on the National Register

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Comment and consult on development projects that impact historic buildings

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Provide property tax abatement for historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer grants for maintenance of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Offer technical assistance and legal assistance for owners of historic properties

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	◉	○	○	Highly effective

Host festivals and events that promote preservation

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Publicize preservation successes across the County

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	◉	○	○

Create educational materials sharing the significance of Jefferson County's history

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Support local archives and museums

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	○	◉	Highly effective

Help municipalities adopt and administer local preservation ordinances

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not effective	○	○	○	◉	○	Highly effective

Are you interested in providing further input for the Jefferson County Preservation Plan?

Would you be interested in attending a future public meeting about this preservation plan?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Maybe

Would you be interested in participating in a focus group?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Are you willing to help share information about this plan with your network?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Maybe

Do you have any suggestions about how to increase public input for the preservation plan?

This form was created inside of HHM & Associates, Inc..

Google Forms

APPENDIX C: PRESERVATION RESOURCES TOOLKIT

Preservation is a multi-layered and complex field that is built upon a variety of programs and policies. It relies on individuals with a wide range of experience and includes people from many areas of expertise and fields from history and architecture to planning, finance, and public policy. Indeed, preservation means different things to different people, all of whom desire to pursue certain actions suited to their particular needs that fall under the broad heading of "historic preservation."

Empowering people with tools and guidance to learn more about specific steps helps ensure the advancement of preservation in Jefferson County. This toolkit aims to answer common questions encountered when beginning a preservation project. The sources of information within the toolkit represent some of the most reliable, common, and relevant tools available – written in accessible language and intended for both professional preservationists and the general public. These sources of information aim to help anyone interested in beginning a preservation project from designation to tax incentives to the nuts-and-bolts of maintaining historic buildings. A guide for navigating the toolkit is presented below in table C-1.

Table C-1. Guide for navigating this toolkit (Appendix C). Note that the "Question" column provides a hyperlink to the relevant section.

Question		Page no.
1.	How do I contact the Jefferson County Historic Preservation Office and CLG?	Page C-1
2.	How do I determine if a property is already a designated as historic?	Page C-2
3.	How can I learn about municipal preservation policies in Jefferson County?	Page C-2
4.	How do I seek appropriate historic designation for a property?	Page C-2
5.	How do I take advantage of preservation tax incentives?	Page C-5
6.	Where can I find information about the economic benefits of preservation?	Page C-6
7.	Where can I find technical information and guidance about how to appropriately rehabilitate a historic property?	Page C-9
8.	Where can I find information about the sustainability of historic preservation?	Page C-10
9.	How can I apply for grants and financial aid for preservation projects?	Page C-11
10.	How can I participate in the Section 106 consultation process for federal projects?	Page C-13
11.	How can I learn more about the role of archeology in the preservation process in Texas?	Page C-13
12.	How can I research the history of a specific property in Jefferson County?	Page C-13
13.	How to learn more: additional online resources and references	Page C-13

A note about online sources

In the modern era, the internet functions as the primary means for most people to conduct research and obtain information, and this resource can be accessed from the comfort and convenience of homes or workplaces. A few keystrokes at a search engine website, such as Google, will identify seemingly countless sources of information about a variety of both general and specific preservation topics. The results, however, may be overwhelming. To that end, this section provides guidance to learn about some of the most common preservation-related activities.

Please note that the sources and internet links (noted as underlined blue text) in this section functioned at the time this report was prepared. These links may change over time. If the hyperlinks do not function, please use an internet search engine such as Google using appropriate key words or contact the program or sponsor for the appropriate subject.

1. How do I contact the Jefferson County Historical Commission and CLG?

Current contact information for the Jefferson County Historical Commission and CLG are provided below.

- Current phone number: 409-835-8701
- Current website: https://co.jefferson.tx.us/historical_commission/home.html
- Current CHC email: histcomm@jeffcotx.us
- Current CLG email: jennifer.trenbeath@jeffcotx.us

- Current mailing address: 1149 Pearl Street, Third Floor, Beaumont, Texas 77701

2. How do I determine if a property is already designated as historic?

- Explore the *Texas Historic Sites Atlas*[1] website that the Texas Historic Commission maintains to show previous historic designations. The *Atlas* is a GIS-based interface that plots the locations of most state-designated historic properties. The information can be viewed on a map or listed by name and address by searching keywords and applicable designation(s).
    - For NHLs, the *Atlas* has a predefined filter that can be viewed at the following website: https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/AdvancedSearch/NHLIndex
    - For NRHP listings, the *Atlas* has a predefined filter that can be further refined by selecting "Jefferson" from the box identified "County" or by any other relevant search parameter, such as "City." To initiate this search, view the following website: https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/AdvancedSearch
- Refer to the inventory appendix within the Historic Resources Survey Report prepared in tandem with this Historic Preservation Plan. The appendix identifies known designated historic properties from multiple sources. Since it was compiled for this preservation plan, with time, the inventory is subject to change once new properties are subject to designation. The final survey report will be posted on the CHC website (https://co.jefferson.tx.us/historical_commission/home.html).
- Check the Jefferson County Historical Commission website for an interactive digital map with updates to the historic resources inventory (https://co.jefferson.tx.us/historical_commission/home.html). The CHC intends to create, host, and regularly update the digital map as part of the implementation of this preservation plan.
- Refer to your local municipality.
- Contact the Jefferson County Historic Preservation and Archives Officer (contact information above).

3. How can I learn about municipal preservation policies in Jefferson County?

Within Jefferson County, the municipalities of Beaumont and Port Arthur are independent CLGs and maintain independent historic preservation codes and ordinances, as linked below:

- Beaumont
    - City of Beaumont Planning Department: https://beaumonttexas.gov/departments/community-development/planning/
    - Historic Landmark Commission: https://beaumonttexas.gov/departments/community-development/planning/historic-land-commission/
    - Economic Design Incentives for Downtown Beaumont, including Historic Preservation Loan Program guidelines: https://beaumontmainstreet.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/overview-of-invcentives-offered.pdf
    - Code sections related to historic preservation: https://ecode360.com/BE6239/search?query=historic&scope=all&sortOrder=relevance&selections=
- Port Arthur
    - City of Port Arthur Development Services Department: https://library.municode.com/tx/port_arthur/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_CH14BOAUCOCO_ARTXIHILACO

[1] https://atlas.thc.state.tx.us/.

- Code sections related to historic preservation: https://library.municode.com/tx/port_arthur/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_CH14BOAUCOCO_ARTXIHILACO

4. How do I seek appropriate historic designation for a property?

Owners of historic properties can choose from a variety of designations issued at the national, state, and local levels. Each designation has its own requirements, eligibility criteria, and application processes. See figure C-1 below for an overview of most state-sanctioned historic designations and associated benefits.

- **National Historic Landmarks** (NHL) possess national significance and illustrate the nationwide impact of events or persons associated with the property, its architectural type or style, or information potential. The following provide instructions to get this type of designation:
  - Overview - https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1582/index.htm
  - Process - https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalhistoriclandmarks/nomination-process.htm
  - Instructions - https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalhistoriclandmarks/nhl-bulletin.htm\
- **National Register of Historic Places** (NRHP) is a federal program administered in our state by the THC in coordination with the National Park Service (NPS). The following provide instructions to get this type of designation:
  - Overview - https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/designate-historic-properties/national-register-historic-places
  - Process - https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/designate-historic-properties/national-register-historic-places/national-register-process
- The NPS provides a series of *National Register Bulletins* designed to guide efforts to complete NRHP nominations. A selected list of *Bulletins* is provided in table C-2. For a complete list, go to: https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/publications.htm
- **Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks** (RTHL) are buildings at least 50 years old that are judged worthy of preservation for their architectural and historical associations. It is a state-level program administered by the THC. The following provide instructions to get this type of designation:
  - Overview - https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/designate-historic-properties/recorded-texas-historic-landmarks
  - Process - https://beaumontmainstreet.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/overview-of-invcentives-offered.pdf
- **Historic Texas Cemeteries** (HTC) are designated cemeteries or burial sites that are at least 50 years old and are worthy of preservation for their historical associations. It is a state-level program administered by the THC. The following provide instructions to get this type of designation:
  - Overview - https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/designate-historic-properties/historic-texas-cemetery-designations
  - Process - https://www.thc.texas.gov/sites/default/files/2023-12/HTC_Guidelines_Instructions_2024.pdf
- **Local Landmarks and Historic Districts** are designated by municipalities. Currently, the only municipalities in Jefferson County with ordinances enabling designation of local landmarks and historic districts are Beaumont and Port Arthur. See municipal information under Question #3 above.

Methods of Protecting Historic Property: Comparison Chart

Updated June 2018

LEGEND

● = yes, comment applies to column heading

O = no, comment does not apply

	Comments	Preservation Easement or Covenant	Historical Designations & Markers: State Antiquities Landmark (SAL)	National Register of Historic Places (NR)	Recorded Texas Historic Landmark (RTHL)	Educational Subject Markers	Historic Texas Cemetery* (HTC)
	Benefits the Citizens of Texas!	●	●	●	●	●	●
Applicability	Property must be historic	●	●	●	●	O	●
	Available to private owners	●	●	●	●	●	●
	Available to public owners	●	●	●	●	●	●
	Can apply to archeological sites	●	●	●	O	●	●
	Can apply to buildings and structures	●	●	●	●	O	O
	Can apply to historic landscapes or sites	●	●	●	depends	●	●
	Requires owner consent for implementation	●	depends	depends	●	●	O
Ownership	Owner retains use of the property	●	●	●	●	●	restricted use
	Must provide limited public access or public benefit	depends	O	O	O	O	●
	Property can be sold	●	●	●	●	●	●
	Conveys with property	●	●	●	●	●	●
	May be revoked at owner's request	O	O	O	O	O	depends
Protection	Alterations require notification to THC	●	●	O	●	O	O
	Prevents demolition of historic property	●	●	O	O	O	●
	Requires maintenance by the owner	●	O	O	●	O	O
	Federal agencies must consider impacts to these historic properties	●	●	●	●	depends	depends
Fiscal Matters	Potential federal tax benefits for historic rehabs	O	O	●	O	O	O
	Potential state tax benefits for historic rehabs	O	●	●	●	O	O
	Potential to reduce property taxes	O	●	O	●	O	●
	Ability to exempt labor from state sales tax	O	O	●	O	O	depends
	Fees Required	●	depends	O	●	●	●
Notes	1. Local designations are awarded and administered by the local governing body; the Texas Historical Commission has no role in administering local designations and local markers.						
	2. Above matrix provides typical application of subject matter; however, please consult with Texas Historical Commission staff because each property is handled individually.						
	3. Visit www.thc.texas.gov and use its search box (top, right corner) to learn more about easements, designations, markers, cemeteries, and other preservation matters.						

TEXAS HISTORICAL COMMISSION
real places telling real stories

* Protections and benefits described in this handout apply to all cemeteries, regardless of designation status. The HTC designation is primarily honorary and does not trigger a higher degree of protection or benefits than those afforded to all cemeteries by other Texas laws.

Figure C-1. Chart comparing different options for historic preservation in Texas. Source: Texas Historical Commission, accessed May 14, 2020, https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/preserve/national_register/Protecting-Comparison-Chart-2018.pdf

Table C-2. Selected list of NPS National Register Bulletins.

National Register Bulletin Title	Hyperlink
Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation	https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB-15_web508.pdf
Bulletin 16A: How to Complete the National Register Registration Form	https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB16A-Complete.pdf
Bulletin 16B: How to Complete the National Register Multiple Property Documentation Form	https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB16B-Complete.pdf
Bulletin 18: How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes	https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB18-Complete.pdf
Bulletin 22: Guidelines for Evaluating and Nominating Properties That Have Achieved Significance Within the Past Fifty Years	https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB22-Complete.pdf
Bulletin 24a: Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning Part 1	https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB24-Complete_Part1t.pdf
Bulletin 24b: Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning Part 2	https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB24-Complete_Part2.pdf
Bulletin 30: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes	https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB30-Complete.pdf
Bulletin 32: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Properties Associated with Significant Persons	https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB32-Complete.pdf
Bulletin 39: Researching a Historic Property	https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB39-Complete.pdf
How to Prepare National Historic Landmark Nominations	https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalhistoriclandmarks/nhl-bulletin.htm

5. How do I take advantage of preservation tax incentives?

All levels of government have some type of tax-based incentives to encourage historic preservation, primarily as tax credits. Property owners must adhere to the particular requirements of each program, and coordination with reviewing staff at the earliest possible stage of any rehabilitation will greatly improve the chances of success and ensure compliance. As possible, seek out advice and preliminary input from reviewing authorities during early planning phases before the project gets too far along to avoid or minimize costly modifications and/or delays to adhere to applicable provisions.

- The NPS offers guidance about the federal tax credit program, which is a collaborative effort that the NPS undertakes with State Historic Preservations Offices, such as the THC.
    - *Tax Incentives for Preserving Historic Properties* – describes the program at the federal level; for a brochure that summarizes the incentives, go to: https://www.nps.gov/tps/tax-incentives/taxdocs/about-tax-incentives-2012.pdf
    - *Before You Apply* – provides instructions and strategies for taking advantage of federal tax credits that can be viewed at the following website: https://www.nps.gov/subjects/taxincentives/before-apply.htm. Among the topics explain are the following:
        - Eligibility requirements
        - Qualified expenses
        - IRS information
- The THC maintains a website that presents an overview of federal, state, and local tax incentives for owners of historic properties. For more information, go to: https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/preservation-tax-incentives. Topics include:

  - *About Preservation Tax Incentives* – contains useful background information. For more information, go to: https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/preservation-tax-incentives/about-preservation-tax-incentives
  - *Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives Program* – offers an income tax credit worth 20 percent of the eligible rehabilitation costs of historic, income-producing buildings. For more information, go to: https://www.thc.texas.gov/federal-rehabilitation-tax-credit-program
  - *Texas Historic Preservation Tax Credit Program* – offers a tax credit equal to 25 percent of eligible rehabilitation costs for qualifying historic buildings. For more information, go to: https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/preservation-tax-incentives/texas-historic-preservation-tax-credit
  - *How to Submit* – describes the process of submitting documentation for the THC to review tax credit applications for review and approval. For more information, go to: https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/preservation-tax-incentives/how-submit
  - *Tax Credit FAQ* – commonly asked questions about preservation tax credits. For more information, go to: https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/preservation-tax-incentives/tax-credit-programs-faq
- Multiple municipalities also offer tax incentives. Refer to municipal contact information above.

6. Where can I find information about the economic benefits of preservation?

Various studies have examined the many economic benefits of historic preservation and the way in which it has supported economic development and revitalization efforts across the nation. The THC has been a national leader in the development of detailed analyses that examine the subject in quantitative and data-driven terms. In addition, other national preservation-advocacy groups have also undertaken similar studies that showcase how successful historic preservation can be as a positive force in economic development and revitalization. The following are samples of some of the best known and relevant studies that have been undertaken in recent years.

- The THC has prepared multiple studies to examine how historic preservation has contributed to the state and local economies.
  - In 2015, the THC published "Economic Impact of Historic Preservation in Texas," which documented more than $4.6 billion in annual GDP and more than 79,000 jobs that can be attributed to historic preservation. To view the report, go to: https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/economic-impact-historic-preservation.pdf
  - "Historic Preservation at Work for the Texas Economy" is a publication that examines the economic impact of historic preservation in Texas. In 1999, the THC along with multiple cities including the City of Grapevine, as well as the Grapevine Heritage Foundation, funded the study – one of the early and most comprehensive efforts on the topic in the nation. The report is posted at the THC's website and can viewed at the following location: https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/EconImpact_wnote.pdf
  - "Economic Impact of Historic Preservation in Texas" is an update to the THC's 1999 report and provides still further evidence of the economic benefits of historic preservation in the state. To view the "Technical Analysis," go to: http://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/economic-impact-technical-analysis.pdf

  - The Executive Summary of the report can be viewed by going to the following website: http://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/economic-impact-historic-preservation.pdf

- The National Park Service assists with the implementation of programs that incentivize the economic benefits of preservation at the federal level and provides information at the agency's website: https://www.nps.gov/index.htm
  - "Tax Incentives for Preservation Historic Properties" explains the 20 percent income tax credit available for certified rehabilitation of income-producing properties that are listed in the NRHP. A discussion of these incentives can be viewed at: https://www.nps.gov/subjects/taxincentives/index.htm
  - The agency also provides an extensive list of Case Studies that highlight numerous tax-incentive projects that include a wide range of property types including neighborhood revitalization, industrial properties, affordable housing, buildings in continued historic use, and buildings rehabilitated into new uses. To choose from a selection of case studies, go to: https://www.nps.gov/subjects/taxincentives/case-studies.htm
- The National Trust for Historic Preservation[2] (NTHP) is a private, non-profit, preservation-advocacy organization that has been quite active promoting the economic benefits of historic preservation and has published numerous studies.
  - "Preservation Basics: Preservation Revolving Funds" is an NTHP publication, published in 1993 and updated in 2006, that examines how the use of a revolving fund can create a pool of capital to preserve and protect historic properties. To view the publication, go to: https://www.slideshare.net/PreservationNation/fj-revolving-fund-book
  - The "Opportunity Zone Resource Roundup" is a collaborative effort by the NTHP and the National Main Street Center that presents a list of useful articles and webinars on a variety of topics touting the economic benefits of historic preservation. For more information, go to: https://ntcic.com/news-blog/opportunityzoneroundup-2/
- The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation[3] (ACHP) is another federal agency involved with historic preservation. Among its most noteworthy reports is "Measuring Economic Impacts of Historic Preservation: A Report of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation" by Donovan Rypkema and Caroline Cheong. This report studies the national economic impact of historic preservation and how "historic preservation has become a fundamental tool for strengthening American communities." Since its original publication in 2011 (updated in 2013), it has proven to be an effective tool for a wide range of public goals including small business incubation, affordable housing, sustainable development, neighborhood stabilization, center city revitalization, job creation, promotion of the arts and culture, small town renewal, heritage tourism, economic development, and others. To view the report, go to: https://www.achp.gov/sites/default/files/guidance/2018-06/Economic Impacts v5-FINAL.pdf
- PlaceEconomics[4] is a nationally known private consulting firm that has undertaken numerous studies and analyses that show the economic benefits of historic preservation across the country including such topics as:
  - Downtown revitalization
  - Economic impact studies
  - Historic preservation incentives
  - Sustainable development
  - Tax credit studies

[2] https://savingplaces.org/.

[3] https://www.achp.gov/.

[4] https://www.placeeconomics.com/about-the-firm/.

7. Where can I find technical information and guidance about how to appropriately rehabilitate a historic property?

Knowing how to undertake projects that are respectful to the qualities and character of historic buildings is a popular topic among private property owners, public officials, developers, architects, contractors, and others. The following represent some of the best-known publications that provide technical guidance to ensure that work is undertaken in a manner that is consistent with widely accepted preservation guidelines and standards and in compliance with tax-based incentives.

The NPS maintains a website entitled "Historic Preservation Standards and Guidelines" that provides critical guidance for those in both the public and private sectors to undertake a variety of preservation-related projects. For more information, please go to:
https://www.nps.gov/subjects/historicpreservation/standards.htm

- The *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* have provided the most complete and thorough guidance for preservation-related work on historic buildings. They offer broad strategies to ensure that these buildings retain their most important and salient physical qualities. They provide a degree of flexibility to consider the countless subtle and sometimes not-so-subtle issues that property owners, architects, contractors, and those in the building trades may encounter. Moreover, the standards are designed to ensure that buildings can be adapted to modern uses and conveniences. A copy of the document can be viewed at: https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/treatment-guidelines-2017-part2-reconstruction-restoration.pdf
- The Technical Services Branch of the NPS has prepared a series of *Preservation Briefs* that provide detailed guidance on the preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration of historic buildings. The briefs include topics involved with specific architectural features, finishes, and materials as well as additions, signage, HVAC systems and landscapes. A selected list of the 50 published Preservation Briefs is presented in table C-3. For a complete list, go to: https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/preservation-briefs.htm
- The Technical Services Branch of NPS also has developed a set of Interpreting the Standards Bulletins, aimed to clarify interpretation of the Secretary's Standards for common rehabilitation issues. A full list of Interpreting the Standards Bulletins is available at: https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/its-bulletins.htm

Table C-3. Selected list of NPS Preservation Briefs.

Preservation Brief Title	Hyperlink
Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-02-repointing.pdf
Improving Energy Efficiency in Historic Buildings	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-03-energy-efficiency.pdf
Roofing for Historic Buildings	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-04-roofing.pdf
The Repair of Historic Wooden Windows	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-09-wood-windows.pdf
Rehabilitating Historic Storefronts	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-11-storefronts.pdf
New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings: Preservation Concerns	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-14-exterior-additions.pdf
Architectural Character—Identifying the Visual Aspects of Historic Buildings as an Aid to Preserving their Character	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-17-architectural-character.pdf
Heating, Ventilating, and Cooling Historic Buildings: Problems and Recommended Approaches	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-24-heating-cooling.pdf
The Preservation of Historic Signs	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-25-signs.pdf
Making Historic Properties Accessible	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-32-accessibility.pdf
Understanding Old Buildings: The Process of Architectural Investigation	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-35-architectural-investigation.pdf
Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-36-cultural-landscapes.pdf
Removing Graffiti from Historic Masonry	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-38-graffiti.pdf
Holding the Line: Controlling Unwanted Moisture in Historic Buildings	https://www.nps.gov/tps/how-to-preserve/briefs/39-control-unwanteC-moisture.htm
The Use of Awnings on Historic Buildings: Repair, Replacement and New Design	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-44-awnings.pdf
Preserving Historic Wooden Porches	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-45-wood-porches.pdf
Maintaining the Exterior of Small and Medium Size Historic Buildings	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-47-exteriors-small-medium-buildings.pdf

8. Where can I find information about the sustainability of historic preservation?

A common adage among preservationists is that "the greenest building is the one that isn't in the landfill." Many historic buildings were designed with intrinsically sustainable features, like passive heating and cooling. In addition, historic buildings embody generations' worth of energy used for construction and maintenance – energy that would be lost and then have to be recreated in a demolition and reconstruction project. A number of preservation organizations have published information documenting the sustainability features of historic buildings, as set forth below.

SUSTAINABILITY INFORMATION FROM THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Table C-4. Additional information on sustainability and historic preservation from the National Park Service.

Title	Hyperlink
NPS Sustainability Homepage	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/sustainability.htm
NPS Energy Efficiency, Sustainability, and Green Building Practices in Historic Buildings	https://www.nps.gov/subjects/taxincentives/energy-efficiency-sustainability-green.htm
Preservation Brief #3: Conserving Energy in Historic Buildings	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-03-energy-efficiency.pdf
Illustrated Guidelines on Sustainability for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/sustainability-guidelines.pdf
Guidelines for Solar Panels on Historic Properties	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/solar-panels-on-historic-properties.htm
Guidelines for Adding Green Roofs to Historic Buildings	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/green-roofs-on-historic-buildings.htm

SUSTAINABILITY INFORMATION FROM OTHER SOURCES

Table C-5. Additional information on sustainability and historic preservation from other sources.

Title	Hyperlink
California SHPO's Compilation of Window Repair and Retrofit Resources	https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=25935
"Green Stories," National Trust for Historic Preservation	https://savingplaces.org/story-categories/green-stories
Whole Building Design Guide - Sustainable Historic Preservation	http://www.wbdg.org/resources/sustainable_hp.php
Donovan Rypkema- Economics, Sustainability and Historic Preservation	http://sohosandiego.org/images/rypkema.pdf
Energy Efficiency, Renewable Energy and Historic Preservation: A Guide for Historic District Commissions	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/cacp_enrgyefcnygd_0.pdf
Going Green Downtown	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/mdms_gnggrndwntwn_0.pdf

9. How can I apply for grants and financial aid for preservation projects?

Most of the financial assistance for preservation is based on a market-driven approach that offers tax-based incentives to help offset rehabilitation costs. However, some grants are available to the public, but keep in mind that this funding source is limited and highly competitive. Moreover, grants typically are allocated for projects that fit within narrow parameters and support a particular strategic or long-term goal.

- Seek CLG grants from the THC. Jefferson County is eligible for such funding. For more information, go to: https://www.thc.texas.gov/review/certified-local-government/certified-local-government-grants
- If your local municipality does not have CLG status, consider applying for CLG status, taking advantage of the resources below to guide the process:
    - CLG Reference Center – https://www.thc.texas.gov/review/certified-local-government/certified-local-government-reference-center
    - Sample Historic Preservation Ordinance – https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/ModelHis.pdf
- Seek a grant from the THC's *Texas Preservation Trust Fund* (TPTF), which provides funds for eligible historic structures, archaeological sites, and heritage education projects. For more information, go to: https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/texas-preservation-trust-fund

- Seek funding for a local Main Street Program. For more information, go to: https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/Funding a Local Main Street Program 2013 version.pdf
- Contact the Jefferson County Economic Development staff[5] to discuss using funds from the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) or Hotel Occupancy Tax funds. For more information, go to: https://www.Jeffersoncounty.com/en/commissioner-3/programs-and-initiatives/economic-development.html
- Seek a grant from the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program, a federal initiative that allocates money to local governments to undertake projects designed to meet the needs of each community. CDBG monies are often used for local housing departments and often target residences in older neighborhoods. A guide from HUD shows "historic preservation can be linked to other eligible activity under Community Development Block Grant Program. The publication focuses on the broad range of historic preservation activity that may be assisted under the CDBG program, not only to save historic structures but to use them in promoting economic development, neighborhood revitalization and the conservation of energy resources as well." For more information, go to: https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/historic-preservation-in-housing-anC-community-development.pdf
- The NTHP offers funds to "encourage preservation at the local level by providing seed money for preservation projects." For more information, go to: https://savingplaces.org/grants
- Seek the African American Cultural Heritage Action Fund, sponsored by the NTHP, which awards funds for interpreting and preserving African American cultural heritage. For more information, go to: https://savingplaces.org/african-american-cultural-heritage
- Seek grants from other sources from the THC's "Grants, Tax Credits, and Funding," which includes informational instructions as well as specific grant opportunities. For more information, go to: http://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/museum-assistance/grants-funding

10. How can I participate in the Section 106 consultation process for federal projects?

When crafting the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, Congress included a provision (Section 106 of the act) that mandated public involvement on federally funded, permitted, or licensed projects that have the potential to have an effect on historic properties. This provision has since become known as the Section 106 Process and is a routine step that agencies such as the Texas Department of Transportation and the US Army Corps of Engineers undertake on a regular basis.

- The ACHP has been active in assisting with the Section 106 Process and has sought to encourage greater public outreach to sponsors of projects that trigger Section 106 reviews, as well as engagement of the general public to encourage their input and participation on project review and comment. The ACHP provides a summary of the Four-Step Review Process associated with the Section 106 Process as a handout that can downloaded at the following website: https://www.achp.gov/sites/default/files/2019-10/106%20Flow%20Chart%20Handout.pdf
    - "A Citizen's Guide to Section 106 Review" is a publication that the ACHP prepared to explain the Section 106 Process to the public. It is written in non-technical and easy-to-understand terms and provides useful sources of information for reference and education. A copy is available at: https://www.achp.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2017-01/CitizenGuide.pdf

[5] https://www.Jeffersoncounty.com/en/administration/staff/economic-development-coordinator.html.

  - ACHP Section 106 Classroom Courses[6] lists workshops and seminars that are open to those in both the public and private sectors to learn more about the Section 106 Process.
- The National Preservation Institute (NPI) offers training on a variety of topics for those involved in the management, preservation and stewardship of cultural heritage. Their website "Protecting the Past Through Preservation"[7] identifies opportunities to attend regional workshops, including those devoted to Section 106, that are held across the nation.

11. How can I learn more about the role of archeology in the preservation process in Texas?

- The Texas Historical Commission leads archeology efforts in Texas. A table listing archeological resources published by the Texas Historical Commission is presented in table C-6.
- The Texas Historical Commission helps organize a network of volunteer "Archeological Stewards" across the state. To find a steward near you, contact the THC's Archeology Division by calling (512) 463-6096, or write to Archeology Division, Texas Historical Commission, P.O. Box 12276, Austin, TX 78711-2276.
- The Texas Archeology Society, based at Texas State University, provides additional materials and training workshops. Details are provided at https://www.txarch.org/.

Table C-6. Additional information on archeology in Texas.

Title	Hyperlink
African American Archeology in Texas: A Planning Document	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/African-American-Archeology-in-Texas-A-Planning-Document.pdf
Archeology Publications for Purchase	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/Technical-Publications-AC-2016.pdf
Artifact Collecting in Texas	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/archeology-artifact-collecting-tx.pdf
Destruction of Archeological Sites in Texas	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/archeology-destruction-sites-tx.pdf
Documenting Archeological Collections	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/archeology-documenting-collections.pdf
Historic Texas Lands Plaque	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/archeology-historic-tx-lands-plaque.pdf
How to Get Involved in Texas Archeology	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/archeology-how-get-involved.pdf
Laws that Protect Archeological Sites	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/archeology-laws-protect-sites.pdf
Property Owner's Guide to Archeological Sites	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/archeology-property-owners-guide.pdf
State Archeological Landmark Designation: A User's Guide	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/archeology-state-landmark-designation.pdf
Texas Archeological Stewardship Network: Volunteers Saving the Past	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/archeology-tx-stewardship-network.pdf
Texas Archeology Awareness Month: A Learning Opportunity for All Ages	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/texas-archeology-month.pdf
Texas Archeology in the Classroom: A Unit for Teachers - Appendix: Acknowledgements and Introduction	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/tx-archeology-classroom.pdf

[6] https://www.achp.gov/training/classroom.

[7] http://www.npi.org.

Table C-6. Additional information on archeology in Texas.

Title	Hyperlink
Texas Archeology in the Classroom: A Unit for Teachers - Part I: Introduction to Archeology, Prehistory and Historic Sites	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/intro_archeology_prehistory_2014.pdf
Texas Archeology in the Classroom: A Unit for Teachers - Part II: Classroom Activities	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/part_II_activities_2014.pdf
Texas Archeology in the Classroom: A Unit for Teachers - Part III: Resources for Teachers	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/part_III_resources_teachers_2014.pdf
Texas Archeology in the Classroom: A Unit for Teachers - Part IV: Supplemental Materials	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/part-IV-supplemental-materials.pdf

12. How can I research the history of a specific property in Jefferson County?

Individual property owners and local historians may seek to research specific properties in Jefferson County. Repositories and sources likely to yield information are listed in Table C-7 below. Note that recommendations regarding eligibility for historic designation in the accompanying Historic Resources Survey report were based on windshield- or reconnaissance-level survey only, and new research findings may suggest that additional properties are eligible for National Register listing and/or local designation. If research reveals that a specific property is associated with a significant historic individual or event, contact the Jefferson County Historical Commission so that they may update the online survey database accordingly.

Table C-7. Additional information on research for state markers and National Register Nominations.

Title	Hyperlink
How to Use Census Records	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/Census.docx
How to Use Confederate Pension Records	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/Confederate.docx
How to Use Oral History	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/Oral History.docx
How to Use Sanborn Maps	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/Sanborn maps %28updated July 2018%29.docx
How to Use Department of Insurance State Fire Marshal Maps	https://www.tsl.texas.gov/arc/maps/mapsinother
Institutions Research Guide	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/MRG - Institutions.docx
Remembering Texas: Guidelines for Historical Research	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/Remembering Texas.pdf
Researching Newspapers	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/Newspapers.docx
Researching Photographic Collections	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/Photographic Collections.docx
Structures: Houses and Buildings Research Guide for Official Texas Historical Marker Applications	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/MRG - Structures.docx
Using Primary and Secondary Sources	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/Sources.docx

13. How to Learn More: Additional Online Resources and References

Most of the information in tables C-8 – C-16 below is made available to the public at the THC website and are useful reference tools for readers to learn more about a variety of preservation-related subjects. Please note that the listings are subject to change and may require additional online research using a search engine like Google.

HISTORIC RESOURCES SURVEYS IN TEXAS

Table C-8. Additional information on historic resources surveys.

Title	Hyperlink
Survey Tools, Funding, and Publications	https://thc.texas.gov/learn/historic-resources-survey/survey-tools-funding-and-publications
TxDOT Historic Resources Toolkit	https://www.txdot.gov/business/resources/environmental/compliance-toolkits/historic-resources.html
Useful Survey Tools	https://www.thc.texas.gov/learn/historic-resources-survey/survey-tools-funding-and-publications
What is a Historic Resources Survey?	https://www.thc.texas.gov/learn/historic-resources-survey

NATIONAL REGISTER PROGRAM IN TEXAS

Table C-9. Additional information on the National Register Program in Texas.

Title	Hyperlink
National Register Criteria	https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/designate-historic-properties/national-register-historic-places
National Register FAQ	https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/designate-historic-properties/national-register-historic-places/national-register-faq
National Register Photo Guidelines	https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/designate-historic-properties/national-register-historic-places/national-register-photo
National Register Process of Texas	https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/designate-historic-properties/national-register-historic-places/national-register-process
National Register Publications and Forms	https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/designate-historic-properties/national-register-historic-places/national-register
Request a Determination of Eligibility	https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/designate-historic-properties/national-register-historic-places/request-determination

PRESERVATION TAX CREDITS

Table C-10. Additional information on preservation tax credits.

Title	Hyperlink
Historic Preservation Tax Credits, Texas Historical Commission	https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/grants-tax-credits-and-funding/historic-preservation-tax-credits
Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credit Program	https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/grants-tax-credits-and-funding/historic-preservation-tax-credits/federal-rehabilitation
Tax Credit FAQ	https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/grants-tax-credits-and-funding/historic-preservation-tax-credits/tax-credit-programs-faq

PROJECT REVIEW INCLUDING SECTION 106 PROJECTS

Table C-11. Additional information on review of Section 106 projects.

Title	Hyperlink
Finding and Hiring a Preservation Consultant	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/hiring-preservation-consultant.pdf
Guidance and Agreement Documents	https://www.thc.texas.gov/project-review/guidance-and-agreement-documents
Guidance for Studying Late 19th- and Early 20th-Century Sites	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/Revised_19th_and_20th_Century_Sites_0.pdf
How THC Reviews Projects	https://www.thc.texas.gov/project-review/how-thc-reviews-projects
Preservation Covenants and Easements	https://www.thc.texas.gov/project-review/preservation-covenants-and-easements
Project Review FAQ	https://www.thc.texas.gov/project-review/project-review-faq
Project Review Resource Links	https://www.thc.texas.gov/project-review/project-review-resource-links
Statutes, Regulations, & Rules	https://www.thc.texas.gov/project-review/statutes-regulations-rules
Tribal Consultation Guidelines	https://www.thc.texas.gov/project-review/tribal-consultation-guidelines
Tribal Consultation Guidelines FAQ	https://www.thc.texas.gov/tribal-consultation-guidelines-faqs
What to Send for a Project Review	https://www.thc.texas.gov/project-review/what-send-project-review

STATE MARKER GUIDANCE

Table C-12. Additional information on state markers in Texas.

Title	Hyperlink
Apply for a Historical Marker	https://www.thc.texas.gov/MarkerToolkit
Historic Texas Cemetery Marker Application	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/2020 HTC Marker Application.docx
Official Texas Historical Marker Policies	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/Marker Policies_0.pdf
Official Texas Historical Marker Procedures	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/OFFICIAL TEXAS HISTORICAL MARKER PROCEDURES.pdf
Recorded Texas Historic Marker Application	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/2020 RTHL Application.docx
State Marker Types (pdf)	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/Marker Types - 2020.pdf
Subject Marker Application	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/forms/2023%20Subject%20marker%20application.docx

TEXAS HERITAGE TRAIL TRAVEL GUIDES

Table C-13. Additional information on Texas Heritage Trail Travel Guides.

Title	Hyperlink
Lakes Trail Region	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/lakes.pdf
Texas Heritage Travel Guide	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/texas-heritage-travel-guide.pdf
Texas Heritage Travel Guide Map	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/texas-heritage-travel-guide-map.pdf

TEXAS MAIN STREET PROGRAM

Table C-14. Additional information on the Texas Main Street Program.

Title	Hyperlink
About the Texas Main Street Program	https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/texas-main-street/about-texas-main-street-program
Becoming a Main Street Community	https://www.thc.texas.gov/becoming-main-street-community
Before/After: Sample Texas Main Street Rehabilitation Projects	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/2016_Main__Street_Before_%26_After_FINAL_FOR_WEBSITE.pdf
Financing Methods for Downtown Revitalization	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/Funding__Methods_for_Main_Street_communities_6.3.15_update.pdf
Funding a Main Street Program	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/Funding_a_Local_Main_Street_Program_2013_version.pdf
Main Street Matters	https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/texas-main-street/resources/main-street-matters
Main Street Resources	https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/texas-main-street/resources
Texas Main Street FAQ	https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-anC-programs/texas-main-street/texas-main-street-faq

THEMATIC TRAVEL GUIDES IN TEXAS

Table C-15. Additional Information on Thematic Travel Guides.

Title	Hyperlink
African Americans in Texas: A Lasting Legacy	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/African-Americans-in-Texas-2016.pdf
Bankhead Highway	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/bankhead-highway-brochure.pdf
Hispanic Texans: Journey from Empire to Democracy	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/hispanic-heritage-travel-guide.pdf
Texas and the Great War	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/WWI_Texas_and_the_Great_War_TravelGuide.pdf
Texas in World War II	https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/tx-in-wwII.pdf

APPENDIX D: PRIORITIZED NATIONAL REGISTER RECOMMENDATIONS

As noted above under Action Item 3-1, this historic preservation plan recommends listing eligible resources in the National Register according to the following prioritized tiers:

- Tier A: Commercial, industrial, and non-profit properties are given highest priority since National Register listing will enable access to federal and/or state preservation tax credits (as detailed in Appendix C).
    - Tier A-i: Multi-property district nominations are prioritized first, in order to provide access for the greatest number of property owners.
    - Tier A-ii: Individual properties are prioritized next.
- Tier B: Public properties are given second priority for National Register nomination. Although typically not able to access federal or state tax credits, these properties often hold value for a large number of people, and National Register nomination can have significant benefits for education and public engagement.
    - Tier B-i: District nominations are prioritized first within this tier.
    - Tier B-ii: A multi-property submission for Post-World War II Public Buildings of Jefferson County is given second priority within this tier.
    - Tier B-iii: Individual properties are prioritized next.
- Tier C: Residential properties are placed within the third priority level for National Register nomination. Although owner-occupied residences are not eligible for federal and/or state preservation tax credits, rental residences or home offices may be eligible (as further detailed in Appendix C).
    - Tier C-i: District nominations are prioritized first within this tier.
    - Tier C-ii: Individual properties are prioritized next.

Table D-1 below provides a list of recommended National Register nominations, prioritized according to these tiers. Additional information regarding each recommended nomination is provided within the accompanying Historic Resources Survey Report.

Table D-1. Prioritized list of National Register nominations.

Tier	City	District Name/ Address	Property Type(s)	Subtype(s)	Year(s) built
A-i					
	NEDERLAND	Downtown Nederland	Commercial	One- and two-part commercial blocks	1915-1977
A-ii					
	CHEEK	12895 HIGHWAY 124	Commercial	Agriculture complex	1925-1955
	CHEEK	5702 INDUSTRY RD	Industrial	Rice dryer	1968
	CHEEK	9889 BOYT RD	Commercial	Agriculture complex	1930-1960
	CHINA	245 HIGHWAY 90	Religious	Church	1935
	FANNETT	9894 OLD GILBERT RD	Religious	Church	1965
	GROVES	5601 39TH ST	Commercial	Funeral home	1958
	GROVES	5801 JEFFERSON W BLVD	Religious	Church	1970
	NEDERLAND	1300 NEDERLAND AVE	Religious	Church	1963
	NEDERLAND	1911 NEDERLAND AVE	Religious	Church	1955
	NEDERLAND	2310 NEDERLAND AVE	Religious	Church	1951
	NEDERLAND	703 TWIN CITY N HWY	Commercial	Gas station	1948
	NEDERLAND	844 NEDERLAND AVE	Commercial	Telephone exchange	1948
	NOME	2000 BLOCK NORTH ST	Industrial	Rice dryer	1946
	PORT NECHES	100 PORT NECHES ATLANTIC RD	Commercial	Office	1915
	PORT NECHES	1024 DEARING ST	Religious	Church	1945

Tier	City	District Name/ Address	Property Type(s)	Subtype(s)	Year(s) built
	PORT NECHES	1117 PORT NECHES AVE	Commercial	Store	1920
	PORT NECHES	1303 PORT NECHES AVE	Commercial	Store	1925
	PORT NECHES	1309 PORT NECHES AVE	Commercial	Store	1920
	PORT NECHES	1826 NALL ST	Religious	Church	1950 (church), 1961 (education building)
B-i					
	BEAUMONT	Beaumont Country Club	Recreational	Golf course	1906 (course), 1965 (club house)
	BEAUMONT	Collier's Ferry Park	Transportation, Recreation	Park	1750-1980
	BEAUMONT	Pumping station	Agricultural, Public works	Pumping station	1935
	BEAUMONT	Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Extension Center	Agricultural, Educational	Experimental farm - barns, lab buildings, offices	1930 - 1980
	GROVES	Greenlawn Memorial Park	Funerary	Cemetery	1898-2020
	HAMSHIRE	Broussard Cemetery	Funerary	Cemetery	1861-2021
	NEDERLAND	Downtown Nederland	Recreational	Museum	1969
	PORT NECHES	Old Bluff Memorial Park	Funerary	Cemetery	1868-present
	PORT NECHES	River Front Park	Recreational	Park	1920 (park); 1985-1990 (La Maison Beausoleil moved)
B-ii					
	CHINA	305 BROADWAY ST	Governmental	Post office	1960
	GROVES	3901 CLEVELAND AVE	Educational	School	1948
	GROVES	3947 LINCOLN AVE	Governmental	Bank, City Hall	1950
	GROVES	6150 SHORT ST	Governmental	Fire station	1950
	GROVES	6400 VAN BUREN ST	Educational	School	1955
	HAMSHIRE	12702 2ND ST	Educational	School	1966
	NEDERLAND	200 N 17TH ST	Educational	School	1950
	NEDERLAND	200 S 6TH ST	Educational	School	1965
	NEDERLAND	2611 AVE H	Educational	School	1965
	NEDERLAND	2800 HELENA AVE	Educational	School	1965
	PORT NECHES	1522 HEISLER ST	Educational	School	1950
	PORT NECHES	2101 LLANO ST	Educational	School	1958
	PORT NECHES	2820 MERRIMAN ST	Educational	School	1958
B-iii					
	CHEEK	8600 BLOCK KIDD RD	Public works	Water tower	1975
	CHINA	305 BROADWAY ST	Governmental	Post office	1960
	CHINA	400 BLOCK N BROADWAY ST	Public works	Water tower	1978
	GROVES	5500 SONNIER LN	Public works	Water tower	1950
	GROVES	VINCENT DR	Public works	Water tower	1938
	NEDERLAND	1500 BOSTON AVE	Recreational (public)	Museum	1969
	NEDERLAND	3500 BLOCK CANAL AVE	Public works	Water tower	1978
	NEDERLAND	800 S 12TH ST	Educational	School	1939
	NEDERLAND	923 BOSTON AVE	Governmental	Library	1932
	NOME	1000 BLOCK N 3RD ST	Educational	School	1948
	NOME	1675 TEXAS ST	Recreational (public)	Scholl gymnasium	1937

Tier	City	District Name/ Address	Property Type(s)	Subtype(s)	Year(s) built
	PORT ARTHUR	1200 BLOCK HIGHWAY 365	Public works	Water tower	1965
	PORT NECHES	633 AVE C	Governmental	Jail	1920
C-i					
	BEVIL OAKS	River Oaks Ranchettes	Residential	Subdivision - single-family homes	1955-1975
	GROVES	Wynnewood Estates	Residential	Subdivision - single-family homes	1965-1970
	LABELLE	Duplantis Farmstead	Residential, Agricultural	Farmstead - single-family homes, outbuildings, cultural landscape	1886-1920
	NEDERLAND	College to Nederland	Residential	Subdivision - single-family homes	1930-1940
	NEDERLAND	College to Nederland Subdivision	Residential	Subdivision - single-family homes	1925-1935
	TAYLOR LANDING	Country Club Park Estates	Residential	Subdivision - single-family homes	1960-1995
C-ii					
	BEAUMONT	16435 OLD SOUR LAKE RD	Residential	Single-family house	1965
	BEAUMONT	2000 BLOCK YORKSHIRE RD	Residential	Single-family house	1920
	BEAUMONT	442 MEEKER RD	Residential	Cistern	1930
	BEAUMONT	495 WEST RD	Residential	Single-family house	1930
	BEAUMONT	7679 SHADY LN	Residential	Single-family house	1930
	BEAUMONT	790 TODD ST	Residential	Single-family house	1930
	BEAUMONT	827 HILLEBRANDT ACRES	Residential	Single-family house	1945
	BEAUMONT	8505 LABELLE RD	Residential	Single-family house	1910
	CHINA	110 BENOIT AVE	Residential	Single-family house	1905
	CHINA	200 BROADWAY ST	Residential	Train depot	1905
	CHINA	20921 HIGHWAY 90	Residential	Single-family house	1915
	CHINA	4017 CHINA N RD	Residential	Single-family house	1910
	CHINA	500 BLOCK MAINE W AVE	Residential	Store	1925
	CHINA	600 BLANCH RD	Residential	Single-family house	1899
	GROVES	4849 WILSON ST	Residential	Single-family house	1930
	GROVES	5000 MAIN AVE	Residential	Single-family house	1930
	GROVES	5600 MONROE BLVD	Residential	Single-family house	1935
	GROVES	5700 MONROE BLVD	Residential	Single-family house	1935
	GROVES	6170 WASHINGTON ST	Residential	Single-family house	1925
	GROVES	6246 JEFFERSON BLVD	Residential	Single-family house	1920
	GROVES	6301 JEFFERSON BLVD	Residential	Single-family house	1920
	GROVES	6498 JEFFERSON BLVD	Residential	Single-family house	1930
	GROVES	6523 JEFFERSON BLVD	Residential	Single-family house	1920
	HAMSHIRE	14876 BOONDOCKS RD	Residential	Single-family house	1920
	HAMSHIRE	15882 WISE RD	Residential	Single-family house	1910
	NEDERLAND	1143 JACKSON AVE	Residential	Duplex house	1930
	NEDERLAND	1298 DIXIE BLVD	Residential	Single-family house	1930
	NEDERLAND	1403 AVENUE H	Residential	Single-family house	1930
	NEDERLAND	1508 FRANKLIN AVE	Residential	Single-family house	1925
	NEDERLAND	203 N TWIN CITY HWY	Residential	Single-family house	1910
	NEDERLAND	2304 AVE B	Residential	Single-family house	1920
	NEDERLAND	319 15TH ST	Residential	Single-family house	1920
	NEDERLAND	904 S 12TH ST	Residential	Single-family house	1930
	NOME	1460 2ND ST	Residential	Single-family house	1910
	NOME	1669 AVE C	Residential	Single-family house	1920
	PORT NECHES	1013 WAGNER ST	Residential	Single-family house	1925
	PORT NECHES	1030 MARION ST	Residential	Single-family house	1925
	PORT NECHES	1105 GRIGSBY AVE	Residential	Single-family house	1925
	PORT NECHES	2450 MERRIMAN ST	Residential	Single-family house	1935

Tier	City	District Name/ Address	Property Type(s)	Subtype(s)	Year(s) built
	PORT NECHES	2901 MERRIMAN ST	Residential	Single-family house	1925
	PORT NECHES	326 AVE D	Residential	Single-family house	1910
	PORT NECHES	805 MONTGOMERY ST	Residential	Single-family house	1925
	TAYLOR LANDING	206 GREENWOOD DR	Residential	Single-family house	1962
	VITERBO	13023 WEST PORT ARTHUR RD	Residential	Single-family house	1900
	WINNIE	15532 BRUSH ISLAND RD	Residential	Single-family house	1900