

**Branch Forbes Road
South of US 92 to North of I-4
Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study**

Cultural Resource Assessment Survey

Work Program Item Segment No. 447159-1
Federal Project No. D721 009 B
ETDM Project No. 14470
Hillsborough County, Florida



Florida Department of Transportation
District 7

October 2024

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) pursuant to 23 U.S.C. § 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated May 26, 2022, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration and FDOT.

**Branch Forbes Road
South of US 92 to North of I-4
Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study**

Cultural Resource Assessment Survey

Work Program Item Segment No. 447159-1
Federal Project No. D721 009 B
ETDM Project No. 14470
Hillsborough County, Florida

Prepared for:



Florida Department of Transportation
District Seven

Prepared by:
Conzor Engineers, LLC
20162 Cortez Boulevard
Brooksville, FL 34601

and

SEARCH
3117 Edgewater Drive
Orlando, FL 32804
www.SEARCHINC.com

Kristina Altes, Ph.D., RPA
Principal Investigator, Archaeology

Kate Willis, MSP
Principal Investigator, Architectural History

October 2024

This page intentionally left blank.

**CULTURAL RESOURCE ASSESSMENT SURVEY FOR THE
BRANCH FORBES ROAD PONDS
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENT STUDY,
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA**

CONSULTANT:	SEARCH 3117 Edgewater Drive; Orlando, FL 32804
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR, ARCHAEOLOGY:	Kristina Altes, PhD, RPA
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR, ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY:	Kate Willis, MPS
CLIENT:	Conсор and Florida Department of Transportation District 7
DATE:	October 2024
WORK PROGRAM ITEM SEGMENT #:	447159-1-32-01
SEARCH PROJECT #:	T21123

This report details the results of a cultural resource assessment survey (CRAS) of four preferred pond locations in Hillsborough County, Florida. The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) District 7 is proposing to construct three stormwater management facilities (SMFs 2B, 3C, and 7B) and one floodplain compensation (FPC) site (FPC 1A) associated with improvements along Branch Forbes Road (**Figure 1**). The current project is within the area of potential effects (APE) of a 2024 SEARCH survey titled *Branch Forbes Road South of US 92 to North of I-4 Project Development & Environment Study, Cultural Resource Assessment Survey* (Florida Master Site File [FMSF] Survey Number [No.] TBD). The current study is limited to archaeological and architectural history survey of the pond locations. The total area tested for the current survey is 4.03 acres (ac; 1.63 hectares [ha]). The architectural survey for the project utilized standard procedures for locating, investigating, and recording historic properties. In addition to a search of the FMSF for previously recorded historic resources within the project area, USGS quadrangle maps were reviewed for structures built prior to 1979. The discussions of regional precontact and postcontact history, historic map and aerial review, research design, and laboratory and field methods provided in the previous report apply to the current CRAS and are not repeated in this report.

The APE defines the area within which the proposed work and subsequent maintenance may cause physical, visual, audible, and atmospheric effects to historic properties. The archaeological APE defined for this project includes the proposed pond footprints. The architectural history APE includes the archaeological APE and was expanded to include a buffer of 30.5 meters (m; 100.0 feet [ft]; **Figure 2**). In this document, “APE” refers to the combined archaeological APE and architectural history APE.

The purpose of the survey was to locate, identify, and bound any archaeological resources, historic structures, and potential districts within the project's APE and to assess their potential for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). This study was conducted to comply with Public Law 113-287 (Title 54 U.S.C.), which incorporates the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, and the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974, as amended. The study also meets the regulations for implementing NHPA Section 106 found in 36 CFR Part 800 (*Protection of Historic Properties*). This study also complies with Chapter 267 of the Florida Statutes and Rule Chapter 1A-46, Florida Administrative Code. All work was performed in accordance with Part 2, Chapter 8, of the FDOT's Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Manual (revised July 2023) and with the Florida Division of Historical Resources' (FDHR) recommendations for such projects as stipulated in the FDHR's *Cultural Resource Management Standards & Operations Manual, Module Three: Guidelines for Use by Historic Preservation Professionals*. The principal investigator for this project meets the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation* (48 FR 44716-42).

ENVIRONMENT AND MODERN CONDITIONS

Geologically, the APE is in the transitional area between the Southwestern Flatwoods and Ocala Uplift physiographic districts, as defined by Brooks (1981). The Southwestern Flatwoods district is a province of Miocene and Pliocene sedimentary rocks and sediments with thin to absent Quarternary deposits. The Ocala Uplift district is a "Lime Sink Region" with early Tertiary limestones at or near the surface in most places and low rolling limestone plains (Brooks 1981). Elevations within the APE range from approximately 28 m (91 ft) above mean sea level at Pond SMF 7B in the northern part of the project to 37 m (120 ft) at Pond SMF 2B in the southern part. Mapped soils within the study area range from moderately well-drained in Ponds SMF 2B and FPC 1A to excessively drained in Ponds SMF 7B and 3C to the north (see **Table 1**; **Figure 3**).

Table 1. Soil Conditions within the APE.

Area Name	Size (ac)	Soil Drainage	Soil Type
SMF 2B	1.28	Moderately well-drained	Archbold Fine Sand; Tavares-Millhopper Fine Sands, 0 to 5% slopes
SMF 3C	0.79	Excessively Drained	Lake Fine Sand, 0 to 5% slopes
SMF 7B	0.71	Excessively drained	Lake Fine Sand, 0 to 5% slopes
FPC 1A	1.25	Moderately well-drained	Travares-Millhopper Fine Sands, 0 to 5% slopes




Figure 1. Location of the project in Hillsborough County, Florida.




Figure 2. Topographic map of the APE.




Figure 3. Soil drainage within the APE.

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE REVIEW

SEARCH reviewed the FMSF database (updated July 2024), which indicates that 14 cultural resource surveys have been completed within 1.6 km (1.0 mi) of the APE (not including the 2024 SEARCH CRAS of the Branch Forbes Road PD&E corridor). Of these, three are intersected by the current APE (Table 2; Figure 4).

Table 2. Previous Cultural Resources Assessment Surveys Intersected by the APE.

FMSF No.	Title	Year	Consultant/Author	Location
3543	<i>A Cultural Resource Assessment Survey US 92 (SR 600) Improvements Project from Garden Lane to County Line Road Hillsborough County, Florida [3 Volumes]</i>	1993	Almy et al.	SMF 2B FPC 1A
26284	<i>Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Update, SR 600 (US 92) PD&E Study Re-Evaluation from East of I-4 to East of County Line Road in Hillsborough County, Florida</i>	2016a	ACI	SMF 2B FPC 1A
28189	<i>CRAS Technical Memorandum Proposed Stormwater Management Facilities (SMF) and Floodplain Compensation (FPC) Sites SR 600 (US 92) from East of I-4 to East of County Line Road, Hillsborough County, Florida; WPIS No: 435749-1</i>	2016b	ACI	FPC 1A
TBD	<i>Branch Forbes Road South of US 92 to North of I-4 Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study Cultural Resource Assessment Survey</i>	2024	Altes and Willis	SMF 2B SMF 3C SMF 7B

FMSF Survey No. 3543 is a cultural resource assessment survey (CRAS) of US 92 (SR 600) that was completed by Archaeological Consultants, Inc. (ACI) (Almy et al. 1993). Although the current study area was identified as an area of low to moderate archaeological potential, further review of the FMSF documentation suggests the survey did not include shovel testing in the pond footprints. The survey resulted in the identification of 164 historic buildings and 13 archaeological sites, none of which are within the current APE.

FMSF Survey No. 26284 is a CRAS of US 92 (SR 600) that was completed by ACI in 2016. The survey included the excavation of 41 shovel tests within the US 92 (SR 600) right-of-way and resulted in the identification of 511 architectural resources, none of which are within the current APE. Review of the FMSF documentation suggests the survey did not include shovel testing in the current pond footprints.

FMSF Survey No. 28189 is a pond addendum to FMSF Survey No. 26284 that was completed by ACI in 2016. The survey included the excavation of 125 shovel tests in pond and drainage sites along US 192 (SR 600), including three negative tests within or near FPC 1A in the current APE. The survey resulted in the identification of one archaeological site and 59 architectural resources, none of which are within the current APE.




Figure 4. Previous cultural resource surveys within 1.6 km (1.0 mi) of the APE.

The FMSF review further indicates that 12 archaeological sites, 104 historic buildings (as well as five buildings recorded as “destroyed” in the FMSF), one historic bridge, two historic cemeteries, and nine resource groups have been identified within 1.6 km (1.0 mi) of the APE (**Figure 5**). Of these, one archaeological site (8HI05064) has been identified within the APE at Pond SMF 7B in the northern part of the project.



ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCE POTENTIAL

The potential to identify Native American sites within the archaeological APE was based on an examination of environmental variables (soil drainage, access to streams and other freshwater resources, and relative elevation), the results of previously conducted surveys, and the examination of historic maps and aerial photographs. As noted above, archaeological sites have been previously recorded within or near Ponds SMF 2B and SMF 7B. These are the areas with highest potential for containing archaeological deposits (**Figure 6**). The highest potential for archaeological sites was judged to be those areas with moderately to well-drained soils within 100 m (328 ft) of a natural freshwater source, such as Spartman Branch. Areas with moderately well-drained soils or those that are 100 to 300 m (328 to 984 ft) from water were considered to have moderate potential for archaeological sites. Areas with poorly drained soils or those that are more than 300 m (984 ft) from water were considered to have low potential for archaeological sites. Areas that have clearly been disturbed by previous development (e.g., paved areas) were also considered to have low potential for archaeological sites.

The areas with the highest probability of containing historic archaeological or architectural resources were judged to be those where the APE extends onto parcels with previously recorded historic resources or unrecorded historic buildings. These areas were identified through review of the property appraiser database and historic maps and aerial photographs.




Figure 5. Previously recorded cultural resources within 1.6 km (1.0 mi) of the APE.




Figure 6. Archaeological probability model.

PROCEDURES TO DEAL WITH UNEXPECTED DISCOVERIES

SEARCH has made a reasonable and good-faith effort during this investigation to identify and evaluate possible locations of precontact and historic archaeological sites; however, the possibility exists that evidence of cultural resources may yet be encountered within the project limits. Should evidence of unrecorded cultural resources be discovered during construction activities, work in that portion of the project area must stop. Evidence of cultural resources includes precontact Native American or historic pottery, precontact stone tools, bone or shell tools, historic trash pits, and historic building foundations. Should such materials be uncovered during the excavation of the APE, representatives of FDOT District 7 will assist in the identification and preliminary assessment of the materials. If such evidence is found, the FDHR will be notified within two working days.


In the unlikely event that human skeletal remains or associated burial artifacts are uncovered within the project area, all work in that area must stop. The FDOT District 7 cultural resources coordinator must be contacted. The discovery must be reported to local law enforcement, who will in turn contact the medical examiner. The medical examiner will determine whether the state archaeologist should be contacted per the requirements of Chapter 872.05, Florida Statutes.

CLG CONSULTATION AND INFORMANT INTERVIEWS

The project is in unincorporated Hillsborough County, which is a certified local government (CLG). SEARCH archaeologist Kristina Altes, PhD, RPA, initiated consultation with Ms. Colleen Marshall, executive planner and the CLG representative for the county, to discuss the project and inquire whether the county might have concerns related to cultural resources associated with the project. In the email, Dr. Altes provided the project map to Ms. Marshall for review. As of the submittal of this report, the county has not responded with concerns about the project.

SURVEY RESULTS

Archaeology Results






Figure 7. Results of the archaeological survey.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



Figure 8. Existing conditions within Pond SMF 2B. Left: typical soil profile within the pond area. Right: environmental overview within Pond SMF 7B, view west.



Figure 9. Existing conditions within Pond SMF 3C. Left: environmental overview of the pond area, view southwest. Right: environmental overview of the pond area, view northwest.



Figure 10. Existing conditions within Pond SMF 7B. Left: typical soil profile within the pond area. Right: environmental overview within Pond SMF 7B, view west.



Newly Recorded Site




[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



ARCHITECTURE RESULTS

The architectural survey resulted in the identification and evaluation of one newly recorded historic structure (8HI15783) within the APE (**Figure 12**; **Table 4**). The resource lacks the architectural distinction and significant historical associations necessary to be considered for listing in the NRHP and are recommended ineligible. Ineligible resources do not require consideration of effects per *Section 267.061(2)(a)*, Florida Statutes, and the criteria of adverse effect are not applicable to ineligible resources per *36 CFR 800.5(a)* and *36 CFR Part 800.16 (i and j)*. No existing or potential historic districts were identified. No further architectural history survey is recommended.

The completed FMSF forms for the newly recorded resource (8HI15783) is provided in **Attachment 1**. A survey log sheet is included in **Attachment 2**.

Table 4. Historic Resources Recorded within the Forbes Road Ponds APE.

Pond	Resource	Name/Address	Style	Year Built	Recommended NRHP Status
SMF 3C	8HI15783	5109 Glen Harwell Road	Ranch	ca. 1959	Ineligible




Figure 12. Architectural history results.

NRHP EVALUATIONS

Pond SMF 2B

No historic architectural resources were identified within the APE surrounding Pond SMF 2B.

Pond SMF 3C

Resource 8HI15783, 5109 Glen Harwell Road

Resource 8HI15783, at 5109 Glen Harwell Road, is a newly recorded residence in Section 27 of Township 28 South, Range 21 East, as depicted on the 2024 *Plant City West, Fla.* USGS quadrangle map. The circa (ca.) 1959 building is on a rectangular parcel on the south side of Glen Harwell Road, with Branch Forbes Road to the east, Keene Drive to the south, and Rogers Road to the west (see **Figure 12**). Resource 8HI15783 is a one-story, irregular-plan, Ranch-style residence set on a concrete slab foundation (**Figure 13**). The exterior fabric of the building consists of concrete block. The residence is heavily obscured by mature vegetation and a metal privacy fence. The visible windows include metal-sash six-over-six and metal-sash eight-over-eight windows, individual and paired. The remaining windows are obscured from the right-of-way. The main entrance is on the north façade and consists of a wood-frame door with a half-light. A shed extension overhang porch, which is supported by wooden beams, shelters the main entrance. A screened-in porch projects from the west façade of the residence, and details are obscured by a wooden privacy fence. The hipped roof is clad in asphalt shingles. A chain-link metal fence surrounds the perimeter of the property.

Assessment

Based on the historic context, Resource 8HI15783 is not significant under NRHP Criterion A because it is not indicative of a particular era and is not associated with any significant period, event, or theme. The resource is not eligible under Criterion B because it lacks association with any person(s) significant in history. The resource is not eligible under Criterion C due to its lack of architectural distinction. Ranch-style residential buildings are common across Florida and throughout the US. Finally, Resource 8HI15783 is not significant under Criterion D because it lacks the potential to yield further information of historical importance. Therefore, Resource 8HI15783 is not eligible for listing in the NRHP, either individually or as a contributor to a historic district.



Figure 13. Resource 8HI15783, view facing southeast.

Pond SMF 7B

No historic architectural resources were identified within the APE surrounding Pond SMF 7B.


Pond FPC 1A

No historic architectural resources were identified within the APE surrounding Pond FPC 1A.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report details the results of a CRAS of four preferred pond locations in Hillsborough County, Florida. FDOT District 7 is proposing to construct three SMFs (SMFs 2B, 3C, and 7B) and one FPC (FPC 1A) site associated with improvements along Branch Forbes Road. The current project is within the APE of a 2024 SEARCH survey titled *Branch Forbes Road South of US 92 to North of I-4 Project Development & Environment Study, Cultural Resource Assessment Survey* (FMSF Survey No. TBD). The current study is limited to archaeological and architectural history survey of the pond locations. The total area tested for the current survey is 4.03 ac (1.63 ha).

The current archaeological survey included the excavation of 20 shovel tests within the proposed



Archaeological survey of Pond SMF 3C was not possible due to lack of parcel access. If Pond SMF 3C is selected for construction, archaeological survey, including shovel testing, is recommended.

The architectural survey resulted in the identification and evaluation of one newly recorded historic structure (8HI15783) within the APE. The resource identified lacks the architectural distinction and significant historical associations necessary to be considered for listing in the NRHP and is recommended ineligible. No existing or potential historic districts were identified. No further architectural history survey is recommended.

REFERENCES CITED

- Almy, Marion, Joan G Deming, Francesca Moran Fiore, and Rebecca Spain Schwarz
1993 *A Cultural Resource Assessment Survey US 92 (SR 600) Improvements Project from Garden Lane to County Line Road Hillsborough County, Florida [3 Volumes]*. FMSF Survey No. 3543, submitted by Archaeological Consultants, Inc. On file, Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- Altes, Kristina, and Kate Willis
2024 *Branch Forbes Road South of US 92 to North of I-4 Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study Cultural Resource Assessment Survey*. FMSF Survey No. TBD, submitted by SEARCH.
- Archaeological Consultants, Inc. (ACI)
2016a *Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Update, SR 600 (US 92) PD&E Study Re-Evaluation from East of I-4 to East of County Line Road in Hillsborough County, Florida*. FMSF Survey No. 26284. On file, Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
2016b *CRAS Technical Memorandum Proposed Stormwater Management Facilities (SMF) and Floodplain Compensation (FPC) Sites SR 600 (US 92) from East of I-4 to East of County Line Road, Hillsborough County, Florida; WPIS No: 435749-1*. FMSF Survey No. 28189. On file, Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- Brooks, H.K.
1981 *Guide to the Physiographic Divisions of Florida*. Florida Cooperative Extension Service. University of Florida, Gainesville.
- Estabrook, Richard W., Charles E. Fuhrmeister, and Janus Research/Piper Archaeology
1992 *A Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the Interstate 4 Improvements Project Right-of-Way from 50th Street to the Hillsborough/Polk County Line, Hillsborough County, Florida*. FMSF Survey No. 3243, submitted by Janus Research/Piper Archaeology. On file, Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

This page intentionally left blank.

ATTACHMENT 1:
FMSF RESOURCE FORMS

the 1990s, the number of people in the UK who are aged 65 and over has increased by 1.5 million, and the number of people aged 75 and over has increased by 1.1 million (Office of National Statistics 1999). The number of people aged 65 and over is projected to increase to 10.5 million by 2026, and the number of people aged 75 and over to 6.5 million (Office of National Statistics 1999).

There is a growing awareness of the need to develop strategies to meet the needs of the ageing population. The Department of Health (1999) has published a strategy for ageing, which sets out the government's commitment to improve the lives of older people. The strategy is based on three main principles: (1) to ensure that older people are able to live independently and actively; (2) to ensure that older people are able to access the services and support they need; and (3) to ensure that older people are able to participate in the decisions that affect their lives.

The strategy is based on the following assumptions: (1) that older people are a diverse group with different needs and interests; (2) that older people are able to live independently and actively; (3) that older people are able to access the services and support they need; and (4) that older people are able to participate in the decisions that affect their lives. The strategy is based on the following principles: (1) to ensure that older people are able to live independently and actively; (2) to ensure that older people are able to access the services and support they need; and (3) to ensure that older people are able to participate in the decisions that affect their lives.

The strategy is based on the following principles: (1) to ensure that older people are able to live independently and actively; (2) to ensure that older people are able to access the services and support they need; and (3) to ensure that older people are able to participate in the decisions that affect their lives. The strategy is based on the following principles: (1) to ensure that older people are able to live independently and actively; (2) to ensure that older people are able to access the services and support they need; and (3) to ensure that older people are able to participate in the decisions that affect their lives.

The strategy is based on the following principles: (1) to ensure that older people are able to live independently and actively; (2) to ensure that older people are able to access the services and support they need; and (3) to ensure that older people are able to participate in the decisions that affect their lives. The strategy is based on the following principles: (1) to ensure that older people are able to live independently and actively; (2) to ensure that older people are able to access the services and support they need; and (3) to ensure that older people are able to participate in the decisions that affect their lives.

The strategy is based on the following principles: (1) to ensure that older people are able to live independently and actively; (2) to ensure that older people are able to access the services and support they need; and (3) to ensure that older people are able to participate in the decisions that affect their lives. The strategy is based on the following principles: (1) to ensure that older people are able to live independently and actively; (2) to ensure that older people are able to access the services and support they need; and (3) to ensure that older people are able to participate in the decisions that affect their lives.

The strategy is based on the following principles: (1) to ensure that older people are able to live independently and actively; (2) to ensure that older people are able to access the services and support they need; and (3) to ensure that older people are able to participate in the decisions that affect their lives. The strategy is based on the following principles: (1) to ensure that older people are able to live independently and actively; (2) to ensure that older people are able to access the services and support they need; and (3) to ensure that older people are able to participate in the decisions that affect their lives.

The strategy is based on the following principles: (1) to ensure that older people are able to live independently and actively; (2) to ensure that older people are able to access the services and support they need; and (3) to ensure that older people are able to participate in the decisions that affect their lives. The strategy is based on the following principles: (1) to ensure that older people are able to live independently and actively; (2) to ensure that older people are able to access the services and support they need; and (3) to ensure that older people are able to participate in the decisions that affect their lives.

2 positive shovel tests 12.5-m apart, 50 cm diameter, to 100 cmbs, 1/4" screen

artifacts from 40-60 cmbs

The difference in elevation between the two positive shovel tests combined with the difference in stratum appearance from which artifacts were recovered suggest the site was used more than once over time.

in proposed pond footprint

A - category always collected
S - some items in category collected
O - observed first hand, but not collected
R - collected and subsequently left at site
I - informant reported category present
U - unknown

The artifact assemblage consists of two lithic flakes made of coastal plain chert.

2) [redacted] [redacted]

1

Plan at 1:3,600 or larger. Show boundaries, scale, north arrow, test/collection units, landmarks and date.

the 1990s, the number of people in the UK who are aged 65 and over has increased by 1.5 million (1990–2000) and is projected to increase by a further 1.5 million by 2020 (Office for National Statistics 2001). The number of people aged 65 and over who are living alone has increased from 1.1 million in 1990 to 1.5 million in 2000 (Office for National Statistics 2001). The number of people aged 65 and over who are living alone is projected to increase to 2.0 million by 2020 (Office for National Statistics 2001).

There is a growing awareness of the need to address the needs of older people living alone. The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority. The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority. The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority.

The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority. The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority. The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority.

The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority. The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority. The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority.

The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority. The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority. The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority.

The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority. The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority. The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority.

The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority. The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority. The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority.

The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority. The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority. The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority.

The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority. The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority. The Department of Health (2000) has identified the need to address the needs of older people living alone as a priority.

☒ Original
☐ Update



HISTORICAL STRUCTURE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 5.0 3/19

Site#8 **HI15783**
 Field Date 5-9-2024
 Form Date 9-12-2024
 Recorder # _____

Shaded Fields represent the minimum acceptable level of documentation.
 Consult the Guide to Historical Structure Forms for detailed instructions.

Site Name(s) (address if none) 5109 Glen Harwell Rd. Multiple Listing (DHR only) _____
 Survey Project Name Branch Forbes Road Ponds PD&E Survey # (DHR only) _____
 National Register Category (please check one) ☒ building ☐ structure ☐ district ☐ site ☐ object
 Ownership: ☐ private-profit ☐ private-nonprofit ☒ private-individual ☐ private-nonspecific ☐ city ☐ county ☐ state ☐ federal ☐ Native American ☐ foreign ☐ unknown

LOCATION & MAPPING

Street Number 5109 Direction _____ Street Name Glen Harwell Street Type Road Suffix Direction _____
 Address: 5109 Glen Harwell Road
 Cross Streets (nearest / between) N Branch Forbes Rd. & Keene Dr.
 USGS 7.5 Map Name PLANT CITY WEST USGS Date 2024 Plat or Other Map _____
 City / Town (within 3 miles) Plant City In City Limits? ☒ yes ☐ no ☐ unknown County _____
 Township 28S Range 31E Section 27 ¼ section: ☐ NW ☐ SW ☐ SE ☐ NE Irregular-name: _____
 Tax Parcel # 082364-0000 Landgrant _____
 Subdivision Name _____ Block _____ Lot _____
 UTM Coordinates: Zone ☐ 16 ☐ 17 Easting ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Northing ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
 Other Coordinates: X: _____ Y: _____ Coordinate System & Datum _____
 Name of Public Tract (e.g., park) _____

HISTORY

Construction Year: 1959 ☒ approximately ☐ year listed or earlier ☐ year listed or later
 Original Use Private Residence (House/Cottage/Ca From (year): 1959 To (year): 2024
 Current Use Private Residence (House/Cottage/Ca From (year): 1959 To (year): 2024
 Other Use _____ From (year): _____ To (year): _____
 Moves: ☐ yes ☒ no ☐ unknown Date: _____ Original address _____
 Alterations: ☒ yes ☐ no ☐ unknown Date: _____ Nature updates; Date: UNKN
 Additions: ☒ yes ☐ no ☐ unknown Date: _____ Nature enclosed carport addition; Date: 1983
 Architect (last name first): UNKN Builder (last name first): UNKN
 Ownership History (especially original owner, dates, profession, etc.)
 Current Owner: Randy Lee Jones

Is the Resource Affected by a Local Preservation Ordinance? ☐ yes ☐ no ☒ unknown Describe _____

DESCRIPTION

Style Ranch Exterior Plan Irregular Number of Stories 1
 Exterior Fabric(s) 1. Concrete block 2. _____ 3. _____
 Roof Type(s) 1. Hip 2. _____ 3. _____
 Roof Material(s) 1. Asphalt shingles 2. _____ 3. _____
 Roof secondary strucs. (dormers etc.) 1. Not applicable 2. _____
 Windows (types, materials, etc.)
6/6 & 8/8 metal SHS, paired and individual
 Distinguishing Architectural Features (exterior or interior ornaments)
screened-in porch/carport addition W facade
 Ancillary Features / Outbuildings (record outbuildings, major landscape features; use continuation sheet if needed.)
heavy vegetation, chain-link fence

DHR USE ONLY

OFFICIAL EVALUATION

DHR USE ONLY

NR List Date _____	SHPO – Appears to meet criteria for NR listing: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient info Date _____ Init. _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Owner Objection	KEEPER – Determined eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no Date _____
	NR Criteria for Evaluation: <input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c <input type="checkbox"/> d (see <i>National Register Bulletin 15</i> , p. 2)

DESCRIPTION (continued)

Chimney: No. 0 Chimney Material(s): 1. Not applicable 2. _____Structural System(s): 1. Concrete block 2. _____ 3. _____Foundation Type(s): 1. Slab 2. _____Foundation Material(s): 1. Concrete, Generic 2. _____

Main Entrance (stylistic details)

wood frame door w/ half-light N facade

Porch Descriptions (types, locations, roof types, etc.)

shed extension porch supported by wooden beams N facade

Condition (overall resource condition): ☒ excellent ☐ good ☐ fair ☐ deteriorated ☐ ruinous

Narrative Description of Resource

Resource 8HI15783 is a 1-story, Ranch residence with an irregular plan set at grade on a concrete slab foundation. Asphalt Shingles clad the hipped roof and the walls are concrete block.

Archaeological Remains _____ ☐ Check if Archaeological Form Completed

RESEARCH METHODS (select all that apply)

☒ FMSF record search (sites/surveys)☒ library research☐ building permits☐ Sanborn maps☐ FL State Archives/photo collection☐ city directory☐ occupant/owner interview☐ plat maps☒ property appraiser / tax records☐ newspaper files☐ neighbor interview☐ Public Lands Survey (DEP)☒ cultural resource survey (CRAS)☐ historic photos☐ interior inspection☐ HABS/HAER record search☒ other methods (describe) Pedestrian/Windshield Survey

Bibliographic References (give FMSF manuscript # if relevant, use continuation sheet if needed)

OPINION OF RESOURCE SIGNIFICANCE

Appears to meet the criteria for National Register listing individually?

☐ yes☒ no☐ insufficient information

Appears to meet the criteria for National Register listing as part of a district?

☐ yes☒ no☐ insufficient information

Explanation of Evaluation (required, whether significant or not; use separate sheet if needed)

Due to lack of sufficient historic significance and architectural distinction, 8HI15783 is ineligible for listing in the NRHP, either individually or as a contributing resource within a potential or existing historic district.

Area(s) of Historical Significance (see *National Register Bulletin 15*, p. 8 for categories: e.g. "architecture", "ethnic heritage", "community planning & development", etc.)

1. _____ 3. _____ 5. _____

2. _____ 4. _____ 6. _____

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File - including field notes, analysis notes, photos, plans and other important documents

Document type All materials at one location Maintaining organization Southeastern Archaeological Research1) Document description Photos, Maps, Field Notes, Aerials File or accession #'s _____

2) Document type _____ Maintaining organization _____

Document description _____ File or accession #'s _____

RECORDER INFORMATION

Recorder Name Bonatakis, Mary Affiliation Southeastern Archaeological ResearchRecorder Contact Information 3117 Edgewater Dr, Orlando, FL 32804/407-236-7711/Mary.Bonatakis@searchinc.
(address / phone / fax / e-mail)

Required Attachments

① USGS 7.5' MAP WITH STRUCTURE LOCATION CLEARLY INDICATED

② LARGE SCALE STREET, PLAT OR PARCEL MAP (available from most property appraiser web sites)

③ PHOTO OF MAIN FACADE, DIGITAL IMAGE FILE

When submitting an image, it must be included in digital AND hard copy format (plain paper grayscale acceptable).

Digital image must be at least 1600 x 1200 pixels, 24-bit color, jpeg or tiff.




8HI15783_a Facing SE



8HI15783_b Facing S



8HI15783_c Facing SE



☐ APE

◆ Newly Recorded Historic Structure


☐ SMF Footprint

☐ FPC Footprint

0 100 0 200
Meters Feet

Esri World Imagery (2023)





□ APE

◆ Newly Recorded Historic Structure

■ SMF Footprint

■ FPC Footprint

0 100
Meters

0 200
Feet

USGS US Topo Basemap



ATTACHMENT 2:
FDHR SURVEY LOG

Ent D (FMSF only) _____



Survey Log Sheet

Florida Master Site File
Version 5.0 3/19

Survey # (FMSF only) _____

Consult *Guide to the Survey Log Sheet* for detailed instructions.

Manuscript Information

Survey Project (name and project phase)

Forbes Road Ponds Phase I

Report Title (exactly as on title page)

Cultural Resource Assessment Survey for the Branch Forbes Road Ponds Project Development and Environment Study, Hillsborough County, Florida

Report Authors (as on title page)

1. Kristina Altes

3. _____

2. Kate Willis

4. _____

Publication Year 2024Number of Pages in Report (do not include site forms) 25

Publication Information (Give series, number in series, publisher and city. For article or chapter, cite page numbers. Use the style of *American Antiquity*.)

On file at SEARCH, Orlando, FL. Project No. T21123

Supervisors of Fieldwork (even if same as author) Names Tim Parsons

Affiliation of Fieldworkers: Organization Southeastern Archaeological ResearchCity Orlando

Key Words/Phrases (Don't use county name, or common words like *archaeology*, *structure*, *survey*, *architecture*, etc.)

1. FDOT

3. _____

5. _____

7. _____

2. ponds

4. _____

6. _____

8. _____

Survey Sponsors (corporation, government unit, organization, or person funding fieldwork)

Name Lisa QuinnOrganization Florida Dept of Transportation - District 7Address/Phone/E-mail 11701 N McKinley Dr, Tampa, FL 33612/813-975-6637/lisa.quinn@dot.stateRecorder of Log Sheet Kristina AltesDate Log Sheet Completed 9-18-2024Is this survey or project a continuation of a previous project? ☐ No ☒ Yes:

Previous survey #s (FMSF only) _____

Project Area Mapping

Counties (select every county in which field survey was done; attach additional sheet if necessary)

1. Hillsborough

3. _____

5. _____

2. _____

4. _____

6. _____

USGS 1:24,000 Map Names/Year of Latest Revision (attach additional sheet if necessary)

1. Name PLANT CITY WESTYear 2024

4. Name _____

Year _____

2. Name _____

Year _____

5. Name _____

Year _____

3. Name _____

Year _____

6. Name _____

Year _____

Field Dates and Project Area Description

Fieldwork Dates: Start 8-26-2024 End 8-28-2024 Total Area Surveyed (fill in one) _____ hectares 15.33 acresNumber of Distinct Tracts or Areas Surveyed 4

If Corridor (fill in one for each) Width: _____ meters _____ feet

Length: _____ kilometers _____ miles

Research and Field Methods

Types of Survey (select all that apply): ☒ archaeological ☒ architectural ☐ historical/archival ☐ underwater
☐ damage assessment ☐ monitoring report ☐ other(describe): _____

Scope/Intensity/Procedures

pedestrian inspection; shovel testing at 25- and 50-m intervals, 50 cm diameter, to 100 cmbs, 1/4" screen

Preliminary Methods (select as many as apply to the project as a whole)

☐ Florida Archives (Gray Building) ☐ library research- local public ☒ local property or tax records ☒ other historic maps ☐ LIDAR
☐ Florida Photo Archives (Gray Building) ☐ library-special collection ☐ newspaper files ☒ soils maps or data ☐ other remote sensing
☒ Site File property search ☐ Public Lands Survey (maps at DEP) ☒ literature search ☐ windshield survey
☒ Site File survey search ☐ local informant(s) ☐ Sanborn Insurance maps ☒ aerial photography
☐ other (describe): _____

Archaeological Methods (select as many as apply to the project as a whole)

☐ Check here if **NO** archaeological methods were used.
☐ surface collection, controlled ☐ shovel test-other screen size ☐ block excavation (at least 2x2 m) ☐ metal detector
☐ surface collection, uncontrolled ☐ water screen ☐ soil resistivity ☐ other remote sensing
☒ shovel test-1/4"screen ☐ posthole tests ☐ magnetometer ☒ pedestrian survey
☐ shovel test-1/8" screen ☐ auger tests ☐ side scan sonar ☐ unknown
☐ shovel test 1/16"screen ☐ coring ☐ ground penetrating radar (GPR)
☐ shovel test-unscreened ☐ test excavation (at least 1x2 m) ☐ LIDAR
☐ other (describe): _____

Historical/Architectural Methods (select as many as apply to the project as a whole)

☐ Check here if **NO** historical/architectural methods were used.
☐ building permits ☐ demolition permits ☐ neighbor interview ☐ subdivision maps
☐ commercial permits ☐ windshield survey ☐ occupant interview ☒ tax records
☐ interior documentation ☒ local property records ☐ occupation permits ☐ unknown
☒ other (describe): pedestrian inspection

Survey Results

Resource Significance Evaluated? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Count of Previously Recorded Resources 0 Count of Newly Recorded Resources 2

List Previously Recorded Site ID#s with Site File Forms Completed (attach additional pages if necessary)

List Newly Recorded Site ID#s (attach additional pages if necessary)

HI15778, HI15783

Site Forms Used: ☐ Site File Paper Forms ☒ Site File PDF Forms


REQUIRED: Attach Map of Survey or Project Area Boundary

SHPO USE ONLY

SHPO USE ONLY

SHPO USE ONLY

Origin of Report: ☐ 872 ☐ Public Lands ☐ UW ☐ 1A32 # _____ ☐ Academic ☐ Contract ☐ Avocational
☐ Grant Project # _____ ☐ Compliance Review: CRAT # _____
 Type of Document: ☐ Archaeological Survey ☐ Historical/Architectural Survey ☐ Marine Survey ☐ Cell Tower CRAS ☐ Monitoring Report
☐ Overview ☐ Excavation Report ☐ Multi-Site Excavation Report ☐ Structure Detailed Report ☐ Library, Hist. or Archival Doc
☐ Desktop Analysis ☐ MPS ☐ MRA ☐ TG ☐ Other: _____
 Document Destination: Plottable Projects Plotability: _____



☐ APE

☐ SMF Footprint

☐ FPC Footprint

0 100
Meters

0 200
Feet

USGS US Topo Basemap

