



Project Development & Environment Study

I-75 (SR 93A)

From Moccasin Wallow Road (CR 6)
to South of US Highway 301 (SR 43)

Final Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Report

WPI Segment No.: 419235 2
Manatee & Hillsborough Counties

Prepared for the

**Florida Department of Transportation
District Seven**



October 2009

**Manuel Santos, E.I.
FDOT Project Manager**



Project Development & Environment Study

I-75 (SR 93A)
From Moccasin Wallow Road (CR 6)
to South of US Highway 301 (SR 43)

Final Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Report

WPI Segment No.: 419235 2
Manatee & Hillsborough Counties

Prepared for the

**Florida Department of Transportation
District Seven**



Prepared by:
**American Consulting Engineers of Florida, LLC and
Archaeological Consultants, Inc.**



18250 North US Highway 41 Lutz, FL 33549

October 2009

Manuel Santos, E.I.
FDOT Project Manager

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) is conducting a Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study to evaluate capacity improvements along approximately 25 miles of Interstate 75 (I-75) (State Road (SR) 93A) from Moccasin Wallow Road in Manatee County to south of US 301 (SR 43) in Hillsborough County, Florida (see Figure 1-1). The design year for the improvements is 2035.

This PD&E Study is being conducted concurrently with the PD&E Study for the portion of I-75 that extends from south of US 301 (SR 43) to north of Fletcher Avenue (CR 582A) in Hillsborough County.

The objective of this PD&E study is to help the FDOT and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) reach a decision on the type, location, and conceptual design of the necessary improvements for I-75 to safely and efficiently accommodate future travel demand. This study will document the need for the improvements as well as the procedures utilized to develop and evaluate various improvements including elements such as proposed typical sections, preliminary horizontal alignments, and interchange enhancement alternatives. The social, physical, and natural environmental effects and costs of these improvements were identified. The alternatives were evaluated and compared based on a variety of parameters utilizing a matrix format. This process assisted in identifying the alternative that will best balance the benefits with the impacts (such as environmental effects and costs).

The PD&E Study satisfies all applicable requirements, including the National Environmental Policy Act, in order for this project to qualify for federal-aid funding of subsequent development phases (design, right of way acquisition, and construction).

This Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS) report has been prepared as part of this PD&E Study. The purpose of the survey was to locate and identify any cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) and to assess their significance in terms of eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). This CRAS was conducted in accordance with the requirements set forth in the *National Historic Preservation Act of 1966*, as amended, and Chapter 267, *Florida Statutes (F.S.)*. The investigations were carried out in conformity with Part 2, Chapter 12 (“Archaeological and Historical Resources”) of the FDOT *Project Development and Environment Manual* and the standards contained in the Florida Division of Historical Resources’ (FDHR) *Cultural Resource Management Standards and Operations Manual* (FDHR 2003; FDOT 1999). In addition, this survey meets the specifications set forth in Chapter 1A-46, *Florida Administrative Code*.

Research methods included preliminary background research; the preparation of a research design (including both WPI Segment Numbers 419235-2 and 419235-3) for the review and approval by the FHWA, Florida State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and Native American tribes; archaeological and historical/architectural field surveys; artifact analysis; and preparation of draft and final reports. The fieldwork was conducted

between February and August 2008. A probability analysis for proposed stormwater management ponds/sites was not a part of this effort, and will be prepared at a later time.

The initial review of the Florida Master Site File (FMSF), NRHP, and the Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM) Summary Report (Project #8001) for this project (FDOT 2007) indicated that 14 previously recorded archaeological sites (including one historic canal - 8MA1337) are located within or adjacent to the project APE, with another 23 known sites located within 0.5 miles. The background research suggested a variable probability for archaeological site occurrence along the project corridor.

The original draft CRAS report was submitted for FDOT review in December 2008. Subsequently, for typical section and geometry transitioning reasons, the northern limits of the study area were adjusted to the south. As a result, this revised CRAS report contains updated background information and field survey results for the new corridor limits. Specifically, three previously recorded archeological sites (8HI521, 8HI522, and 8HI12029) which were originally contained within the APE for WPI Segment No. 419235-2 are now included in WPI Segment No. 419235-3.

Updated background information resulted in the identification of 11 archaeological sites located within or adjacent to the revised project APE. One of these, 8MA1337, was recently reclassified by the FMSF as a resource group, and thus, is not counted as an archaeological site. It was evaluated by the SHPO as ineligible for listing in the NRHP. Of the 10 archaeological sites, 8HI480 was evaluated as potentially eligible; the other nine sites (8HI409, 8HI478, 8HI479, 8HI524, 8HI525, 8HI526, 8HI527, 8HI532, and 8MA136) were not evaluated by the SHPO.

As a result of field survey, cultural materials associated with three (8HI478, 8HI524, and 8HI532) of the previously recorded sites were recovered. No evidence of the other seven sites was found. One new archaeological site (8HI11359) and one archaeological occurrence (AO) were discovered. 8HI11359, the 409 North Site, is a culturally indeterminate lithic scatter which was evaluated as not potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP given the common nature and low research potential (NRHP Criterion D). The AO, consisting of two pieces of lithic debitage, was also considered not significant.

Background research indicated that one historic resource, 8HI1029, had been recorded previously within the project APE. This Georgian Revival style residence, located at the end of Elbow Bend Road, was first documented in 1979, and updated as destroyed in 1998. Thus, as per the results of background research, no previously recorded historic resources are still extant within the I-75 project APE. A review of the relevant USGS quadrangle maps (USGS 1956a, 1956b, 1956c, 1956d) revealed the potential for several historic (pre-ca. 1960) resources. Historical/architectural field survey resulted in the identification and evaluation of eight historic buildings, 8HI11295 through 8HI11302. All are residences constructed between ca. 1945 and ca. 1960. Four buildings are of the Masonry Vernacular style, two of the Frame Vernacular style, and two of the Ranch style. Of these, six are associated with possible interchange improvement areas along

Old Big Bend Road and Gibsonton Drive. None of the eight newly identified historic resources is considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.

In conclusion, based on the results of background research and field survey, no significant archaeological sites or historic resources are located within the I-75 PD&E Study project APE. Therefore, project development will have no involvement with any archaeological sites or historic resources which are listed, determined eligible, or considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. No further work is recommended.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
Section 1 - INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Project Description	1
1.2 Existing Facility	1
1.3 Project Need	5
1.4 Improvement Alternatives	8
Section 2 - ENVIRONMENTAL OVERVIEW	14
2.1 Physiography and Geology	14
2.2 Lithic Resources	14
2.3 Soils and Vegetation.....	19
2.4 Local Hydrology.....	27
2.5 Paleoenvironmental Considerations	27
2.6 Existing Conditions	28
Section 3 - CULTURAL CHRONOLOGY	31
3.1 Paleo-Indian.....	31
3.2 Archaic	34
3.3 Formative.....	35
3.4 Mississippian/Acculturative	37
3.5 Colonialism	38
3.6 Territorial and Statehood.....	39
3.7 Civil War and Aftermath.....	43
3.8 Twentieth Century.....	47
Section 4 - RESEARCH CONSIDERATIONS AND METHODS.....	50
4.1 Background Research and Literature Review	50
4.1.1 Archaeological Considerations.....	50
4.1.2 Historical Considerations	58
4.2 Field Methodology	58
4.3 Unexpected Discoveries	59
4.4 Laboratory Methods and Curation	59
Section 5 - SURVEY RESULTS	61
5.1 Archaeological Survey Results	61
5.1.1 Previously Recorded Sites.....	70
5.1.2 Newly Recorded Site.....	76
5.1.3 Archaeological Occurrence	76
5.2 Historical/Architectural Survey Results.....	77
Section 6 - CONCLUSIONS AND SITE EVALUATIONS	89
6.1 Archaeological Sites.....	89
6.2 Historic Resources.....	89
6.3 Conclusions	89
Section 7 - REFERENCES CITED	90

APPENDICES

- Appendix A: Relevant Correspondence
- Appendix B: FMSF Forms
- Appendix C: Survey Log

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
Figure 1-1: Project Location Map.....	2
Figure 1-2: Study Area Aerial Map (sheet 1 of 2).....	3
Figure 1-2: Study Area Aerial Map (sheet 2of 2).....	4
Figure 1-3: Existing Roadway Typical Sections	6
Figure 1-4: Proposed Typical Sections.....	9
Figure 2-1: Environmental setting along the I-75 PD&E Study corridor.....	15
Figure 2-2: Environmental setting along the I-75 PD&E Study corridor:.....	16
Figure 2-3: Environmental setting along the I-75 PD&E Study corridor.....	17
Figure 2-4: Environmental setting along the I-75 PD&E Study corridor.....	18
Figure 2-5: Location of the project area relative to the quarry clusters.....	20
Figure 2-6: Soil types and their drainage characteristics along the I-75 PD&E Study corridor, Manatee County.....	21
Figure 2-7: Soil types and their drainage characteristics along the I-75 PD&E Study corridor, Hillsborough County	22
Figure 2-8: Soil types and their drainage characteristics along the I-75 PD&E Study corridor, Hillsborough County.	23
Figure 2-9: Soil types and their drainage characteristics along the I-75 PD&E Study corridor, Hillsborough County	24
Figure 3-1: Florida Archaeological Regions	32
Figure 4-1: Previously recorded archaerological sites proximate to the I-75 PD&E Study corridor and the zones of archaeological potential.....	51
Figure 4-2: Previously recorded archaeological sites proximate to the I-75 PD&E Study corridor and the zones of archaeological potential.....	52
Figure 4-3: Previously recorded archaeological sites proximate to the I-75 PD&E Study corridor and the zones of archaeological potential.....	53
Figure 4-4: Previously recorded archaeological sites and historic structure proximate to the I-75 PD&E Study corridor and the zones of archaeological potential.....	54
Figure 5-1: Approximate location of the shovel tests and archaeological resources within the I-75 PD&E Study project APE	62
Figure 5-2: Approximate location of the shovel tests and archaeological resources within the I-75 PD&E Study project APE.....	63
Figure 5-3: Approximate location of the shovel tests and archaeological resources along the I-75 PD&E Study project APE	64
Figure 5-4: Approximate location of the shovel tests and archaeological resources within the I-75 PD&E Study project APE	65

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
Figure 5-5: Approximate location of the shovel tests and archaeological resources within the I-75 PD&E Study project APE	66
Figure 5-6: Approximate location of the shovel tests and archaeological resources within the I-75 PD&E Study project APE	67
Figure 5-7: Approximate location of the shovel tests and archaeological resources within the I-75 PD&E Study project APE	68
Figure 5-8: Approximate location of the shovel tests and archaeological resources within the I-75 PD&E Study APE	69
Figure 5-9: Location of newly recorded historic structures located within the I-75 PD&E Study APE	78
Figure 5-10: Location of newly recorded historic structures located within the I-75 PD&E Study APE	79
Figure 5-11: Location of the newly recorded historic structure located within the I-75 PD&E Study APE	80

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
Table 1-1: Sections, Townships, and Ranges	1
Table 2-1: Soil types and their drainage characteristics located along the I-75 PD&E Study corridor	25
Table 4-1: Previously recorded archaeological sites within one-half mile of the I-75 PD&E Study corridor	55
Table 5-1: Results of archaeological survey	61
Table 5-2: Newly identified historic resources within the I-75 project APE	81

LIST OF PHOTOS

<u>Photo</u>	<u>Page</u>
Photo 2-1: Median area to north of Buckeye Road, looking north	28
Photo 2-2: East side of I-75 in vicinity of Curiosity Creek, looking north	28
Photo 2-3: West side of I-75, south of Big Bend Road, looking south	29
Photo 2-4: West side of I-75, south of Gibsonton Road, looking south	29
Photo 2-5: West side of I-75 to north of Progress Boulevard, looking south	30
Photo 5-1: North elevation of 2201 18th Avenue SE (8HI11295), looking south	81
Photo 5-2: South and east elevations of 6908 Simmons Loop Road (8HI11296), looking northwest	82
Photo 5-3: South and east elevations of 9922 Old Big Bend Road (8HI11297), looking northwest	83
Photo 5-4: South elevation of 9002 Gibsonton Drive (8HI11298), looking northwest	84

LIST OF PHOTOS

<u>Photo</u>	<u>Page</u>
Photo 5-5: South and west elevations of 9208 Gibsonton Drive (8HI11299), looking northeast.....	85
Photo 5-6: South and west elevations of 9212 Gibsonton Drive (8HI11300), looking northeast.....	86
Photo 5-7: South and east elevations of 11010 Gibsonton Drive (8HI11301), looking northwest.....	87
Photo 5-8: East elevation of 8007 Formby Street (8HI11302), looking west	88

Section 1 - INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Description

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), District Seven, is conducting a Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study to evaluate improvements along Interstate 75 (I-75) (State Road (SR) 93A) from Moccasin Wallow Road in Manatee County to south of US 301 (SR 43) in Hillsborough County, Florida. The design year for the improvements is 2035. A project location map is shown in **Figure 1-1** along with a study area aerial map in **Figure 1-2**.

The PD&E study satisfies all applicable requirements, including the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), in order for this project to qualify for federal-aid funding of subsequent development phases (design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction).



The sections, townships and ranges where the project is located are summarized in **Table 1-1**. The total length of the proposed project is approximately 25 miles, and it includes interchanges at Sun City Center Boulevard (SR 674), Big Bend Road (CR 672), and Gibsonton Drive. Existing rest area facilities for northbound and southbound travelers are situated approximately 3 miles south of SR 674. A concurrent PD&E Study is underway for the segment from south of US 301 (SR 43) to north of Fletcher Avenue (WPI Segment No. 419235-3).


Table 1-1: Sections, Townships, and Ranges

Sections	Townships	Ranges
Hillsborough County		
06,07,18,19,30,31	30 S	20 E
01,12,13,23,24,25,26,35	31 S	19 E
02,10,11,15,16,20,21,29,30,31,32	32 S	19 E
Manatee County		
01,02,10,11,15,16	33 S	18 E

1.2 Existing Facility

Interstate 75 is a limited access, 1,786-mile-long freeway that travels in a generally north/south direction from a southern terminus at SR 826 (Palmetto Expressway) in Hialeah, Florida, to a northern terminus in Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan, near the border with Canada.




I-75 (SR 93A) PD&E Study
Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301
 WPI Segment No.: 419235-2
 Hillsborough and Manatee Counties

Project Location Map

Figure 1-1





In Florida, I-75 is included in the State Highway System (SHS), designated as SR 93A; the Florida Intrastate Highway System (FIHS); the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS); and the Federal Aid Interstate System. I-75 serves as a major evacuation route throughout the state.

Within the project limits, I-75 is classified as a “Rural (south of 21st Avenue SE) and Urban (north of 21st Avenue SE) Principal Arterial – Interstate”. The roadway is generally six lanes south of Gibsonton Drive and eight lanes north of Gibsonton Drive. All travel lanes are 12-ft wide, and 12-ft inside and outside shoulders are provided, including 10-ft paved. The median width is a minimum of 88 ft wide; several areas near the south end of the project have a wider median where the roadway has been partially bifurcated.

The existing typical sections are shown in **Figure 1-3**.

The existing (limited access) right-of-way (ROW) varies throughout the study limits; however, in most areas, the minimum ROW width is 348 ft. For a segment north of SR 674, the ROW on the west side narrows by as much as 46 feet just north of the interchange, yielding a total ROW of only 302 ft. Several areas near the south end have a ROW as wide as 556 ft, where the two roadways are partially bifurcated with a wider median.


There are three interchanges along I-75 within the project limits. They are located at East College Avenue/Sun City Center Boulevard (SR 674), CR 672 (Big Bend Road), and Gibsonton Drive. Existing rest area facilities for northbound and southbound travelers are situated approximately 3 miles south of SR 674.

The study area includes 22 bridge structures, including crossings over Curiosity Creek, the Little Manatee River, Bullfrog Creek and the Alafia River.

I-75 has not had capacity improvements from Moccasin Wallow Road to south of US 301 since its original construction.

1.3 Project Need


Interstate 75 is a vital link in the local and regional transportation network as well as a critical evacuation route as shown on the Florida Division of Emergency Management’s evacuation route network. As a major north/south corridor, I-75 links the Tampa Bay region with the remainder of the state and the nation, supporting commerce, trade, and tourism. I-75 is part of the FIHS, a statewide transportation network that provides for the movement of goods and people at high speeds and high traffic volumes. The FIHS is comprised of interconnected limited and controlled access roadways, such as Florida’s Turnpike, selected urban expressways, and major arterial highways. The FIHS is the Highway Component of the SIS, which is a statewide network of highways, railways, waterways, and transportation hubs that handle the bulk of Florida’s passenger and freight



Typical Section #2

From Gibsonton Drive to South of US 301

Design Speed = 70 mph



Typical Section #1

From Moccasin Wallow Road to Gibsonton Drive

Design Speed = 70 mph



traffic. As an SIS/FIHS facility and part of the regional roadway network, I-75 is included in the 2025 Regional Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) developed by the West Central Florida Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Chairs Coordinating Committee (CCC). Preserving the operational integrity and regional functionality of I-75 is critical to mobility, as it is a vital link in the transportation network that connects the Tampa Bay region to the remainder of the state and the nation.

A portion of the study corridor, from SR 674 to Big Bend Road, is included in the FIHS 2025 Cost Feasible Plan Update, dated August 2003. Due to the intense traffic growth and high levels of congestion, the remaining portions of the study corridor are proposed to be included in the latest update of the FIHS 2025 Cost Feasible Plan. This project is identified in the SIS Multimodal Unfunded Needs Plan (May 2006) and in the earlier SIS 2030 Highway Component Unfunded Needs Plan (April 2004). This project is consistent with the Transportation Element of the Hillsborough County Local Government Comprehensive Plan adopted in March 2001 and last amended in January 2005. It is also included in the Hillsborough County MPO's 2025 LRTP adopted on November 10, 2004. This project is also consistent with other similar projects planned along the I-75 corridor throughout the state and provides continuity with these projects. This study is being conducted concurrently with the PD&E Study for the section of I-75 that extends from south of US 301 to north of Fletcher Avenue in Hillsborough County (WPI Segment No. 419235-3). Also, FDOT's District One is currently completing two PD&E Studies for the widening of two continuous portions of I-75, which when combined extend from SR 681 in Sarasota County to Moccasin Wallow Road in Manatee County. FDOT, District Seven is currently designing capacity improvements to I-75 from Fowler Avenue in Hillsborough County to SR 52 in Pasco County.

In 2007, the traffic volumes along I-75 in the study area ranged from 58,000 vehicles per day (vpd) north of Moccasin Wallow Road to 115,200 vpd north of Gibsonton Drive. These volumes included truck traffic that varied from 7.0 to 10.0 percent of the daily volumes. As a result of this high travel demand, several sections of I-75 already operate at congested conditions and levels of service (LOS) worse than the FIHS minimum level of service standard for both "urban areas" and "rural areas", which are LOS "D" and LOS "B", respectively. Without improvements, the operating conditions along I-75 and connecting roadways will continue to deteriorate, resulting in unacceptable levels of service throughout the entire study corridor. Capacity improvements could also enhance travel safety by reducing congestion, thereby decreasing vehicle conflicts.

According to the crash records for the years 2003 through 2007, obtained from the FDOT's crash database, a total of 1,562 crashes were reported along I-75 within the project limits. The 1,562 crashes involved a total of 1,035 reported injuries and 34 fatalities. The total economic loss from these crashes is estimated to be approximately \$60 million.

Summary Report was published as part of the FDOT's Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM) process on March 29, 2007. This project is designated as ETDM Project #8001. The FHWA has determined that the project qualifies as a Type 2 Categorical Exclusion.

1.4 Improvement Alternatives

A detailed Design Traffic Technical Memorandum (DTTM) was prepared as part of this PD&E Study. The DTTM documented the existing travel conditions along I-75, presented forecasts of the design year travel demand along I-75 and the crossing corridors, and summarized level of service evaluations of several improvement alternatives for the mainline of I-75. This document concluded that the construction of two special use lanes in each direction would be the most advantageous alternative because it provides mobility options and preserves acceptable levels of service for the regional travelers.

1.4.1 No-Build Alternative


For the No-Build Alternative it was assumed that no capacity improvements, other than those already planned and funded, would be made to the I-75 corridor. The advantages to the No-Build Alternative include no new costs for design and construction, no effects to existing land uses and natural resources, and no disruption to the public during construction. However, the No-Build Alternative would not address the travelers' needs and would result in increased congestion and user costs. This option will remain under consideration as a viable alternative throughout the PD&E Study process.

1.4.2 Mainline Build Alternatives


For the I-75 mainline, two build alternative alignments were developed and evaluated based on three alternate typical sections. The typical sections generally consist of 10 travel lanes with six general use lanes (GUL) (three in each direction) and four special use lanes (SUL) (two in each direction). The main differences between the typical sections are the type of separation provided between the GULs and the SULs and whether widening takes place within the median or to the outside. Each mainline alternative considered is discussed below with the typical sections illustrated in **Figure 1-4**.

The mainline alternative improvements could be constructed within the existing ROW. Additional right of way may be required, however, for stormwater management facilities, floodplain compensation sites and to maintain the standard border width under Alternative 1A.


Mainline Alternative 1 consists of widening to the outside and maintaining a multimodal envelope within the existing median. This alternative preserves a multimodal envelope within the existing 88-foot median and widens to the outside in each direction to provide 2 SULs and 3 GULs separated by 10-foot shoulders and a two foot barrier. Two alternative typical sections were prepared and evaluated for this alternative.



Alternative 1A



Alternative 1B



Alternative 2

	<p>I-75 (SR 93A) PD&E Study Moccasin Wallow Rd to US 301 WPI Segment No. 419235-2 Hillsborough and Manatee Counties</p>	<p>Proposed Typical Sections</p>	<p>Figure 1-4</p>
--	--	----------------------------------	-------------------

Mainline Alternative 1 - Typical 1A (Alternative 1A)

The main objective for this alternative typical section was to maintain a standard border width of 94 feet, per FDOT Plans Preparation Manual (PPM) requirements. The exceptions to this guideline are at locations where it would be impractical to relocate major facilities such as the County’s wastewater treatment plant near SR 674. In these instances, a design variation for border width would be required. This alternative has longitudinal ROW requirements along the entire corridor (0’ to 58’ on both sides of I-75).

Mainline Alternative 1 – Typical 1B (Alternative 1B)

This alternative typical section is very similar to Alternative 1A except that its footprint is intended to be constructed within the existing Limited Access (L.A.) ROW. As a result, the border width would be less than the required standard border width and would require a design variation. However, as a result of the elevation difference between the pavement and the side ditches, mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) walls or “retaining walls” would be required at the outside shoulders on both sides of I-75 for a significant portion of the corridor.


Mainline Alternative 2 was developed by widening towards the inside, thereby moving a potential multimodal envelope to the outside. This alternative is achieved within the existing L.A. ROW as it generally holds the existing roadway pavement as the six GULs. It includes a median barrier separating northbound and southbound traffic. It also includes 2 SULs and 3 GULs separated by a six foot buffer (painted or pylons) in each direction.

1.4.3 Interchange Build Alternatives

There are three interchanges along I-75 within the project limits located at SR 674, Big Bend Road and Gibsonton Drive. Three configuration changes were evaluated for the SR 674 and Big Bend Road interchanges while one option was evaluated for the Gibsonton Drive interchange. All interchange options considered work with either mainline alternative and also include operational improvements at the ramps terminal intersections. A general description of the configuration improvements evaluated for each interchange follows below.

SR 674 Interchange Improvement Alternatives

The SR 674 interchange is presently a combination diamond-partial cloverleaf configured interchange as depicted on the figure shown to the right with I-75 carried over SR 674. Three improvement options (Option A, Option B, and Option C) were evaluated at the SR 674 interchange. A brief description of each alternative is shown below:




- Option A - Diverging Diamond Interchange (DDI) – This interchange option would eliminate

the EB to NB and SB to EB loop ramps and modify the interchange to a DDI configuration.

- Option B- Single Point Urban (SPUI) – This interchange option would eliminate the EB to NB and SB to EB loop ramps and modify the interchange to a SPUI configuration.
- Option C – Modify Existing Partial Cloverleaf (PARCLO) – This interchange option would not eliminate the existing loop ramps, but simply modify the SB exit ramps. The modifications consist of providing a single exit point from I-75 for the SB to WB and SB to EB off-ramps and provide a two land SB to EB ramp.

Big Bend Road Interchange Improvement Alternatives


The Big Bend Road interchange is presently a half-cloverleaf configured interchange as depicted on the figure shown to the right with I-75 carried over Big Bend Road and Old Big Bend Road. Three improvement options (Option A, Option B, and Option C) were evaluated at the Big Bend Road interchange. A brief description of each alternative is shown below:



- Option A – Grade Separated option with frontage road open – This interchange option would retain the existing loop ramps and add a SB to WB off-ramp and a WB to NB on-ramp. This option would allow for Old Big Bend Road to remain open underneath I-75.
- Option B – At Grade option with frontage road closed – This interchange option would retain the existing loop ramps and add a SB to WB off-ramp and a WB to NB on-ramp. This option would require that the existing Old Big Bend Road to be closed while relocating Bullfrog Creek Road.
- Option C – Flyover option – This interchange option would remove the existing EB to NB loop ramp and replace it with a flyover ramp. This option would also add a SB to WB off-ramp along with a WB to NB on-ramp.

Gibsonston Drive Interchange Improvement Alternatives

The Gibsonston Drive interchange is presently a diamond configured interchange as depicted on the figure shown to the right with Gibsonston Drive carried over I-75. A single option (Option A) was considered for this interchange consisting of a partial cloverleaf design. This option would remove the existing NB to WB and SB to EB movements and replace them with loop ramps.



Possible New Interchanges

No new interchanges have been formally evaluated at this point under this PD&E Study, however; two separate analyses have been performed or are currently underway.

- Between SR 674 and Gibsonton Drive
A planning level analysis was performed for a potential future interchange at three possible locations based on local agency requests. The purpose of this analysis was not to select a particular location, but to quantify the potential impacts and benefits of each location with respect to one another.
- Possible Port Manatee Connector Interchange
A PD&E Study is currently being conducted by FDOT District One under FPID No.: 422724-1-22-01 to provide improved access to Port Manatee from I-75. There are five corridors being evaluated as a part of this study with the possibility of a new interchange being added along I-75 between the I-275 junction in Manatee County to Valroy Road in Hillsborough County.

1.4.4 Preferred Build Alternative

All options considered and discussed previously have been evaluated with regards to costs, operational factors and environmental impacts. Based on these evaluations, preferred alternatives have been identified for the I-75 mainline along with each interchange within the corridor and are listed below:

- **I-75 Mainline – Alternative 2**
- **SR 674 Interchange – Option C**
- **Big Bend Road Interchange – Option B**
- **Gibsonton Drive – Option A**

1.5 Report Purpose

This Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS) Report is one of several documents that will be prepared as part of this I-75 PD&E Study. The purpose of the CRAS was to locate and identify any archaeological sites and historic resources located within the project Area of Potential Effects (APE) and to assess, to the extent possible, their significance as to eligibility for listing in the NRHP. The archaeological APE was defined as the existing and proposed ROWs. The historical APE extended approximately 300 feet from the edge of the existing ROW, and a maximum of 3000 feet of the centerline of I-75 along Gibsonton Drive, CR 672 (Big Bend Road), and SR 674 (Sun City Center Boulevard/E. College Avenue). The archaeological and historical components of the survey were conducted between February and August 2008. A probability analysis for proposed stormwater management ponds/sites was not part of the current investigation. Background research preceded field survey. Such research served

to provide an informed set of expectations concerning the kinds of cultural resources that might be anticipated to occur, as well as a basis for evaluating any newly discovered sites.

This CRAS was conducted to comply with Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act of 1966* (Public Law 89-665), as amended, and the implementing regulations 36 CFR Part 800 (revised January 2001), as well as the provisions contained in the revised Chapter 267, *F.S.* All work was carried out in conformity with Part 2, Chapter 12 (Archaeological and Historical Resources) of the FDOT *Project Development and Environment Manual* (FDOT 1999), and the standards contained in the Florida Division of Historical Resources' (FDHR) *Cultural Resource Management Standards and Operations Manual* (FDHR 2003). In addition, the survey report meets the specifications set forth in Chapter 1A-46, *Florida Administrative Code*.

Section 2 - ENVIRONMENTAL OVERVIEW

Environmental factors such as geology, topography, relative elevation, soils, vegetation, and water resources are important in determining where archaeological and historical sites are likely to be located. These variables influenced what types of resources were available, which in turn influenced decisions regarding settlement location and land-use patterns. Due to the influence of these environmental factors upon the local inhabitants, a discussion of the effective environment is included.

2.1 Physiography and Geology

The project corridor (**Figures 2-1 to 2-4**) is located within the Central or Mid-peninsula physiographic zone (White 1970). The topography is gently rolling with a series of low hills and valleys paralleling the coast. The land ranges in elevation from 0 to 15 m (0 to 50 ft) above mean sea level (amsl) with the lowest elevations along the Little Manatee and Alafia Rivers. The project is situated within the Gulf Coastal Lowlands. These are characterized by surficial streams with little to no down cutting. Low sand ridges formed by ocean waters during the Pleistocene form slight, rolling hills within this zone. The lack of elevation in the Gulf Coastal Lowlands creates the near surficial to exposed water table throughout the region. This high water table results in the poor natural drainage and abundance of wetlands in the region (Davis 1943; McNab and Avers 1996).

The area is underlain by medium fine sands and silts, sandy clay and clay, and shelly sand and clay (Knapp 1980). The area contains undifferentiated surficial sands of the Pleistocene and Holocene and shelly sediments of the Plio-Pleistocene. Much of the area is underlain by the limestone of the Peace River Formation; the remainder is underlain by limestone from the Tampa Member of the Arcadia Formation within the Hawthorn Group (Campbell and Arthur 1993; Scott 2001; Scott et al. 2001).

2.2 Lithic Resources

Stone played an important role in the lifeways of the prehistoric people. Moreover, due to highly acidic soils in which preservation of organic cultural material is quite poor, stone tools and the debris from their manufacture are by far the most common archaeological material present at inland sites.

Two kinds of lithic raw material were utilized by prehistoric populations in this part of Florida, namely silicified limestone, known by geologists and archaeologists as chert, and silicified coral. Chert and silicified coral are the result of silicification of two host materials, i.e., Miocene limestones and coral, respectively (Upchurch et al. 1982). Silicified coral is the product of the replacement of the original coral aragonite skeletal material with silicates. Such replacement often preserved the fabric of the coral resulting in the distinctive “star” pattern found in the stone if it is broken perpendicular to the plant’s axis. The genus most common in the Tampa Bay area is *Siderastrea*, a fossil found in Miocene and Oligocene formations (Upchurch et al. 1982).




Figure 2-1 Environmental setting of the I-75 PD&E Study corridor (USGS 1975, 1982b, 1982d, 1982f).

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2




Figure 2-2 Environmental setting of the I-75 PD&E Study corridor (USGS 1975, 1982f).

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2




Figure 2-3 Environmental setting of the I-75 PD&E Study corridor (USGS 1982c, 1982e, 1982f, 1982h).

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2




Figure 2-4 Environmental setting of the I-75 PD&E Study corridor (USGS 1982a, 1982c, 1982e, 1982g).

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2


The I-75 project corridor is located within and to the south of the Hillsborough River Quarry Cluster which extends along the Hillsborough River and its tributaries to Hillsborough Bay (**Figure 2-5**). This quarry cluster provided a significant source of Tampa Formation silicified limestone. Cherts from this cluster vary widely in color and fabric and contain few diagnostic fossils, though several subareas within this cluster have been identified, based primarily on fossil content and rock fabric (Goodyear et al. 1983; Upchurch et al. 1982). Some cherts contain large macrofossils including gastropods, pelecypods, and coral fragments. These are generally preserved as chalcedony casts. Charophyte oogonia are diagnostic of the locale near Cow House Creek.

2.3 Soils and Vegetation

The I-75 PD&E Study project corridor in Hillsborough County transects the Myakka-Basinger-Holopaw, Myakka-Immokalee-Pomello, Samsula-Basinger, and Myakka-Urban land-St. Augustine soil associations (USDA 1989). The Myakka-Basinger-Holopaw association is the most prevalent and consists of nearly level, poorly and very poorly drained soils of the flatwoods. The Myakka-Immokalee-Pomello association is characterized by poorly and moderately well drained soils. These are nearly level to gently sloping and associated with the flatwoods. The nearly level, very poorly drained Samsula-Basinger association is located along Bullfrog Creek. The Myakka-Urban land-St. Augustine soil association, situated along the Little Manatee River, is characterized by nearly level, very poorly drained to somewhat poorly drained soils. Within Manatee County, the I-75 PD&E Study corridor crosses through the EauGallie-Floridana and Wabasso-Bradenton-EauGallie associations. Both are associated with the flatwoods. In general, the soils are nearly level and poorly drained, with a somewhat loamy subsoil (USDA 1983).

The I-75 PD&E Study corridor is underlain by 31 soil types, 16 within Hillsborough County and 15 within Manatee County (**Figures 2-6 to 2-9**, Table 2-1) (USDA 2005a, 2005b). The majority of the soils are poorly and very poorly drained. The most prevalent of the better drained soils is Pomello fine sand, which occurs in small pockets along the corridor in Hillsborough County. Archbold fine sand is located along the southern bank of the Little Manatee River and Orsino fine sand is located along the southern bank of the Alafia River. Zolfo fine sand is located just north of the county line, while the moderately well drained Cassia fine sand is located about a mile south of the county line.

The I-75 PD&E Study corridor crosses through areas of pine flatwoods (Davis 1980) although each of the soils types along the corridor supports a specific vegetative regime (USDA 1983, 1989). Archbold fine sand occurs on low ridges on the flatwoods. The natural vegetation consists of sand pine with an understory of pineland threeawn, pricklypear cactus, and saw palmetto. The depressional Basinger, Holopaw, and Samsula soils are situated within swamps and depressions on the flatwoods. The natural vegetation consists of cypress with an understory of bluestem, maidencane, panicum, Jamaica sawgrass, and cutgrass. Bradenton fine sand occurs on low-lying ridges and hammocks. The native vegetation includes slash pine, laurel and live oak, cabbage palm, waxmyrtle, magnolia, bluestems, saw palmetto, and vines.



(After Upchurch et al. 1982: Figure 1).

Figure 2-5 Location of the project area relative to the quarry clusters.

**I-75 PD&E STUDY
MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
HILLSBOROUGH AND
MANATEE COUNTIES
WPI Segment No. : 419235-2**




Figure 2-6 Soil types and their drainage characteristics along the I-75 PD&E Study corridor, Manatee County (USDA 2005b).

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2




Figure 2-7 Soil types and their drainage characteristics along the I-75 PD&E Study corridor, Hillsborough County (USDA 2005a).

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2




Figure 2-8 Soil types and their drainage characteristics along the I-75 PD&E Study corridor, Hillsborough County (USDA 2005a).

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2




Figure 2-9 Soil types and their drainage characteristics along the I-75 PD&E Study corridor, Hillsborough County (USDA 2005a).

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2

Table 2-1: Soil types and their drainage characteristics located along the I-75 PD&E Study corridor

Symbol	Name	Drainage
Hillsborough Soils		
3	Archbold fine sand	Moderately Well
5	Basinger, Holopaw, and Samsula soils, depressional	Very Poor
14	Eaton mucky sand, depressional	Very Poor
15	Felda fine sand	Poor
27	Malabar fine sand	Poor
29	Myakka fine sand	Poor
30	Myakka fine sand, frequently flooded	Very Poor
33	Ona fine sand	Poor
36	Orsino fine sand, 0 to 5 percent slopes	Moderately Well
41	Pomello fine sand, 0 to 5 percent slopes	Moderately Well
46	St. Johns fine sand	Poor
52	Smyrna fine sand	Poor
56	Urban Land	
60	Winder fine sand, frequently flooded	Poor
61	Zolfo fine sand	Somewhat Poor
99	Water	
Manatee Soils		
5	Bradenton fine sand, limestone substratum	Poor
7	Canova, Anclote, and Okeelanta soils	Very Poor
12	Cassia fine sand	Moderately Well
14	Chobee variant sandy clay loam	Very Poor
15	Delray mucky loamy fine sand	Very Poor
16	Delray complex	Very Poor
17	Delray-EauGallie complex	Very Poor
20	EauGallie fine sand	Poor
22	Felda fine sand	Poor
25	Floridana fine sand	Very Poor
26	Floridana-Immokalee-Okeelanta association	Very Poor
35	Ona fine sand, orstein substratum	Poor
38	Palmetto sand	Poor
39	Parkwood variant-Chobee, limestone substratum-Parkwood complex	Poor
48	Wabasso fine sand	Poor

The Canova, Anclote, and Okeelanta soils are located within freshwater swamps and in broad poorly defined drainageways. They support bay, gum, ash, swamp maple, water oak, scattered cypress, and some slash pine. The moderately well drained Cassia fine sand occurs on low ridges and knolls in the uplands. The natural vegetation includes scrub live oak, scrub oak, sawpalmetto, sand pine, pricklypear, rosemary, and pineland threawn. Chobee Variant sandy clay loam occurs in shallow depressions and supports swamp oak, swamp maple, cypress, grasses, vines, and forbs. Some areas support a prairie growth of sawgrass, pickerelweed, weeds, grasses, and scattered maple. The Delray soils occur in shallow depressions, on flats, and broad, low sloughs. The natural

vegetation includes maidencane, sawgrass, bay, sweetgum, maple, cypress, and scattered pine as well as bluestem, lopsided indiagrass, pineland threeawn, and gallberry.

EauGallie fine sand occurs in broad areas of flatwoods. The natural vegetation consists of slash pine, sawpalmetto, waxmyrtle, gallberry, bluestem, panicum, and pineland threeawn. Eaton mucky sand occurs on depressions on the flatwoods. The natural vegetation consists of cypress and sweetgum with an understory of sand cordgrass, bluestem, maidencane, and waxmyrtle. The Felda sands occur on broad sloughs, on low hammocks on the flatwoods, and on low terraces of major rivers and streams. These support live oak, cabbage palm, slash pine, swamp maple, and sweetgum with an understory of saw palmetto, pineland threeawn, bluestem, and waxmyrtle.

Floridana fine sand and the Floridana-Immokalee-Okeelanta association occur on low flats and in large, shallow grassy ponds, respectively. They support cattails, maidencane, sawgrass, willow, St. Johnswort, bluestems, smooth cordgrass, sedges, and in some areas, cypress. Malabar fine sand occurs on low-lying sloughs and shallow depressions on the flatwoods. The natural vegetation consists of cabbage palm, longleaf pine, and slash pine with an understory of broomsedge, bluestem, inkberry, maidencane, saw palmetto, and waxmyrtle. Myakka and Ona sands occur on broad plains on the flatwoods. Their associated vegetation consists of longleaf and slash pine with an understory of gallberry, running oak, saw palmetto, pineland threeawn, and waxmyrtle. The frequently flooded Myakka sands are located in tidal areas and are subject to shallow flooding by the highest of normal tides. The natural vegetation consists of mangrove, seashore saltgrass, glasswort, needlegrass rush, and marshhay cordgrass. Orsino fine sand generally occurs on uplands and along slope breaks to stream channels. This moderately well drained soil supports turkey oak, sand pine, and slash pine with an understory of sand heath, pineland threeawn, saw palmetto and pricklypear cactus.

Palmetto sand occurs in sloughs, in poorly defined drainageways, and in narrow bands around some ponds in the flatwoods. The native vegetation includes chalky bluestem, blue maidencane, sand cordgrass, pineland threeawn, low panicums, scattered slash pines, and clumps of sawpalmetto. Pomello fine sand occurs on low ridges on the flatwoods and its natural vegetation consists of longleaf, sand, and slash pine with an understory of creeping bluestem, lopsided indiagrass, running oak, saw palmetto, and pineland threeawn. The Parkwood complex occurs on cabbage palm hammocks, in drainageways, and around the edges of ponds. The native vegetation includes cabbage palm, a few live oaks, slash pine, water oak, magnolia, and an undergrowth of shrubs, vines, grasses, and sawpalmetto.

St. Johns fine sand occurs on low-lying plains on the flatwoods. The natural vegetation consists of longleaf and slash pine with an understory of gallberry, running oak, saw palmetto, pineland threeawn, and waxmyrtle. Smyrna sand occurs on broad, low-lying, convex swells on the flatwoods. The natural vegetation consists of longleaf and slash pine. The understory includes gallberry, running oak, saw palmetto, pineland threeawn, and waxmyrtle. St. Johns fine sand occurs on low-lying plains on the flatwoods and supports the same vegetative regime as Smyrna fine sand.

Urban land is defined as areas covered by concrete, asphalt, buildings, and/or other impervious services such that the actual soil types cannot be discerned. The frequently flooded Winder fine sand occurs along floodplains. The natural vegetation consists of Coastal Plain willow, red maple, cabbage palm, and sweetgum with an understory of buttonbush, maidencane, sawgrass, smartweed, and sedges. Finally, Zolfo fine sand occurs on broad, low ridges on the flatwoods. It supports live oak, turkey oak, longleaf pine, and slash pine. The understory includes broomsedge, bluestem, lopsided indiangrass, saw palmetto, and pineland threeawn.

2.4 Local Hydrology

Water resources along the I-75 PD&E Study corridor include the Alafia and Little Manatee Rivers, Cabbage Slough, Curiosity Creek, Wolf Branch, Bullfrog Creek, and a number of other lakes, ponds, wetlands, and swamps.

2.5 Paleoenvironmental Considerations

The early environment of the region was different from that of today. Sea levels were lower, the climate was arid, and fresh water was scarce. An understanding of human ecology during the earliest periods of human occupation in Florida cannot be based on observations of the modern environment because of changes in water availability, botanical communities, and faunal resources. Aboriginal inhabitants would have developed cultural adaptations in response to the environmental changes taking place which were then reflected in settlement patterns, site types, artifact forms, and subsistence economies.

Due to the arid conditions between 16,500 and 12,500 years ago, the perched water aquifer and potable water supplies were absent (Dunbar 1981:95). Palynological studies conducted in Florida and Georgia suggest that between 13,000 and 5000 years ago, this area was covered with an upland vegetation community of scrub oak and prairie (Watts 1969, 1971, 1975). The rise of sea level reduced xeric habitats over the next several millennia. Intermittent flow in the Hillsborough River some 8500 years ago was likely due to precipitation and surface runoff, and by 6000 years ago the river probably began flowing as a result of spring discharge from the Floridan aquifer (Dunbar 1981:99).

By 5000 years ago, a climatic event marking a brief return to Pleistocene climatic conditions induced a change toward more open vegetation. Southern pine forests replaced the oak savannahs. Extensive marshes and swamps developed along the coasts and subtropical hardwood forests became established along the southern tip of Florida (Delcourt and Delcourt 1981). Northern Florida saw an increase in oak species, grasses, and sedges (Carbone 1983). At Lake Annie, in south central Florida, pollen cores were dominated by wax myrtle and pine. The assemblage suggests that by this time, a forest dominated by longleaf pine along with cypress swamps and bayheads existed in the area (Watts 1971, 1975). By about 3500 B.C.E (Before Common Era), surface water was plentiful in karst terrains and the level of the Floridan aquifer rose to 1.5 m (5 ft) above present levels. After this time, modern floral, climatic, and environmental conditions began to be established.

2.6 Existing Conditions

Representative views of the land along the I-75 project corridor are provided in Photos 2-1 through 2-5.



Photo 2-1: Median area to north of Buckeye Road, looking north



Photo 2-2: East side of I-75 in vicinity of Curiosity Creek, looking north



Photo 2-3: West side of I-75, south of Big Bend Road, looking south



Photo 2-4: West side of I-75, south of Gibsonton Road, looking south



Photo 2-5: West side of I-75 to north of Progress Boulevard, looking south

Section 3 - CULTURAL CHRONOLOGY


A discussion of the regional culture history is included to provide a framework within which the local historical and archaeological records can be examined. Archaeological sites and historic features are not individual entities, but rather are part of once dynamic cultural systems. As a result, individual sites cannot be adequately examined or interpreted without reference to other sites and resources in the general area.

In general, archaeologists summarize the culture history of a given area (i.e., an archaeological region) by outlining the sequence of archaeological cultures through time. These are defined largely in geographical terms but also reflect shared environmental and cultural factors. The I-75 PD&E Study corridor is located in the Central Peninsular Gulf Coast archaeological region (Milanich 1994; Milanich and Fairbanks 1980). This region extends from just north of Tampa Bay southward to the northern portion of Charlotte Harbor (**Figure 3-1**). Within this zone, the Paleo-Indian, Archaic, Transitional, Formative, Mississippian, and Acculturative stages have been defined based on unique sets of material culture traits such as characteristic stone tool forms and ceramics as well as subsistence, settlement, and burial patterns. These broad temporal units are further subdivided into culture phases or periods: Paleo-Indian (Clovis, Suwannee, Dalton), Archaic (Early, Middle, and Late), Formative (Manasota/Weeden Island-related), and Mississippian/Acculturative (Safety Harbor).

The local history of the region is divided into four broad periods based initially upon the major governmental powers. The first period, Colonialism, occurred during the exploration and control of Florida by the Spanish and British from around 1513 until 1821. At that time, Florida became a territory of the United States and 21 years later became a State (Territorial and Statehood). The Civil War and Aftermath (1861-1899) period deals with the Civil War, the period of Reconstruction following the war, and the late 1800s, when the transportation systems were dramatically increased and development throughout the state expanded. The Twentieth Century period includes subperiods defined on the basis of important historic events such as the World Wars, the Boom of the 1920s, and the Depression. Each of these periods evidenced differential development and utilization of the region, thus effecting the historic site distribution across the land.

3.1 Paleo-Indian

The Paleo-Indian period is the earliest known cultural manifestation in Florida, dating from roughly 12,000 to 7500 B.C.E. (Milanich 1994). Archaeological evidence for Paleo-Indians consists primarily of scattered finds of diagnostic lanceolate-shaped projectile points. The Florida peninsula at this time was quite different than today. The climate was cooler and drier. Vegetation was typified by xerophytic species with scrub oak, pine, open grassy prairies, and savannas being the most common (Milanich 1994:40).



When human populations were arriving in Florida, the sea levels were still as much as 35 m (115 ft) below present levels and coastal regions of Florida extended miles beyond present-day shorelines (Milliman and Emery 1968). Thus, many of these sites have been inundated. Evidence of this includes sites that were discovered as a result of dredging activities in the Gulf (Karklins 1970) while other research has shown that some of the shell deposits bordering submerged river channels in Tampa Bay may have been Paleo-Indian midden deposits (Goodyear et al. 1983; Goodyear and Warren 1972).

The Paleo-Indian period has been sub-divided into three horizons based upon characteristic tool forms (Austin 2001). The Clovis Horizon (11,000-10,000 B.C.E.) represents the initial occupation of Florida. It is defined based upon the presence of the fluted Clovis points. These are somewhat more common in north Florida, although Robinson (1979) does illustrate a few points from the central Gulf Coast area. The Suwannee Horizon (10,000-9000 B.C.E.) is the most well known of the three Paleo-Indian horizons. The lanceolate-shaped, unfluted Simpson and Suwannee projectile points are diagnostic of this time period (Bullen 1975; Daniel and Wisenbaker 1987; Purdy 1981). The Suwannee tool kit includes a variety of scrapers, adzes, spokeshaves, unifacially retouched flakes, flakes with beaked projections, and blade-like flakes as well as bone and ivory foreshafts, pins, awls, daggers, anvils, and abraders (Austin 2001:23). Following the Suwannee Horizon is the Late Paleo-Indian (Dalton?) Horizon (9000-8000 B.C.E.). The smaller Tallahassee, Santa Fe, and Beaver Lake projectile points have traditionally been attributed to this horizon (Milanich 1994). However, many of these points have been recovered stratigraphically from late Archaic and early Woodland period components and thus, may not date to this time period at all (Austin 2001; Farr 2006).

Archaeologists hypothesize that Paleo-Indians lived in migratory bands and subsisted by gathering and hunting, including the now-extinct Pleistocene megafauna. Since it was cooler and much drier, it is likely that these nomadic hunters traveled between permanent and semi-permanent sources of water, such as artesian springs, exploiting the available resources. These watering holes would have attracted the animals that the Indians hunted, thus providing both food and drink. In addition to being “tethered” to water sources, most of the Paleo-Indian sites are also proximate to sources of good quality lithic resources. This settlement pattern is considered to be logistical, i.e., the establishment of semi-permanent habitation areas and the movement of the resources from their sources of procurement to the residential locale by specialized task groups (Austin 2001:25).

Some of the information about this period has been derived from the underwater excavations at two inland spring sites in Sarasota County: Little Salt Spring and Warm Mineral Springs (Clausen et al. 1979). Excavation at the Harney Flats Site in Hillsborough County has provided a rich body of data concerning Paleo-Indian life ways. Analysis indicates that this site was used as a quarry-related base camp with special use activity areas (Daniel and Wisenbaker 1987). It has been suggested that Paleo-Indian settlement may “not have been related as much to seasonal changes as generally postulated for the succeeding Archaic period,” but instead movement was perhaps related to the scheduling of “tool-kit replacement, social needs, and the availability of water,” among other factors (Daniel and Wisenbaker 1987:175). The Colorado Site, in Hernando

County, provided data relative to a Paleo-Indian campsite and lithic workshop (Horvath et al. 1998).

3.2 Archaic

As the Paleo-Indian period gradually came to a close, climatic changes occurred and the Pleistocene megafauna disappeared. Archaeological evidence suggests a slow cultural change that led toward an increasingly intensive exploitation of localized food resources. These changes may reflect a transition from the late Pleistocene to a more seasonal, modern climate when the pine-dominated forests began to cover the landscape. With loss of the Ice Age mammals, Archaic populations turned to the hunting of smaller game like deer, raccoon, and opossum as well as a reliance on wild plants and shellfish, where available.

The Early Archaic period, ca. 6500 to 5000 B.C.E., is well documented in Florida and is generally recognized by changes in the artifact assemblages from the Paleo-Indian period. However, because of a lack of excavated collections, our knowledge of the full range of the Early Archaic lithic tool assemblages is uncertain (Milanich 1994:64). The diagnostic projectile point types include Hamilton, Arredondo, Wacissa, Thonotosassa, Hardee Beveled, Kirk, and Sumter (Bullen 1975). Discoveries at Little Salt Spring and the Windover Site indicate that bone and wood tools were also used (Clausen et al. 1979; Doran 2002). The archaeological record suggests a diffuse, yet well-scheduled, pattern of exploiting both coastal and interior resources. Because water sources were much more numerous and larger than in earlier times, the Early Archaic peoples could sustain larger populations, occupy sites for longer periods, and perform activities that required longer occupation at a specific locale (Milanich 1994:67). However, most Early Archaic sites that have been found are small, seasonal campsites.

During the Middle Archaic period, ca. 5000 to 3000 B.C.E., a shift from the dispersed settlement pattern of the preceding period to a system of base camps with numerous, smaller satellite camps has been hypothesized. The changes in settlement pattern resulted in maximizing the use of forest resources and may indicate that larger bands of people were living together part of the year. Artifacts associated with this period include broad-bladed, stemmed projectile points such as the Newnan, Marion, and Putnam types. In addition, specialized tools such as microliths and burins, large chopping implements, as well as an array of expedient tools, have been found at archaeological sites. A few regional cemetery sites [e.g., Bay West in Collier County (Beriault et al. 1981) and Republic Groves in Hardee County (Wharton et al. 1981)], with interments in bogs, springs and other wetlands, provide evidence for mortuary ceremonialism during this time.

During the Late Archaic, ca. 3000 to 1200 B.C.E., populations increased and became more sedentary. Broad bladed, stemmed projectile points of the Middle Archaic continued with the addition of the Clay, Culbreath, and Lafayette stemmed and corner-notched varieties (Bullen 1975). The abundant wetland resources allowed larger settlements to be maintained. It is likely that the change in settlement patterns is related to environmental changes. By the end of the Middle Archaic, the climate closely

resembled that of today; vegetation changed from those species which preferred moist conditions to pines and mixed forests (Watts and Hansen 1988). The adaptation to this environment allowed for a greater variety of resources to be exploited and increased variation in settlement patterns. An increased reliance on marine resources is evident in coastal areas and it is during this period that coastal and riverine shell middens began to accumulate. One of the best-known and preserved sites of this type is the Palmer Site in Sarasota County. Here, a horseshoe-shaped shell midden encircles a freshwater spring adjacent to Sarasota Bay (Bullen and Bullen 1976).

By about 2000 B.C.E., there is evidence of fired clay pottery in Florida. The first ceramics types were tempered with fibers (Spanish moss or palmetto) and are referred to as the Orange series. The ceramics were plain or decorated with geometric designs and punctations. Initially it was thought that the plain ceramics preceded the decorated ones. Recent research has called the Orange chronology into question (Sassaman 2003). Based on a series of AMS dates on soot from Orange Incised sherds from the middle St. Johns Valley and from radiocarbon dates on oyster and charcoal in association with Orange ceramics near the mouth of the river, all the various Orange ceramic types occur within the time span of roughly 2150-1650 B.C.E. In addition, research by Cordell (2004) has documented the presence of sponge spicules in the Orange ceramic paste (the diagnostic trait of St. Johns wares) which suggest that the St. Johns ceramic tradition extends back to the beginning of the ceramic technology in the region.

Bridging the close of the Archaic stage and the beginning of the Formative is the Florida Transitional period, ca. 1200 to 500 B.C.E. (Bullen 1959). This time is characterized by a continued exploitation of shellfish, fish, and wild plants as well as a continued reliance on hunting. Additionally, the diffusion of culture traits resulting from the movements of small groups of people led to the spread of several ceramic and tool traditions (Bullen 1959, 1965; Bullen et al. 1978).

Research at the Canton Street Site suggests that the admixture of three projectile point traditions (basally notched, side and corner notched, and Archaic stemmed) and three ceramic traditions (limestone-tempered, sand-tempered, and temperless chalky ware) were representative of this dynamic period (Bullen et al. 1978). There is evidence that the fiber-tempered ceramics of the preceding Late Archaic were being gradually replaced by pottery of these three different traditions. By the end of the Transitional period, ceramic traditions were clearly regionalized throughout Florida. In the Central Peninsular Gulf Coast region, sand-tempered plain pottery became the dominant ceramic type. In addition, there is evidence of regional interaction with other cultures such as the Poverty Point complex of the lower Mississippi Valley.

3.3 Formative

The Formative is comprised of the Manasota and Weeden Island-related cultures (ca. 500 B.C.E. to 800 C.E. [Common Era]). Settlement patterns consisted of permanent villages located along the coast with seasonal forays into the interior to hunt, gather, and collect those resources unavailable along the coast. Most Manasota sites are shell middens found on or near the shore where aboriginal villagers had easiest access to fish and

shellfish (Milanich 1994). Subsistence patterns were focused on the coastal exploitation of fish and shellfish, supplemented by hunting and gathering inland resources (Luer and Almy 1982). Investigations at the Shaw's Point, Fort Brook Midden, Yat Kitischee, and Myakkahatchee Sites have provided a wealth of information on site formation, subsistence economies, and technology and their changes over time (Austin 1995; Austin et al. 1992; Luer et al. 1987; Schwadron 2002). The major villages were located along the shores with smaller sites being located up to 20-30 km (12-18 mi) inland. These inland sites, which probably served as seasonal villages or special-use campsites, were often located in the pine flatwoods on elevated lands proximate to a source of freshwater where a variety of resources could be exploited (Austin and Russo 1989; Luer and Almy 1982). Hardin and Piper (1984) suggest that some of the larger inland sites may actually be permanent or semi-permanent settlements as opposed to seasonal campsites.

Manasota is characterized by a wide range of material cultural traits such as a well-developed shell and bone tool technology, sand tempered plain ceramics, and burials within shell middens (Luer and Almy 1982). Much of the shell and bone technology evolved out of the preceding Archaic period. Through time, the burial patterns became more elaborate, with burials being placed within sand burial mounds located near the villages and middens. The early burial patterns consisted of primary flexed burials in the shell middens, while later sites contained secondary burials within sand mounds.

Temporal placement within the Manasota period can be determined based upon diagnostic ceramic rim and vessel forms (Luer and Almy 1982). The early forms (ca. 500 B.C.E. - 400 C.E.) are characterized as flattened globular bowls with incurving rims and chamfered lips. Pot forms with rounded lips and inward curving rims were utilized from about 200 B.C.E. until 700 C.E. Deeper pot forms with straight sides and rounded lips were developed around 400 C.E. and continued into the Safety Harbor period. Simple bowls with outward curving rims and flattened lips were used from the end of the Late Weeden Island period (ca. 800 C.E.) into the Safety Harbor period. Vessel wall thickness decreased over time.

The lithic assemblage of the Manasota culture was scarce along the coast especially in the more southern portions of the region where stone suitable for tool manufacture was absent. Projectile point types associated with the Manasota period include the Sarasota, Hernando, and Westo varieties (Luer and Almy 1982).

Influences from the Weeden Island "heartland," located in north-central Florida, probably resulted in the changes in burial practices. These influences can also be seen in the increased variety of ceremonial ceramic types through time. The secular, sand tempered ware continued to be the dominant ceramic type. Manasota evolved into what is referred to as a Weeden Island-related culture. The subsistence and settlement patterns remained fairly consistent. Hunting and gathering of the inland and coastal resources continued. Evidence of a widespread trade network is seen by the ceramic types (Wakulla Check Stamped, St. Johns Check Stamped, and Weeden Island varieties) and other exotic artifacts present within the burial mounds.

Ceremonialism and its expressions, such as the construction of complex burial mounds containing exotic and elaborate grave offerings, reached their greatest development during this time period. Similarly, the subsistence economy, divided between maritime and terrestrial animals and perhaps horticultural products, represents the maximum effective adjustment to the environment. In general, Weeden Island-related period sites are found along the coast, on bay shores, or on streams, and nearly all are marked by shell refuse with burial mounds of sand situated near the middens (Willey 1949).

Many Weeden Island-related sites consist of villages with associated mounds, as well as ceremonial/burial mound sites. The artifact assemblage is distinguished by the presence of Weeden Island ceramic types. These are among some of the finest ceramics in the southeast; they are often thin, well-fired, burnished, and decorated with incising, punctuation, complicated stamping, and animal effigies (Milanich 1994:211). Coastal sites are marked by the presence of shell middens, indicating a continued pattern of exploitation of marine and estuarine resources. Interaction between the inland farmer-gatherers and coastal hunter-gatherers may have developed into mutually beneficial exchange systems (Kohler 1991:98). This could account for the presence of non-locally made ceramics at some of the Weeden Island-related period sites. There is no definitive evidence for horticulture (e.g., charred cobs, kernels, or beans) in the coastal area (Milanich 1994:215).

3.4 Mississippian/Acculturative

The final aboriginal cultural manifestation in the Central Peninsular Gulf Coast region is Safety Harbor, named for the type-site in Pinellas County. The presence of datable European artifacts (largely Spanish) in sites, along with radiocarbon dates from early Safety Harbor contexts associated with Englewood ceramics, provide the basis for dividing the Safety Harbor period into two pre-Columbian phases: Englewood (900-1000 C.E.) and Pinellas (1000-1500 C.E.) and two colonial period phases: Tatham (1500-1567 C.E.) and Bayview (1567-1725 C.E.) (Mitchem 1989). The Safety Harbor variant in Hillsborough, northern Manatee, Pinellas, and southern Pasco counties is identified as the Circum-Tampa Bay regional variant.

In general, further influences from the north led to the incorporation of many features of the Mississippian culture by the late Weeden Island-related peoples, which became the Safety Harbor culture. Often, Safety Harbor components are located on top of the earlier Weeden Island deposits. South of Tampa Bay there is evidence of significant continuity from Weeden Island-related sites into the Mississippian culture of the area. Major Safety Harbor sites remained primarily along the shore with many situated at the same locations as late Manasota sites (Luer and Almy 1981). The Portavant Mound complex (8MA919), in Manatee County, is an excellent example of continued occupation (Weisman et al. 1994).

Large towns or villages often had a temple mound, plaza, midden, and a burial mound associated with them. Research supports earlier suggestions that some maize agriculture may have been practiced by the Safety Harbor peoples as they continued marine and terrestrial exploitation of the region's food resources (Luer and Almy 1981). Although

most Safety Harbor sites are located along coastal bays and rivers, inland sites are also known (Willey 1949).

3.5 Colonialism

The Timucuan Indians are the historic counterparts of the Safety Harbor people. In the Tampa Bay area they are referred to as the Tocobaga. The cultural traditions of the native Floridians ended with the advent of European expeditions to the New World. The initial events, authorized by the Spanish crown in the 1500s, ushered in devastating European contact. After Ponce de Leon's landing near St. Augustine in 1513, Spanish explorations were confined to the west coast of Florida; Narvaéz is thought to have made shore in 1528 in St. Petersburg and de Soto's 1539 landing is commemorated at De Soto Point on the south bank of the Manatee River. When the first Europeans arrived in coastal southwest Florida in the 16th century, they encountered the Calusa, a powerful, complex society ruled by a paramount chief. The principal town of the Calusa is thought to be Mound Key near Fort Myers Beach. Historic documents suggest that the Calusa chief ruled over fifty towns, from which he exacted tribute (Widmer 1988). By the middle of the 18th century, the Calusa population had been almost decimated and dispersed as a result of conflicts with the Europeans and exposure to their diseases.

As the Calusa disappeared, fishing communities, or "ranchos," were established by Cuban and Spanish fisherfolk on various islands and along the coast between Charlotte Harbor and Tampa Bay. The earliest recorded ranchos may have been at Useppa Island and San Carlos Bay in Charlotte Harbor around 1765 (Hammond 1973). However, there is some evidence that remnants of the once powerful Calusa joined the Cuban-Spanish fisherfolk at the ranchos in Charlotte Harbor during the early 18th century (Almy 2001). The ranchos supplied dried fish to Cuban and northern markets until the mid-1830s, when onset of the Seminole Indian Wars and customs control ruined the industry.

The area that now constitutes the State of Florida was ceded to England in 1763 after two centuries of Spanish possession. England governed Florida until 1783 when the Treaty of Paris returned Florida to Spain; however, Spanish influence was nominal during this second period of ownership. Prior to the American colonial settlement of Florida, portions of the Muskogean Creek, Yamasee and Oconee Native American populations moved into Florida and repopulated the demographic vacuum created by the decimation of the original aboriginal inhabitants. These migrating groups of Native Americans became known to English speakers as Seminoles. They had an agriculturally based society, focusing upon cultivation of crops and the raising of horses and cattle. The material culture of the Seminoles remained similar to the Creeks, the dominant aboriginal pottery type being Chattahoochee Brushed. European trade goods, especially British, were common. The Creek settlement pattern included large villages located near rich agricultural fields and grazing lands for cattle.

Their early history can be divided into two basic periods: *colonization* (1716-1767) when the initial movement of Creek towns into Florida occurred and *enterprise* (1767-1821) which was an era of prosperity under the British and Spanish rule prior to the American presence (Mahon and Weisman 1996). The Seminoles formed at various times loose

confederacies for mutual protection against the new American Nation to the north (Tebeau 1980:72). The Seminoles crossed back and forth into Georgia and Alabama conducting raids and welcoming escaped slaves. This resulted in General Andrew Jackson's invasion of Spanish Florida in 1818, which became known as the First Seminole War.

3.6 Territorial and Statehood

As a result of the war and the Adams-Onis Treaty of 1819, Florida became a United States territory in 1821, but settlement was slow and scattered during the early years. Andrew Jackson, named provisional governor, divided the territory into St. Johns and Escambia Counties. At that time, St. Johns County encompassed all of Florida lying east of the Suwannee River, and Escambia County included the land lying to the west. In the first territorial census in 1825, some 317 persons reportedly lived in South Florida; by 1830 that number had risen to 517 (Tebeau 1980:134).

Even though the First Seminole War was fought in north Florida, the Treaty of Moultrie Creek in 1823, at the end of the war, was to affect the settlement of all of south Florida. The Seminoles relinquished their claim to the whole peninsula in return for an approximately four million acre reservation south of Ocala and north of Charlotte Harbor (Covington 1958; Mahon 1985:50). The eastern half of what is Pasco County and the northeastern corner of Hillsborough County were included within the new reservation boundary. The treaty satisfied neither the Indians nor the settlers. The inadequacy of the reservation and desperate situation of the Seminoles living there, plus the mounting demand of the settlers for their removal, soon produced another conflict.

Also in 1823, Gadsden County was created from St. John's County, and the following year Mosquito County was created out of Gadsden. This new county included all of the Tampa Bay area and reached south to Charlotte Harbor (HT/HCPB 1980:7). In 1824, Cantonment (later Fort) Brooke was established on the south side of the mouth of the Hillsborough River in what is now downtown Tampa by Colonel George Mercer Brooke. Frontier families followed the soldiers and the settlement of the Tampa Bay area began. This caused some problems for the military as civilian settlements were not in accord with the Camp Moultrie agreement (Guthrie 1974:10). By 1830, the United States War Department found it necessary to establish a military reserve around Fort Brooke with boundaries extending 16 miles to the north, west, and east of the fort (Chamberlin 1968:43). Within the military reservation were a guardhouse, barracks, storehouse, powder magazine, and stables.

By the early 1830s, governmental policy shifted in terms of relocating the Seminoles to lands west of the Mississippi River. Outrage at this policy of forced relocation resulted in the Second Seminole War (1835-1842). Following this conflict, the Seminoles who remained in Florida were driven further south, clearing the way for homesteaders. Archaeological evidence of the Seminole presence at Fort Brooke was documented in a report which included detailed discussion of Seminole burials recovered from a portion of the old Fort Brooke cemetery (Piper and Piper 1982).

Hillsborough County was established in 1834 by the Territorial Legislature of Florida as a result of the instrumental efforts of Augustus Steele, who arrived in 1832 (Piper and Piper 1982). At that time, the county reached north to Dade City and south to Charlotte Harbor, encompassing eight future counties covering an area that today comprises Pasco, Polk, Manatee, Sarasota, DeSoto, Charlotte, Highlands, Hardee, Pinellas, and Hillsborough counties. The county was named for the “river which ran through it and the bay into which the river flowed” (Bruton and Bailey 1984:18; Robinson 1928:22). Due to its isolated location, Hillsborough County was slow to develop. The Tampa Bay post office was closed at this time and reestablished as “Tampa” on September 13, 1834 (Bradbury and Hallock 1962). As settlement in the area increased, so did hostilities with Native Americans. The growing threat of Seminole invasion to the civilians near the fort propelled them to sign a petition asking for military protection. Only 25 men signed the petition showing the meager settlement in the area.

By 1835, the Second Seminole War was underway, triggered by an attack on Major Francis Langhorne Dade as he led a company of soldiers from Fort Brooke to Fort King (now Ocala). As part of the effort to subdue Indian hostilities in Florida, military patrols moved into the wilderness in search of any Seminole concentrations. As the Second Seminole War escalated, attacks on isolated settlers and communities became more common. To combat this, the combined service units of the U.S. Army and Navy converged on southwest Florida. This joint effort attempted to seal off the southern portion of the Florida peninsula from the estimated 300 Seminoles remaining in the Big Cypress Swamp and Everglades (Covington 1958; Tebeau and Carson 1965).

In 1837, Fort Brooke became the headquarters for the Army of the South and the main garrison for the Seminole wars. The fort also served as a haven for settlers who had to leave their farms and seek protection from the warring Seminoles (Piper and Piper 1982). Several other forts were established around the area during the Seminole War years. Their uses varied from military garrisons to military supply depots; others were built to protect the nearby settlers during Indian uprisings. These included Fort Alabama (later Fort Foster), Fort Thonotosassa, and Fort Simmons (Bruton and Bailey 1984).

The Second Seminole War ended in 1842 when the federal government withdrew troops from Florida. Some of the battle-weary Seminoles were persuaded to emigrate to the Oklahoma Indian Reservation where the federal government had set aside land for Native American occupation. However, those who wished to remain were allowed to do so, but were pushed further south into the Everglades and Big Cypress Swamp. This area became the last stronghold for the Seminoles (Mahon 1967:321).

In 1840, the population of Hillsborough County was 452, with 360 of those residing at Fort Brooke (HT/HCPB 1980:7). Encouraged by the passage of the Armed Occupation Act in 1842, designed to promote settlement and protect the Florida frontier, settlers moved south through Florida. The Act made available 200,000 acres outside the already developed regions south of Gainesville to the Peace River, barring coastal lands and those within a two-mile radius of a fort. The Armed Occupation Act stipulated that any family or single man over 18 able to bear arms could earn title to 160 acres by erecting a habitable dwelling, cultivating at least five acres of land, and living on it for five years.

During the nine-month period the law was in effect, 1184 permits were issued totaling some 189,440 acres (Covington 1961a:48).

Tampa became a center of distribution for settlements being established along the Alafia River and in South Florida. In 1843, William G. Ferris established a general merchandising business at Fort Brooke becoming the first of several merchandising firms. The Tampa area had first been a military center and now was developing into a commercial center for the Gulf Coast region of Florida (Robinson 1928).

It was during this time that one of Hillsborough County's earliest settlements was established. This settlement, called Peru (later to be subsumed by Riverview), was located near the intersection of I-75 and Riverview Drive (Maio et al. 1998:81). Peru's position on the south bank of the Alafia River made it an important transportation and trading center. In addition, the luxuriant primary forest surrounding Peru made logging a lucrative business. As the forests were felled, the opened landscape provided rich agricultural land for the subsequent cattle and citrus industries. In 1842, Benjamin Moody was among the first to recognize the potential of this fertile land along the Alafia. At the completion of his Second Seminole War tour of duty, the Moody family, along with the Boyettes, Simmons, Bravos, Saffolds, Barneses, Hardings, Lesleys, and McGriffs became the earliest settlers of the area (Bakas and Bakas 2006).

In 1845, the State of Florida was admitted to the Union, and Tallahassee was selected as the capital. The land in Tampa, surrounding Fort Brooke, continued to belong to the U.S. Government until 1846; therefore, there were few permanent structures beyond the immediate vicinity of the fort. After the military reservation was reduced from sixteen square miles to four square miles, John Jackson was hired to survey and plat the town in 1847 (Piper and Piper 1982; Robinson 1928:26). By the early 1850s, the first public buildings in Tampa, the courthouse and the Masonic Lodge, were complete; also, the *Tampa Herald*, Tampa's first newspaper, began distribution in 1853 (Robinson 1928:34-5).

The resulting increase in settlement of the region precipitated the need for cadastral cartographic surveys. The surveys in the area of the I-75 PD&E Study corridor were completed between 1843 and 1852 by A. M. Randolph, Charles F. Hopkins, John Jackson, and Sam Reid (State of Florida 1843c, 1846b, 1847b, 1847c, 1847d, 1852b, 1852c, 1852d). No historic features were depicted along the corridor. The trail from Manatee to Tampa was located east of the project area. The northern six miles of the corridor fell within the Fort Brooke Military Reservation. In general, the area along the I-75 PD&E Study corridor consisted of 3rd rate pine and palmetto, with areas of swamp, ponds, creeks, and rivers (State of Florida 1843a, 1843b, 1846a, 1847a, 1852a). The area along the Alafia River was described as 2nd rate hammock and marsh (State of Florida 1852a:394).

Although the majority of Florida's Seminoles had been deported to the western territories by the end of Second Seminole War, a number of Seminoles remained in central and south Florida. In July 1849, an incident occurred at the Kennedy and Darling Store near Peas Creek (Peace River). A band of four Seminoles killed two men and wounded

William McCollough and his wife Nancy before looting and burning the store. This incident created the “Indian Scare” of 1849 in central Florida and resulted in the Federal government establishing a series of forts across the state (Brown 1991; Covington 1961b).

General David Twiggs of Tampa was appointed to oversee the construction of the forts. Starting at the mouth of the Manatee River, the forts were built 15 miles apart, to keep the Seminoles south of the line of forts. Fort Hamer was established by the U.S. Army on November 28, 1849. Located ten miles upriver from Manatee Village, “near the head of the steamboat navigation,” it lay at the western terminus of a cross-Florida military trail. Twiggs described this location as one of the finest sites for a military installation that he had ever seen.

In January of 1855, Manatee County was carved from the southern portion of Hillsborough County. It encompassed the area from Tampa Bay south to Charlotte Harbor and inland to the Kissimmee River and Lake Okeechobee. The village of Manatee, approximately one-mile east of present day Bradenton, was designated as the county seat. On December 15 of that year, the City of Tampa was incorporated by an act of the state legislature. Also at that time, the Third Seminole War, or the Billy Bowlegs War, started as a result of pressure placed on Native Americans remaining in Florida to migrate west. The war started when Seminole Chief Holatter-Micco, also known as Billy Bowlegs, and 30 warriors attacked an army camp killing four soldiers and wounding four others. The attack was in retaliation for damage done by several artillerymen to property belonging to Billy Bowlegs. This hostile action renewed state and federal interest in the final elimination of the Seminoles from Florida. In 1856, Braden Castle was attacked by the Seminoles. The Castle served as a refuge for neighboring families for approximately nine months. Fort Hamer was also reactivated and occupied by a detachment of ten men from William B. Hooker’s Company for Florida Mounted Volunteers (Covington 1982; FWP 1939; Sheppard et al. 1981).

Military action was not decisive during the war; therefore, in 1858 the U.S. government resorted to monetary persuasion to induce the remaining Seminoles to migrate west. Chief Billy Bowlegs accepted \$5,000 for himself and \$2,500 for his lost cattle, each warrior received \$500, and \$100 was given to each woman and child. On May 4, 1858, the ship *Grey Cloud* set sail from Fort Myers with 38 Seminole warriors and 85 Seminole women and children. Stopping at Egmont Key, 41 captives and a Seminole woman guide were added to the group. On May 8, 1858, the Third Seminole War was declared officially over (Covington 1982:78-80).

Residents turned to citrus, tobacco, vegetables, and lumber to make their living. Cattle ranching served as one of the first important economic activities reported in Manatee County. Mavericks left by the early Spanish explorers provided the source for the herds raised by the mid-eighteenth century “Cowkeeper” Seminoles. As the Seminoles were pushed further south during the wars, their cattle were either sold or left to roam. Settlers captured or bought the cattle and branded them for their own. By the late 1850s, the cattle industry of southwest Florida was developing on a significant scale. Hillsborough and Manatee Counties constituted Florida’s leading cattle production region. By 1860,

Fort Brooke and Punta Rassa (south of Ft. Myers) were major cattle shipping points for southwest Florida. William B. Hooker, a veteran Indian fighter and former legislative delegate from Hamilton County, was among those whose cattle grazed north of the Manatee River. Hooker's agricultural enterprises at present day Parrish included citrus cultivation and the cultivation of Sea Island cotton with William H. Johnson (Matthews 1983).

3.7 Civil War and Aftermath

In 1861, Florida followed South Carolina's lead and seceded from the Union in a prelude to the American Civil War. Florida had much at stake in this war as evidenced in a report released from Tallahassee in June of 1861. It listed the value of land in Florida's 35 counties as \$35,127,721 and the value of the slaves in the state at \$29,024,513 (Dunn 1989:59). Even though the coast of Florida, including the port of Tampa, experienced a naval blockade during the war, the interior of the state saw very little military action (Robinson 1928:43). Many male residents abandoned their farms and settlements to join the Union army at one of the coastal areas retained by the United States government or joined the Confederate cow cavalry. The cow cavalry provided one of the major contributions of the state to the Confederate war effort by supplying and protecting the transportation of beef to the government (Akerman 1976). It was estimated that three-quarters of the beef supplied to the Confederacy from Florida came from Brevard and Manatee Counties (Shofner 1995). Salt works along the Gulf Coast also functioned as a major contributor to the efforts of the Confederacy (Lonn 1965). Union troops stationed at Punta Rassa conducted several raids into the Peace River Valley to seize cattle and destroy ranches. In response, Confederate supporters formed the Cattle Guard Battalion, consisting of nine companies under the command of Colonel Charles J. Mannerlyn. The lack of railway transport to other states, the federal embargo, and the enclaves of Union supports and Union troops holding key areas such as Jacksonville and Ft. Myers prevented an influx of finished materials. Additionally, federal gunboats blockaded the mouth of the Manatee River, as well as other large rivers throughout the state preventing the shipment of raw materials. In 1862, armed forces advanced up the Manatee River, burning sugar mills and plantation houses. As a result of these hostilities, new settlement within the area remained limited. The war lasted until 1865, when General Robert E. Lee surrendered to General Ulysses S. Grant at Appomattox Courthouse in Virginia.

Immediately following the war, the South underwent a period of "Reconstruction" to prepare the Confederate states for readmission to the Union. The program was administered by the U.S. Congress, and on July 25, 1868, Florida officially returned to the Union (Tebeau 1980:251). Civilian activity slowly resumed a normal pace after recovery from wartime depression, and the population continued to expand. The 1866 Homestead Act was passed to encourage settlement. The act allowed freedmen and loyal United States citizens to receive 80-acre tracts in Florida and the other four public land states of the south. Former Confederates were not eligible to receive homesteads under the Act until 1876 when the lands were open to unrestricted sale (Tebeau 1980:266, 294). The Homestead Act encouraged growth and settlement throughout the Reconstruction era. It was at this time that the Manatee county seat was moved to Pine Level, which was

more centrally located within the 5,000 square mile county. It remained the county seat for the next 21 years (Knight 1983).

The post-war economic conditions of much of the rest of the South contributed to changes in the economy of the Tampa Bay area and communities to the south along the Gulf Coast. Post-war cattle shipments to Cuba varied considerably with changes in Cuban demand and the institution of a duty. The net result of Reconstruction-period cattle shipping was the movement of ranges and cattlemen farther south, closer to Charlotte Harbor and the Caloosahatchee River (Brown 1991:199). An influx of poor farmers, coinciding with the southward movement of cattle ranches, made the economic stability of the area dependent upon reliable sources of overland freight transport (Mormino and Pizzo 1983:68).

During the 1870s and 1880s, the economy boomed with a number of winter visitors seeking the favorable subtropical climate, and a increase of agricultural production with the introduction of truck farming of tomatoes, cucumbers, and beans, as well as experimentation with oranges and lemons. Cattle continued to play a major role in the inland economy around Pine Level and Arcadia. According to one report, Manatee became a popular winter resort in the 1870s, at which time tourists and health seekers, as well as mail and supplies, were transported on sailing ships from Cedar Key, the nearest railroad station. Boarding houses stimulated appetites by offering wild turkey, venison, a variety of fresh- and salt-water fish, and lemon pie; one hostelry advertised its “well-tended croquet grounds.” Grapes flourished, but no use was made of them, which led a visiting woman to remark that if the manufacture of wine were encouraged, “this beastly drunkenness from strychnine whiskey would very soon be abandoned” (FWP 1939:471).

The State of Florida faced a financial crisis involving title to public lands in the early 1880s. By Act of Congress in 1850, the federal government turned over to the states for drainage and reclamation all “swamp and overflow land.” Florida received approximately ten million acres. To manage that land and the five million acres the state had received on entering the Union, the state legislature created the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Fund in 1851. In 1855, the legislature set up the trust fund in which state lands were to be held. The Fund became mired in debt after the Civil War, and under state law, no land could be sold until the debt was cleared. In 1881, the Trustees started searching for someone to buy enough state land to pay off the Fund’s debt to permit sale of the remaining millions of acres that it controlled.

By 1881, Hamilton Disston, a member of a prominent Pennsylvania saw manufacturing family and friend of then Governor William Bloxham, had entered into agreement with the State of Florida to purchase four million acres of swamp and overflowed land for one million dollars. In exchange for this, he promised to drain and improve the land. Disston’s land holding company was the Florida Land and Improvement Company. He and his associates also formed the Atlantic and Gulf Coast Canal and Okeechobee Land Company in 1881 (Davis 1939:205). This company was established as part of the drainage contract established with the State. This contract provided one-half of the acreage that they could drain, reclaim, and make fit for cultivation south of Township 23 South (later changed to Township 24 South) and east of the Peace River. This “Disston Purchase” enabled the distribution of large land subsidies to railroad companies, inducing

them to begin extensive construction. Disston and the railroad companies in turn sold smaller parcels of land to developers and private investors (Tebeau and Carson 1965:252). He sold half of this contract to the British Florida Land and Mortgage Company, headed by Sir Edward James Reed, in 1882 (Tischendorf 1954). This was done to cover the second payment on the Purchase since Disston's assets had been tied up in the drainage contract. Much of the I-75 PD&E Study corridor was initially owned by Disston and Reed (State of Florida n.d.-a, n.d.-b) (Table 3-1).

The first real influence on the growth of the area was the investment of capital in railroad construction during the 1880s. This was encouraged by the State of Florida, which granted sizeable amounts of land to the railroad companies. This development increased access, stimulated commerce, and promoted tourism, thus resulting in population growth and economic prosperity. Portions of the corridor were purchased by the Plant Investment Company in 1884 (State of Florida n.d.-b). The Florida Southern Railroad acquired the railroad charter and land grant of the Gainesville Ocala, and Charlotte Harbor Railroad which was due to expire in 1885. To hold this charter and secure the land, immediate railroad construction was necessary. Construction started at Bartow in Polk County and continued southward to Punta Gorda (Pettengill 1952).

Between 1880 and 1890, Hillsborough County grew almost seven-fold. With the railroad as a catalyst, there was a sudden surge of buying land for speculation, agriculture, and settlement in Manatee County. This resulted in the formation of DeSoto County from the eastern portion of Manatee County. Braidentown (now Bradenton) was selected as the new county seat for Manatee County (McDuffee 1961). Other portions of the corridor were purchased by individuals during this time as well (Table 3-1) (State of Florida n.d.-a, n.d.-b).

During the 1880s, the timber and naval stores industries flourished across the region. The timber was first tapped for its rosin, and later harvested for lumber. In the late 1880's, phosphate was discovered on the Alafia; it was not until ca. 1894 that the Peruvian Mining Company was formed. In addition to the processing plant, the phosphate-boom led to the construction of a hotel and some houses on the north bank of the river before the shallow deposit was depleted and mining proved too expensive (HT/HCPB 1980; Maio et al. 1998:83). However, it did add to the growth of the area, and by the turn of the century, the combined population of Peru and Riverview was over 500 residents. Through the early part of the century, more settlements sprung up along the Peace River, and across Florida in areas through which the Peace River flowed. The industry radiated out across the deposit regions of the Alafia, Little Manatee, Manatee and Peace Rivers (HT/HCPB 1980:16, 18).

Table 3-1: Original property owners along the I-75 PD&E Study corridor

Twp/Rng	Section & part	To whom Deeded	Year
30S/19E	36 – all	Hamilton Disston	1881
30S/20E	6 – all	Plant Investment Company	1884
	7 – W	Hamilton Disston	1881
	18 – W of NW	Florida Central & Peninsular Railroad (FCP)	1897
	18 – W and NE of SW	Wm. J. Walker & Geo. W. Kelly	1885
	18 – SE of SW	Phineas B. Myers	1883
	19 – NW	Joseph H. Patterson	1883
	19 – W of SW	John T. Lesley	1885
	19 – E of SW	Lenny G. Leslie	1875
	30 – NE of NW, W of NW, W of SW	Hamilton Disston	1881
	30 – SE of NW	Elverton L. Chapman	1892
	31 – Lots 3 and 6	Hamilton Disston	1881
	31 – Lots 4 and 5	Joseph Allen	1885
31S/19E	1, 12, 13, 23, 24 (less E of NE), 25, 26, 35 – all	Hamilton Disston	1881
31S/20E	6 – NW, W of SW	Hamilton Disston	1881
32S/19E	2, 10, 11, 15, 21, 29, 30, and 31 - all	Sir Edward James Reed	1883
	16 – E of NE, SW, SW of SE, E of SE	Florida Naval Stores, Lumber & Cattle Company (FNSLCC)	1903
	16 – NW of SE	J. A. Mum	1904
	20 – N, E of SW, SE	Sir Edward James Reed	1883
32S/18E	36 – all	Florida Land and Improvement Company (FLIC)	1883
33S/18E	1 – all but SW of NW	FLIC	1883
	1 – SW of NW	Franklin C. Armstrong	1882
	2 – all	Sir Edward James Reed	1883
	10 – N of SW	Sir Edward James Reed	1883
	10 – S of SW	Jerome B. Lingo	1881
	11 – W of NE, E of SW	FLIC	1883
	11 – NW, W of SW	Sir Edward James Reed	1883
	15 – all	FLIC	1883
	16 – SW of SE	FNSLCC	1903
	16 – E of SE	Robert D. Swindel	1904
	21 – E	FLIC	1883

Although the national financial panic of 1893 prompted a decline in capital and investment in the area, most folks relied primarily on seafood harvesting, cattle raising, and citrus cultivation for sustenance. The Great Freeze of 1894 and 1895 ruined the crops, but did not destroy the trees, as had happened in areas further north. From the late 1890s through the early 1940s, the production of naval stores including the harvesting of lumber for construction and rosin for products such as glass, varnish, gunpowder, waxes, turpentine, and paints, served as a major industry. The Manatee Crate Mill produced crates and hampers for the farming and citrus industries.

The Spanish American War, in 1898, brought millions of dollars and many troops to Tampa. Tampa was the United States' nearest shipping point for the war effort in Cuba. Consequently, it was the designated departure point for the troops. Henry Plant's Tampa Bay Hotel became the headquarters of the Army (Evans 1972). Troops began arriving in April of 1898 and by May of that year, they outnumbered residents two to one (Friedel 1985; Grismer 1950). By early June, an estimated 20,000 troops had shipped out to Cuba with thousands more waiting. However, the war ended on July 5th, and by the end of August, the troops were gone and Tampa returned to normal.

3.8 Twentieth Century

The turn of the century prompted optimism and an excitement over growth and development. A north/south connector from Tampa to Miami significantly opened up Manatee County. In 1915, a group of businesspersons met to discuss the feasibility of a cross-state highway from Tampa to Miami by way of Sarasota. A portion of this route, stretching from the Hillsborough county line to Sarasota, was constructed in Manatee County with the passage of a bond issue in 1911. This road was eventually designated as US 41, or the Tamiami Trail, but was not completed until 1928 (Scupholm 1997). Developers used propaganda promoting Florida as the eternal garden to attract tourists and new residents.

The town of Ruskin was established in 1909 by Dr. George M. Miller. This community was to be socialistic and a college was established so that the working class could have access to higher education. Those without the means to afford college could work on the cooperative farms or factories. The Ruskin Homemakers and Common Good Societies (Florida Club) were established to sell homesteads and farms along the Ruskin Inlet and surrounding area. The initial efforts of this socialistic project were promising; however, with World War I and the death of Dr. Miller in 1919, the college had to close. Truck farming then became the chief economic industry of the area (HT/HCPB 1980).

The great Florida land boom of the 1920s saw widespread development of towns and highways. Several reasons prompted the boom, including the mild winters, the growing number of tourists, the larger use of the automobile, the completion of roads, the prosperity of the 1920s, and the promise by the state legislature never to pass state income or inheritance taxes.

Wimauma was incorporated in 1925, becoming Hillsborough's fourth municipality. By 1925, the town had four churches, four general stores, a notary, a garage, a justice of the peace, a physician, and 1,000 inhabitants. Two years later, the school board built a two-story schoolhouse to accommodate area children.

Sun City, located south of Ruskin near the Little Manatee River, first developed during the height of the Florida land boom and replaced another settlement known as Ross. Ross supported a few settler families until the Atlantic Coastline Railroad came through. The town started truck farming and the Florida Citrus Exchange built a crate veneer mill. When the town depleted the local lumber supply, the company left. Its former employees then turned to commercial fishing and laboring in the Palmetto turpentine woods. During

the Florida land boom, the land in and around Ross was bought by J. H. Meyer and H. C. Van Swearingen who planned Sun City. Land was platted to include a school, hotel, church, city hall, and a movie studio. Sun City was promoted by enticing prospective buyers with the opportunity of living among film stars. As the land boom ended in the late 1930s, the town of Sun City was nearly abandoned. By the late 1990s, only two buildings from the 1920s survive and the majority of the residents are retirees living in mobile homes or recreational vehicles.

Signs of growth were halted by the end of the Florida Land Boom and the Great Depression hit Florida earlier than the rest of the nation. By 1926-27, the bottom fell out of the Florida real estate market. Massive freight car congestion from hundreds of cars loaded with building materials sitting idle in the railroad yards caused the Florida East Coast Railway to embargo all but perishable goods in August of 1925 (Curl 1986). The embargo spread to other railroads throughout the state, and, as a result, most construction halted. The 1926 real estate economy in Florida was based upon such wild land speculations that banks could not keep track of loans or property values (Eriksen 1994:172). By October, rumors were rampant in northern newspapers concerning fraudulent practices in the real estate market in south Florida. Confidence in the Florida real estate market quickly diminished and the investors could not sell lots (Curl 1986). To make the situation even worse, two hurricanes hit south Florida in 1926 and 1928. The 1928 hurricane created a flood of refugees fleeing northward. The following year, in 1929, the Mediterranean fruit fly invaded and paralyzed the citrus industry creating quarantines and inspections that further slowed an already sluggish industry.

The 1930s saw the closing of mines and mills and widespread unemployment. This included the cigar industry of nearby Tampa, the area's economic backbone for a half century, which was severely impacted. Several cigar factories closed, eleven cigar firms moved, and three merged into one (Campbell 1939). Further compounding the desperate economic situation was the all-time record flood crest of the Alafia River on June 9, 1933. However, during the 1930s, tropical fish farms were established in the general area.

In the mid-1930s, the New Deal programs of Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration were aimed at pulling the nation out of the Depression, and Hillsborough County did benefit from these with the Public Works Administration's projects (Lowry 1974). However, it was not until World War II that the local economy recovered, along with the rest of the state. Federal roads, channel building, and airfield construction for the wartime defense effort brought numerous Americans into Florida and Tampa.

It was during the 1930s and 1940s that Gibsonton started becoming a winter residence to carnival workers otherwise known as "carnies." Grace and Eddie LeMay, who operated cookhouses on carnival midways, began coming to the Gibsonton area during the winters in the 1920s. They finally moved to the area and opened a restaurant called Eddie's Hut. Since the LeMays were successful and loved the area, their friends (mostly carnies) and families followed them. Thus, each year, more and more carnival workers migrated to the area, which caused Gibsonton to grow (Maio et al. 1998:57-59).

As World War II ended, Hillsborough and Manatee Counties, like most of Florida, experienced a population boom in the 1950s. Florida's population increased from 1,897,414 in 1940 to 2,771,305 in 1950 (USCB 1995). After the war, car ownership increased, making the American public more mobile. Tourism, along with corporate investments, developed as one of the major industries for the Tampa Bay area. Many who had served at Florida's military bases during World War II also returned with their families to live. As veterans returned, the trend in new housing focused on the development of small tract homes in new subdivisions.

Finally, the late 1950s saw the end of the cigar industry in Tampa due to Fidel Castro's takeover of Cuba and an American embargo on Cuban tobacco. Tourism began its development as one of the major industries for the city along with corporate investments. As a result, in the 1960s construction of I-75 in Florida was begun, generating a spurt of activity that has continued into the 21st century.

Completion of Interstate 275 provided convenient access within the metropolitan Tampa area. Interstate 75, completed through eastern Hillsborough and Manatee Counties in the early 1980s, provided access allowing continued growth in the counties. Throughout the last twenty years, commercial development, including tourist attractions such as Busch Gardens, restaurants, and hotels, have exploded along the interstate systems, keeping tourism as one of the primary revenue sources in Florida.

With the population explosion in Hillsborough and Manatee Counties, the character of the area has changed dramatically. By 1970, development of residential communities, mobile home parks, and villages was well underway throughout the region. By 2000, the population of Hillsborough County totaled 998,948, making the county the fourth largest in the state; Manatee was ranked 16th, with a population of 264,002 (USCB 2000). The largest employers are in the retail trade, services, and government sectors. Hillsborough County was designated, along with Hernando, Pasco, and Pinellas Counties, as the Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater Metropolitan Area and Manatee County is part of the Sarasota-Bradenton-Venice Metropolitan Area. Most of the Hillsborough and Manatee county population is centered on Tampa Bay and the Gulf Coast; although some of the corridor remains rural in nature, it is increasingly becoming developed.

Section 4 - RESEARCH CONSIDERATIONS AND METHODS

4.1 Background Research and Literature Review

A review of archaeological and historical literature, records, and other documents and data pertaining to the project area, including the ETDM Summary Report (Project #8001; FDOT 2007) was conducted. The focus of this research was to ascertain the types of cultural resources known in the I-75 PD&E Study project APE, their temporal/cultural affiliations, site location information, and other relevant data. This included a review of the sites listed in the NRHP, the FMSF (April 2008 GIS update), published books and articles, and cultural resource survey reports. In addition to the FMSF, other data relative to the background research were obtained from the files of ACI. The data resulting from the background research, including an archaeological site location predictive model, plus proposed survey methods, were summarized in a research design which was prepared for both I-75 study areas (ACI 2008). This was submitted for review to the FHWA, SHPO, and Native American Tribes in 2008. The SHPO concurred with the research design in a letter dated September 5, 2008; the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida approved it in a letter dated August 14, 2008, and requested consultation if the project results in impacts to cultural resources (Appendix A). No individuals with specific knowledge concerning the archaeology and history of the APE were identified during this project. Therefore, no interviews were conducted.

4.1.1 Archaeological Considerations

Typically, for CRAS projects of this kind, specific research designs are formulated prior to initiating fieldwork to delineate project goals and strategies. Primarily, an attempt is made to understand, based on prior investigations, the spatial distribution of known resources. Such knowledge serves not only to generate an informed set of expectations concerning the kinds of sites which might be anticipated to occur within the project area, but also provides a valuable regional perspective and, thus, a basis for evaluating any new sites discovered.

Thirty-seven (37) previously recorded archaeological sites are located within one-half mile of the project corridor (**Figures 4-1 through 4-4**, Table 4-1). Most of the sites are classified as lithic and/or artifact scatters. Some of the lithic scatters may also have been associated with aboriginal stone quarrying activities. Other sites were classified as campsites, areas for raw material procurement, historic artifact scatters, and an isolated piece of lithic debitage. Two of the sites were reported to have human remains (8HI480, 8HI5321) and two others are classified as shell middens/mounds (8HI54, 8HI55) (FMSF). 8MA1337 consists of a segment of the Curiosity Creek Canal System that was constructed in the 1920s (ACI 2004e).




Figure 4-1 Previously recorded archaeological sites proximate to the I-75 PD&E Study corridor and the zones of archeological potential (USGS 1975, 1982b, 1982d, 1982f).

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2




Figure 4-2 Previously recorded archaeological sites proximate to the I-75 PD&E Study corridor and the zones of archaeological potential (USGS 1975, 1982f).

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2



Figure 4-3 Previously recorded archaeological sites proximate to the I-75 PD&E Study corridor and zones of archaeological potential (USGS 1982c, 19823, 1982f, 1982h).

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2




Figure 4-4 Previously recorded archaeological sites and one historic structure (green circle) proximate to the I-75 PD&E Study corridor and zones of archaeological potential (USGS 1982a, 1982c, 1982e, 1982g).

Table 4-1: Previously recorded archaeological sites within one-half mile of the I-75 PD&E Study corridor

Site #	Site Name	Site Type	Culture	SHPO Eval.*
HI00054	NN	Shell midden, mound	Aboriginal	No
HI00055	NN	Campsite, shell midden, mound	Aboriginal with pottery	NE
HI00409	Trotwood	Artifact scatter	Aboriginal with pottery	No
HI00414	Osteen	Lithic scatter	Archaic	No
HI00478	Alafia South	Lithic scatter	Archaic	No
HI00479	Roast Pig	Lithic scatter	Archaic	No
HI00480	Curiosity Creek	Burial mound, artifact scatter	Aboriginal with pottery	PE
HI00524	Symmes Road	Lithic scatter	Archaic	No
HI00525	South Symmes	Lithic scatter	Archaic	No
HI00526	Dickman	Lithic scatter	Archaic	No
HI00527	Gainey Ranch 1	Lithic scatter	Archaic	No
HI00528	Gainey Ranch 2	Lithic scatter	Archaic	NE
HI00529	Gainey Ranch 3	Lithic scatter	Archaic	No
HI00532	Mad Woman West	Lithic scatter	Archaic	No
HI02183	Black Snake	Lithic scatter	Aboriginal lacking pottery	No
HI02184	Burnt Scrub	Lithic scatter	Aboriginal lacking pottery	No
HI03626	Wolf Creek Branch 1	Lithic scatter	Middle Archaic	No
HI04546	SWFLP Site III	Lithic scatter	Aboriginal lacking pottery	NE
HI05321	Ivy Flower	Artifact scatter, human remains	Aboriginal with pottery	No
HI06709	Creek's Edge	Lithic scatter	Aboriginal with pottery	NE
HI07698	Tomato Cow	Artifact scatter	Weeden Island I, Safety Harbor	NE
HI07699	Bullfrog Cow	Artifact scatter	Aboriginal with pottery	NE
HI09641	Double Berm Cove Site	Lithic scatter	Aboriginal	NE
HI09830	Diehl 1	Lithic scatter	Aboriginal	NE
HI09833	Diehl 2	Lithic scatter	Aboriginal	NE
MA00136	End Field	Artifact scatter	Archaic	No
MA01167	JR56	Isolated flake	Aboriginal lacking pottery	NE
MA01337	Curiosity Creek Canal	Canal	20th century	NE
MA01340	Rudolph	Historic artifact scatter, raw material procurement	Archaic, 19th & 20th centuries	NE
MA01341	Buckeye Grove	Raw material procurement	Middle Archaic	NE
MA01375	Cabbage Slough	Campsite	Aboriginal lacking pottery	NE
MA01380	Buckeye D	Lithic scatter	Aboriginal lacking pottery	NE
* SHPO evaluation: PE = Potentially Eligible for NRHP, NE = Not Eligible for NRHP, No = Not Evaluated by SHPO. Green shading denotes sites within or adjacent to the APE.				

In terms of temporal affiliation, Archaic period sites are the most common, but many of the sites cannot be confidently dated due to the lack of temporally diagnostic materials. Other cultural components represented by these sites include Weeden Island, Safety

Harbor, and historic. Eleven of the sites (depicted by green shading in Table 4-1) are located within or adjacent to the I-75 PD&E Study project APE, and thus, site-specific information on these is presented.

8HI409, a culturally indeterminate artifact scatter, was initially recorded in 1975 by Patricia Seabury, a USF graduate student (FMSF). She recovered several pieces of lithic debitage, sand tempered plain ceramics, and oyster shell, as well as a columella. The site was re-examined by B. Calvin Jones during the I-75 survey and was not considered worthy of additional investigations (FMSF). Almost all of the sites located proximate to the I-75 PD&E Study corridor were recorded by Jones during the survey of the I-75 corridor in 1978. Those within or adjacent to the I-75 PD&E Study project APE include 8HI409, 8HI478, 8HI479, 8HI480, 8HI524, 8HI525, 8HI526, 8HI527, 8HI532, and 8MA136 (FMSF). Except for 8HI480, the sites were classified as Archaic period lithic scatters, evidenced by lithic debitage and an occasional projectile point.

Only three of these sites were considered worthy of additional investigations (Jones 1980). The Curiosity Creek Site (8HI480) was initially described as an artificially constructed sand mound that was used as a seasonal encampment during the Perico Island-Glades period (Jones 1980). Excavations conducted at the site resulted in the site being classified as a Manasota period short-term encampment with the occupants utilizing coastal resources (Almy 1981). In addition to the Manasota component, an earlier Middle Archaic component was also revealed.

The Curiosity Creek Canal (8MA1337) was recorded as a result of the survey of the Buckeye Road development tract (ACI 2004e). This canal system, excavated in the 1920s by the Bishop Harbor Drainage District, had a major economic impact to the county by draining additional farmlands. However, the canal, its laterals and sub-laterals were assessed to have a low research potential, and thus not potentially eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. The SHPO concurred with this assessment.

More than 30 CRASs have been conducted within one-half mile of the I-75 PD&E Study corridor. These have included a rest area and several borrow pits along I-75 (Ballo 1987; Browning 1981a, 1981b, 1981c, 1981d). No sites were located during those efforts. Several other surveys were conducted for water and sewage conveyance, though none recorded any sites proximate to the I-75 PD&E Study corridor (Austin 1999, 2000; Deming 1980b; Miller 1979). Similarly, archaeological survey of natural gas transmission lines have yielded negative results near this segment of I-75 (Estabrook et al. 1991; Janus Research 2000, 2001; Pochurek 2000; SEARCH 2000; Stokes 2002a, 2002b).

Most of the surveys conducted in the vicinity were done for planned commercial and residential developments. These include Parkway Center (Austin and Ballo 1986), Wolf Creek Branch (Estabrook 1989; Janus Research 2005b), Gateway North (Layman 1990), Southpointe West (ACI 1998), South Shore Corporate Park (ACI 2001), SDG Land Exchange (Estabrook 2001), a 600-acre parcel (ACI 2003a), Covewood (ACI 2003b), River Bend (ACI 2004a, 2004c), High School PPP (Ambrosino 2004), South Bend (Janus Research 2004a), Wal-Mart (ACI 2004d), Woods at Moccasin Wallow (Janus Research

2005a), Buckeye Road (ACI 2004e, 2005c), Spencer Creek (ACI 2005b), Maury Carter tract (Austin 2005), Mixon Subdivision (ACI 2005a), Diehl property (Carty 2005), McClure property (ACI 2004b), Harvest Creek (Hughes 2006), and Port Dolphin (Nodine 2006). Unless otherwise mentioned, no sites were recorded proximate to the I-75 PD&E Study corridor as a result of these endeavors. Several other surveys have been conducted for cellular communication towers (FAC 2005; Hunt 2000; Pracht 2001a, 2001b, 2001c); no archaeological sites were recorded.

Based on these data, and other regional site location predictive models and studies (e.g., Austin et al. 1991; Burger 1982; de Montmollin 1983; Deming 1980a; Janus Research 1992, 2004b; Weisman and Collins 2004), informed expectations concerning the types of sites likely to occur within the project APE, as well as their probable environmental settings, was generated. As archaeologists have long realized, aboriginal populations did not select their habitation sites and activity areas in a random fashion. Rather, many environmental factors had a direct influence upon site location selection. Among these variables are soil drainage, distance to freshwater, relative topography, and proximity to food and other resources including stone and clay. Based on the aforementioned projects, plus more general regional studies, it has been repeatedly demonstrated that non-coastal archaeological sites are most often located near a permanent or semi-permanent source of potable water. In addition, aboriginal sites are found, more often than not, on better-drained soils, and at the better-drained upland margins of wetland features such as swamps, sinkholes, lakes, and ponds. Numerous sites are located directly on the coast, usually in areas with slightly higher relative topography. Upland sites well removed from potable water are rare. In the pine flatwoods, sites tend to be situated on ridges and knolls near a freshwater source. It should be noted that this settlement pattern can not be applied to sites of the Paleo-Indian and Early Archaic periods, which precede the onset of modern environmental conditions. These were “tethered” to water and lithic resources much more so than is evident during the later periods.

In general, comparative site location data for Hillsborough and Manatee Counties indicate a pattern of site distribution favoring the relatively better-drained terrain proximate to rivers, creeks, ponds, freshwater marshes, lakes, and other wetland features. In spite of the numerous sites along I-75, the recent predictive model for Hillsborough County indicates that the corridor has a low to moderate potential for archaeological site occurrence (Janus Research 2004b).

In summary, most of the previously recorded archaeological sites in the general vicinity of the project area can be described as lithic/artifact scatters. Many of these are characterized by small areal extent and low artifact density. These sites are believed to represent limited activity sites and short-term residential or hunting camps. The debris from stone tool manufacture and/or modification with or without a small quantity of ceramics comprise the site assemblages. Several of the sites in the area are large, suggesting longer periods of occupation or more intensive use of the general area.

Given these known patterns of aboriginal settlement, it was anticipated that additional data on the previously recorded sites would be obtained. In addition, there was a variable probability for additional archaeological sites within the project APE. Several areas were

considered to have a moderate or high potential for site occurrence based upon topography, distance to water, and soil drainage characteristics. The high and moderate probability areas have been combined into a single site “potential zone,” as depicted in Figures 4-1 through 4-4. Given the results of the historic research, no historic period archaeological sites, including nineteenth century homesteads, forts, trails, roads, or Indian encampments were expected (State of Florida 1843c, 1846b, 1847b, 1847c, 1847d, 1852b, 1852c, 1852d).

4.1.2 Historical Considerations

A review of the FMSF and the NRHP revealed that one historic property had been previously recorded within the historical APE (see **Figure 4-4**). 8HI1029, the W.I. Bradley Place, a Georgian Revival style residence located at the end of Elbow Bend Road was first documented in 1979 during the *Cultural Resources of the Unincorporated Portions of Hillsborough County Survey* (HT/HCPB 1980); it was updated as destroyed in 1998 during the *Hillsborough County Historic Resources Survey Report* (Maio and Mohlman 1998). Thus, no previously recorded historic resources are located within the I-75 project APE. A review of the relevant quadrangle maps (Brandon, Gibsonton, Riverview, and Ruskin) (USGS 1956a, 1956b, 1956c, 1956d) revealed the potential for several historic (pre-ca. 1960) structures.

4.2 Field Methodology

Archaeological field methods consisted of an initial ground surface reconnaissance, followed by systematic subsurface shovel testing which was carried out to locate sites not exposed on the ground, as well as to test for the presence of buried cultural deposits in areas yielding surface artifacts. Shovel testing was carried out at 25 m (82 ft) intervals in the high probability areas, at 50 m (164 ft) intervals in the moderate probability areas, and at 100 m (328 ft) intervals or judgmentally within a sample of the low probability areas. Smaller scale interval testing was conducted to delimit site boundaries. Shovel tests were circular and measured approximately 50 cm (20 in) in diameter by at least 1 m (3.3 ft) in depth unless impeded by water or impenetrable substrate. All soil removed was screened through a 6.4 mm (0.25 in) mesh hardware cloth to maximize the recovery of artifacts. The locations of all shovel tests were plotted on the aerial map, and following the recording of relevant data such as stratigraphic profile and artifact finds, all test pits were refilled.

Historical field methodology consisted of a preliminary reconnaissance survey of the project APE to determine the location of all historic properties believed to be approximately 50 years of age or older (pre-1960), and to ascertain if any such resources could be eligible for listing in the NRHP. An in-depth study of each identified historic resource was conducted. Photographs were taken and information needed for the completion of FMSF forms was gathered. In addition to architectural descriptions, each historic property was reviewed to assess style, historic context, and potential NRHP eligibility. Pertinent records housed at the FMSF, State Library of Florida, and the Hillsborough and Manatee County Property Appraiser’s Office via the internet, were examined. A visual reconnaissance survey of the project vicinity was also conducted to

ascertain whether any potential historic district existed within or adjacent to the project corridor.

4.3 Unexpected Discoveries

It was anticipated that if human burial sites such as Indian mounds, lost historic and prehistoric cemeteries, or other unmarked burials or associated artifacts were found, then the provisions and guidelines set forth in Chapter 872.05, *F.S.* (Florida's Unmarked Burial Law) would be followed. Such sites were not expected within the I-75 PD&E Study corridor.

4.4 Laboratory Methods and Curation

All recovered cultural materials were initially cleaned and sorted by artifact class. Lithics were divided into tools and debitage based on gross morphology. Tools, if found, would have been measured, and the edges examined with a 7-45x stereo-zoom microscope for traces of edge damage and classified using standard references (Bullen 1975; Purdy 1981). Lithic debitage was subjected to a limited technological analysis focused on ascertaining the stages of stone tool production. Flakes and non-flake production debris (i.e., cores, blanks, tested cobbles) were measured, and examined for raw material types and absence or presence of thermal alteration. Flakes were classified into four types (primary decortication, secondary decortication, non-decortication, and shatter) based on the amount of cortex on the dorsal surface and the shape (White 1963). In addition, flake categories were utilized to determine site function based on the lithic debitage (Sullivan and Rozen 1985). The Sullivan and Rozen attribute analysis utilizes four mutually exclusive flake categories based on the presence or absence of a single interior surface, point of applied force, and margins. Complete flakes have a single interior surface, an identifiable point of applied force, and intact lateral and distal margins. Proximal flake fragments have an identifiable point of applied force, but one or more of the margins are missing, and the other attributes are the same. Distal/marginal flake fragments do not have an identifiable point of applied force and debris is classified based on the lack of a single interior surface (Sullivan and Rozen 1985:758-759). Based on the distribution of the flake categories, presence of cores, and retouch pieces technological groupings can be determined. A very high percentage of cores and complete flakes with a very low percentage of proximal flake fragments and distal/marginal flake fragments are indicative of unintensive core reduction. Assemblages with a focus on core reduction would have a high percentage of debris. Assemblages from core reduction and tool manufacture would have a similar distribution to that of the intensive core reduction with a decrease in debris and an increase in proximal flakes. Tool manufacture, with little or no core reduction, is evidenced by a high percentage (ca. 50%) of distal flake fragments and a low occurrence of cores.

Aboriginal ceramics would have been classified into commonly recognized types based on observable characteristics such as aplastic inclusions and surface treatment (cf., Cordell 1985; 1987; 2004; Goggin 1948, 1952; Willey 1949). The historic materials would have been identified using a variety of resources to determine site function and temporal placement. Faunal material would have been initially sorted into class

(mammal, reptile, bony fish, etc.); within these broad categories, identifiable elements would have been classified as to genus and species, where possible.

All recovered artifacts and project-related records, including maps and field notes, will be curated at ACI in Sarasota, until arrangements can be made for curation by the FDOT.

Section 5 - SURVEY RESULTS

5.1 Archaeological Survey Results

Archaeological field survey included both surface reconnaissance and the excavation of 689 shovel tests within the project APE. Of these, 200 shovel tests were placed within and near the 10 previously recorded archaeological sites (Table 5-1), and the remainder were excavated mostly within the high and moderate probability areas at 25 m (82 ft) and 50 m (164 ft), respectively, as identified during the background research. In addition, a sample of the low probability zone was archaeologically sampled, with shovel tests placed at 100 m (328 ft) intervals. Shovel test locations are depicted in **Figures 5-1 through 5-8**. Portions of the corridor could not be tested due to buried utilities and constructed features. Other areas were not tested due to extensive disturbance caused by road construction. Some of the probability areas were downgraded in the field due to previous disturbance or current conditions such as wet, poorly drained soils. Although it was originally recorded as an archaeological site, 8MA1337, the Curiosity Creek Canal, was recently reclassified as a resource group, and thus, is not included in Table 5-1.

Table 5-1: Results of archaeological survey

Site #	Site Name	Site Type	SHPO Eval.	No. STs	Results/Evaluation
8HI409	Trotwood	AS	NE	17	Negative/Ineligible in APE
8HI478	Alafia South	LS	NE	42	1 productive/Ineligible in APE
8HI479	Roast Pig	LS	NE	16	Negative/Ineligible in APE
8HI480	Curiosity Creek	CAMP	NE	15	Negative/Ineligible in APE
8HI524	Symmes Road	LS	NE	12	1 productive/Ineligible in APE
8HI525	South Symmes	LS	NE	11	Negative/Ineligible in APE
8HI526	Dickman	LS	NE	14	Negative/Ineligible in APE
8HI527	Gainey Ranch I	LS	NE	14	Negative/Ineligible in APE
8HI532	Mad Woman West	LS	NE	30	13 productive/Ineligible in APE
8MA136	End Field	LS	NE	29	Negative/Ineligible in APE
8HI11359	409 North	LS	No	23	5 productive/Ineligible in APE

Legend: Shading indicates sites identified within the project APE.
Site Type: AS=Artifact Scatter; CAMP=Campsite; LS=Lithic Scatter
SHPO Evaluation: NE=Not Eligible; No=Not Evaluated

As a result of these investigations, one new archaeological site (8HI11359) and one archaeological occurrence (AO) were discovered. An AO is defined as “one or two non-diagnostic artifacts, not known to be distant from the original context, which fit within a hypothetical cylinder of thirty meters diameter, regardless of depth below surface” (FMSF 1999:10). In addition, cultural materials were recovered from three previously recorded sites, 8HI478, 8HI524, and 8HI532. No evidence of the other seven previously recorded sites, 8HI409, 8HI479, 8HI480, 8HI525, 8HI526, 8HI527, and 8MA136 was discovered, suggesting that these sites, as contained within the I-75 APE, have been destroyed. Completed FMSF forms for each of the sites are included in Appendix B. Since no new information was collected on the Curiosity Creek Canal (8MA1337), the



Figure 5-1 Approximate location of the shovel tests and archaeological resources within the I-75 PD&E Study project APE.

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2




Figure 5-2 Approximate location of the shovel tests and archaeological resources within the I-75 PD&E Study project APE.

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2



Figure 5-3 Approximate location of the shovel tests and archaeological resources within the I-75 PD&E Study project APE.

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2



Figure 5-4 Approximate location of the shovel tests and archaeological resources within the I-75 PD&E Study project APE.

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2



Figure 5-5 Approximate location of the shovel tests and archaeological resources within the I-75 PD&E Study project APE.

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2



Figure 5-6 Approximate location of the shovel tests and archaeological resources within the I-75 PD&E Study project APE.

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2




Figure 5-7 Approximate location of the shovel tests and archaeological resources within the I-75 PD&E Study project APE.

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 FPID : 419235-2-22-01




Figure 5-8 Approximate location of the shovel tests and archaeological resources within the I-75 PD&E Study project APE.

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2

FMSF form was not updated. Site descriptions follow, organized by site file number, rather than geographically.

5.1.1 Previously Recorded Sites

8HI409: The Trotwood Site is located in the southwest quarter of Section 30, Township 30 South, Range 20 East (USGS 1982e) (Figure 5-7). The site occurs on Myakka fine sand, a poorly drained soil of the flatwoods (USDA 1989). Site elevation is 6 to 8 m (20-25 ft) amsl. The site is located approximately 100 m (328 ft) west of Bullfrog Creek.

8HI409, a culturally indeterminate artifact scatter, was initially recorded in 1975 by Patricia Seabury, a USF graduate student (FMSF). She reported collecting five flakes, three sand tempered plain sherds, seven pieces of oyster shell, and one columella. The site was re-examined by B. Calvin Jones in 1978 during the I-75 survey and was not considered worthy of additional investigation (FMSF). He characterized the site as “widely scattered lithics, not NR quality, and no excavations recommended” (FMSF).

The current investigation consisted of the excavation of 17 shovel tests at 25 and 50 m (82 and 164 ft) intervals, none of which was positive. The general stratigraphy of the area consists of 0-35 cm (0-14 in) brown gray fill/sand and 35-100 cm (14-39 in) brown gray sand. Given the negative results of testing, the Trotwood Site is not extant within the I-75 project APE. No additional investigations are warranted.

8HI478: The Alafia South Site is located in the southwest quarter of Section 19, Township 30 South, Range 20 East (USGS 1982e) (Figure 5-7). The site occurs on Myakka fine sand, a poorly drained soil of the flatwoods (USDA 1989). Site elevation is 6 to 8 m (20-25 ft) amsl. The site is located approximately 200 m (656 ft) south of the Alafia River.

8HI478 is a culturally indeterminate lithic scatter that was recorded by Jones in 1978 during the I-75 survey. He recovered a broken corner-notched projectile point and some chert flakes (FMSF). Test excavations were recommended prior to roadway construction because although the “site appears to be thin, scattered, though activity areas of concentration are suspected” (FMSF). However, no additional investigations were apparently conducted.

The current investigation consisted of the excavation of 42 shovel tests, of which one was positive. The shovel tests were excavated at 12.5, 25 and 50 m (41, 82, and 164 ft) intervals, as well as judgmentally placed. The stratigraphy of the positive shovel test consists of 0-30 cm (0-12 in) light gray brown sand and 30-100 cm (12-39 in) light gray sand. The artifacts were recovered between 40 and 100 cm (16-39 in) below surface (cmbs). Based on the subsurface testing and previous investigations, the site covers an area roughly 300 m (984 ft) east/west by 260 m (853 ft) north/south.

The limited artifact assemblage recovered from the site consists of two pieces of lithic debitage. Both are chert non-decortication flakes that are medium¹ sized and had not been thermally altered. In terms of the Sullivan and Rosen (1985) analysis, there is one broken and one complete flake. Little can be said concerning the function or temporal placement of the site. The lack of cortical material suggests the later stages of tool manufacture and/or maintenance. Lithic debitage is not temporally diagnostic unless it has been heat treated, which was most common during the Middle to Late Archaic periods (cf., Ste. Claire 1987). The site most likely represents a short-term encampment established to utilize the locally available resources.

Although of interest in terms of regional settlement pattern analyses, given the low artifact density and diversity, lack of subsurface features, and previous disturbance, the Alafia South Site, as contained within the I-75 APE, is not considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP due to its low research potential. No additional investigations are recommended.

8HI479: The Roast Pig Site is located in the northwest quarter of Section 30, Township 30 South, Range 20 East (USGS 1956c) (Figure 5-7). The site occurs on Myakka fine sand, a poorly drained soil of the flatwoods (USDA 1989). Elevation of the site is between 6 and 8 m (20-25 ft) amsl. The site is adjacent to a tributary of Bullfrog Creek, and 50 m east of Bullfrog Creek.

8HI479 was recorded by Jones during the I-75 survey. The site was classified as an Archaic period lithic scatter and was not considered a significant cultural resource (FMSF). Jones recovered a projectile point and some lithic debitage, but he did not consider the site worthy of additional testing.

The current investigation consisted of the excavation of 16 shovel tests at 25 and 50 m (82 and 164 ft) intervals, of which none was positive. The general stratigraphy of the area consists of 0-30 cm (0-12 in) gray brown fill/disturbed sand, 30-70 cm (12-28 in) light brown sand, and 70-100 cm (28-39 in) very dark brown hardpan. Based upon the current testing, it is believed that the Roast Pig Site, as contained within the I-75 APE, has been destroyed through previous construction activities. No additional investigations are warranted.

8HI480: The Curiosity Creek Site is located in the southwest quarter of Section 31, Township 32 South, Range 19 East (USGS 1982f) (Figure 5-2). The site occurs on Myakka fine sand, a poorly drained soil of the flatwoods (USDA 1989). The elevation of the site is 5 to 6 m (15-20 ft) amsl. The channelized Curiosity Creek is located about 100 m (328 ft) southeast of the site.

8HI480 was initially described as an artificially constructed sand mound that was used as a seasonal encampment during the Perico Island-Glades period (Jones 1980). Jones recovered sand tempered plain ceramics, lithic debitage, and some saltwater shell food remains. Excavations conducted at the site resulted in its classification as a Manasota

¹ Small = <1 cm / 0.4 in, medium = 1-2 cm / 0.4-0.8 in, large = 2-3 cm / 0.8-1.2 in, and extra large = 3-4 cm / 1.2-1.6 in.

period short-term encampment with the occupants utilizing coastal resources (Almy 1981). This was based on the recovery of a few projectile points, knives, stone and shell scrapers, aboriginal ceramics, plant remains, and evidence of a number of small fire or cooking pits. No human remains were recovered. In addition to the Manasota component, an earlier Middle Archaic component was also revealed.

The current investigation consisted of the excavation of 15 shovel tests, none of which was positive. The shovel tests were excavated at 25 m (82 ft) intervals. The general stratigraphy of the area consists of 0-35 cm (0-14 in) gray brown sand and 35-100 cm (12-39 in) light brown sand. In several of the tests, excavation could not be completed due to water inflow. Although 8HI480 was previously determined potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP, no significant portions of this site are located within the I-75 project APE. No additional investigations are warranted.

8HI524: The Symmes Road Site is located in Sections 30 and 31, Township 30 South, Range 20 East (USGS 1982e) (Figure 5-7). The site occurs on Pomello fine sand, a moderately well drained soil located on low ridges on the flatwoods (USDA 1989). There is also a small area of Myakka fine sand located in the southeast portion of the site. Myakka fine sand is a poorly drained soil of the flatwoods. Elevation of the site is between 8 and 11 m (25-35 ft) amsl. Bullfrog Creek is about 250 m (820 ft) east of the site.

8HI524 was recorded by Jones during the I-75 survey (FMSF). The site is listed as an Archaic period lithic scatter, and was not considered a significant cultural resource. “No tests of this thin site” were recommended (FMSF).

The current investigation consisted of the excavation of 12 shovel tests, of which one was positive. These were excavated at 25, 50, and 100 m (82, 164, and 328 ft) intervals. This positive test expanded the site boundaries roughly 30 m (98 ft) to the northeast. The site area has been extensively disturbed through overpass construction. Site stratigraphy consists of 0-40 cm (0-16 in) gray sand and 40-100 cm (16-39 in) light gray sand. The northwest portion of the site is low and wet. The artifacts were recovered between 40 and 70 cmbs (16-28 in). Based upon the subsurface testing and the previous investigations, the site extends roughly 200 m (656 ft) north/south by 160 m (525 ft) east west.

The limited artifact assemblage consists of three pieces of medium-sized chert lithic debitage. One of the flakes had been thermally altered. There is one complete secondary decortication flake, and two non-decortication flake fragments. This collection of materials offers little in terms of determining site function or temporal placement. The use of thermal alteration suggests an Archaic component, and the relative small size of the flakes and secondary decortication flake suggests the middle to late stages of tool manufacture. The site most likely represents a short-term encampment established to utilize the locally available resources.

Although of interest in terms of settlement and land-use pattern analyses, given the low artifact density and diversity, absence of subsurface features, and lack of cultural

diagnostic materials, the site, is not considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP due to its low research potential. No additional investigations are recommended.

8HI525: The South Symmes Site is located in the northwest quarter of Section 31, Township 30 South, Range 20 East (USGS 1982e) (Figure 5-7). The site occurs primarily on Pomello fine sand, a moderately well drained soil located on low ridges on the flatwoods (USDA 1989). Myakka fine sand occurs along the northern and southern boundaries of the site. Myakka fine sand is a poorly drained soil of the flatwoods. Elevation of the site is between 8 and 11 m (25-35 ft) amsl. Bullfrog Creek is about 250 m (820 ft) east of the site and a small wetland is immediately adjacent to the east.

8HI525 was recorded by Jones during the I-75 survey (FMSF). The site is listed as an Archaic period lithic scatter, and was not considered a significant cultural resource. Jones noted lithic debitage, but did not recommend any additional testing for the “apparently thin” site (FMSF).

The current investigation consisted of the excavation of 11 shovel tests at 50 m (164 ft) intervals, none of which was positive. The area has been extensively disturbed by the construction of the Symmes Road overpass. The general stratigraphy of the area consists of 0-10 cm (0-4 in) dark gray sand, 10-30 cm (4-12 in) gray brown sand, 30-80 cm (12-32 in) gray sand, and below that dark brown hardpan. Based upon the current testing, it is believed that the South Symmes Site, as contained within the I-75 APE, has been destroyed. No additional investigations are warranted.

8HI526: The Dickman Site is located in the western half of Section 29, Township 32 South, Range 19 East (USGS 1982f) (Figure 5-3). The site occurs on Myakka fine sand, a poorly drained soil of the flatwoods (USDA 1989). Elevation of the site is 2 to 5 m (5-15 ft). It is located about 50 m (164 ft) north of the Little Manatee River.

8HI526 was recorded during the I-75 survey by B. Calvin Jones (FMSF). The site consisted of a light scattering of lithic debris and, although no culturally diagnostic materials were recovered, he classified it as Archaic. No additional testing of the site was recommended by Jones (FMSF). The investigation of the Dickman portion of the Little Manatee River Preserve by USF archaeologists noted that the site had been destroyed by the construction of I-75 (Weisman and Collins 2004:100). However, it does not appear that subsurface testing was conducted at this time, since the river was above flood stage.

The current investigation consisted of the excavation of 14 shovel tests at 25 m (82 ft) intervals. None of the tests was positive. The general stratigraphy consists of 0-60 cm (0-24 in) gray brown sand and 60-100 cm (24-39 in) light gray sand. Based upon the current testing, it is believed that the Dickman Site, as contained within the I-75 APE, has been destroyed. No additional investigations are warranted.

8HI527: The Gainey Ranch 1 Site is located in the southwest quarter of Section 29, Township 32 South, Range 19 East (USGS 1982f) (Figure 5-3). It occurs on Archbold fine sand, a moderately well drained soil that occurs along low ridges in the flatwoods (USDA 1989). Elevation of the site is roughly 6 m (20 ft) amsl. It is situated about 130

m (426 ft) south of the Little Manatee River and 100 m (328 ft) north of a tributary stream.

8HI527 was recorded during the I-75 survey as an Archaic period lithic scatter. Jones did not believe that it was a significant cultural resource and no additional testing was recommended (FMSF).

The current investigation consisted of the excavation of 14 shovel tests, none of which was positive. The testing was conducted at 25 m (82 ft) intervals. The general stratigraphy of the area consists of 0-30 cm (0-12 in) gray sand, 30-85 cm (12-34 in) tan/brown sand, and 85-100 cm (34-39 in) gray sand. Based upon the current testing, it is believed that the Gainey Ranch 1 Site, as contained within the I-75 APE, has been destroyed. No additional investigations are warranted.

8HI532: The Mad Woman West Site is located in the northeast quarter of Section 13, Township 31 South, Range 19 East (USGS 1982f) (Figure 5-6). The site occurs primarily on Pomello fine sand, 0-5% slopes, which is a moderately well drained soil that occurs on low ridges in the flatwoods (USDA 1989). The site was also underlain by Myakka fine sand, a poorly drained soil of the flatwoods. The northern extent of the site is depicted as urban land and suggests that part of the site has been destroyed by interstate construction. Elevation of the site is between 9 and 12 m (30-40 ft) amsl. The site is situated approximately 200 m (656 ft) west of Bullfrog Creek.

8HI532 was recorded by Jones during the survey of the I-75 corridor (FMSF). The site was classified as an Archaic period lithic scatter that functioned as a chipping station. No additional testing of the site was recommended (FMSF).

The current investigation consisted of the excavation of 30 shovel tests, of which 13 were positive. The shovel tests were excavated at 25 m (82 ft) intervals and judgmentally placed. The testing expanded the site boundaries about 70 m (229 ft) to the west and 270 m (886 ft) to the south, providing an overall site size of 650 m (2132 ft) north/south by 125 m (410 ft) east/west. The northern area of the site was extensively disturbed by the construction of the interstate on and off ramps. The general stratigraphy of the site area consists of 0-30 cm (0-12 in) gray sand and 30-100 cm (12-39 in) light gray sand. The artifacts were recovered between 0 and 100 cmbs (0-39 in). The positive shovel tests were all within the western ROW.

The artifact assemblage consists of 21 pieces of lithic debitage, all but one of which is chert; the other flake is coral. Five of the chert flakes had been thermally altered, as had the coral flake. In terms of size, there are 14 medium, six large, and one extra large. Utilizing the Sullivan and Rozen (1985) flake type distribution, there are nine complete, five broken, six flake fragments, and one piece of debris. This distribution does not match with any of the functional categories. It could be that the sample size is too small. Within Sullivan and Rozen's unintensified core reduction category, complete flakes account for over half of the assemblage, and the flake fragments outnumbered the broken flakes almost three to one. However, our assemblage has an almost even distribution of broken and flake fragments. Non-decortication flakes account for 17 of the items, with

another three secondary decortication flakes and one piece of shatter. Based upon this flake typology, site function appears to represent the middle and late stages of lithic tool manufacture and/or tool maintenance.

Although of interest in terms of settlement and land-use pattern analyses, given the relatively low artifact density and diversity, absence of subsurface features, and lack of cultural diagnostic materials, the Mad Woman West Site as contained within the I-75 APE, is not considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP due to its low research potential. No additional investigations are recommended.

8MA136: The End Field Site is located in the northwest quarter of Section 1, Township 33 South, Range 18 East (USGS 1982f) (Figure 5-2). The site occurs on EauGallie fine sand, a poorly drained soil of the flatwoods (USDA 1982). Elevation of the site is between 6 and 8 m (20-25 ft) amsl. It is located about 85 m (280 ft) southwest of a channelized tributary of Curiosity Creek.

8MA136 was discovered by Jones during the I-75 survey. It was recorded as a culturally indeterminate lithic scatter and was not considered a significant cultural resource (FMSF). Jones recovered “a handful of chert flakes in deep gray sand” (FMSF).

The current investigation consisted of the excavation of 29 shovel tests, of which none was positive. These were placed at 25 m (82 ft) intervals along each side of the existing ROW, as well as within the median. The general stratigraphy of the area consists of 0-70 cm (0-28 in) dark gray brown wet sand and 70-85 cm (28-34 in) brown wet sand. Ground water intrusion prevented deeper excavation. Based upon the current testing, it is believed that the End Field Site, as contained within the I-75 APE, has been destroyed. No additional investigations are warranted.

8MA1337: A small segment of the Curiosity Creek Canal was initially recorded as an archaeological site in Section 1, Township 33 South, Range 18 East (USGS 1982f) (Figure 5-2) during the survey of the Buckeye Road development tract (ACI 2004e). Channelization of the creek extends at least another five miles upstream from the recorded segment as well as further downstream. The location of additional portions of the canal have recently been digitized by FMSF staff, including the segment that runs under I-75. 8MA1337 recently has been reclassified from an archaeological site to a linear feature/resource group (Branham 2008).

The canal system was excavated in the 1920s by the Bishop Harbor Drainage District. This system had a major economic impact to the county by draining additional farm lands, but the canal, its laterals, and sub-laterals have a low research potential, and thus were not considered potentially eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. The SHPO concurred with that assessment. Since no new data have been collected on the site and there is no change in its status, a FMSF form was not updated for this feature.

5.1.2 Newly Recorded Site

8HI11359: The 409 North Site is located in the southwest quarter of Section 30, Township 30 South, Range 20 East (USGS 1982e) (Figure 5-7). The site occurs on Archbold fine sand, a moderately well drained soil on low ridges in the flatwoods (USDA 1989). The general stratigraphy consists of 0-15 cm (0-6 in) gray sand and 15-110 cm (6-43 in) white sand. Site elevation is 8 to 9 m (25-30 ft) amsl. The site is located approximately 130 to 150 m (426 – 492 ft) west and south of Bullfrog Creek.

The site was discovered through systematic subsurface testing at 50 m (164 ft) intervals in a moderate probability area. Additional subsurface testing was conducted at 25 m (82 ft) intervals. A total of 23 shovel tests were excavated in the area, of which five were productive. Artifacts were recovered between 30 and 100 cmbs (12-43 in). Based upon the subsurface testing, the site, as contained within the APE, extends roughly 240 m (787 ft) north/south by 100 m (328 ft) east/west.

The artifact assemblage recovered from the site consists of 31 pieces of lithic debitage. There are 28 pieces of chert and three pieces of coral; eight chert flakes had been thermally altered as had one of the coral flakes. The coral flakes are all non-decortication. There are two medium and one extra large. The chert assemblage contains one primary decortication flake, one secondary decortication flake, and one piece of shatter; all are medium sized. There are also 25 non-decortication flakes, of which two are small, 19 are medium, and four are large. The Sullivan and Rozen analysis revealed eight complete, 14 broke, eight fragments, and one piece of debris. As with the Mad Woman West Site, this flake type distribution does not match with any of the basic functional typologies. In that system, broken flakes do not account for over 17%, while here, they account for 50% of the flakes. Based upon the flake sizes and the predominance of non-decortication flakes, the middle to late stages of lithic tool manufacture and/or tool maintenance activities were being conducted.

Roughly 30% of the flakes had been thermally altered, which may suggest a Middle to Late Archaic period of occupation. Debitage, in itself, is not temporally diagnostic, but the use of thermal alteration was most common during the Middle Archaic (cf., Ste. Claire 1987). The site likely served as a short-term encampment for the utilization of the locally available resources of the uplands and nearby Bullfrog Creek.

Although of interest in terms of settlement and land-use pattern analyses, given the relatively low artifact density and diversity, absence of subsurface features, and lack of cultural diagnostic materials, the 409 North Site is not considered eligible for listing in the NRHP due to its low research potential. No additional investigations are recommended.

5.1.3 Archaeological Occurrence

One AO was identified. This AO is located in the southwest quarter of Section 13 of Township 31 South, Range 19 East (USGS 1982e) (Figure 5-6). It occurs on Myakka fine sand, a poorly drained soil of the flatwoods (USDA 1989). Local stratigraphy

consists of 0-30 cm (0-12 in) mottled gray/white sand, 30-60 cm (12-24 in) brown sand, and below that, hardpan. The AO was located about 250 m (820 ft) west of Bullfrog Creek.

The AO was discovered through systematic subsurface testing at 100 m (328 ft) intervals in a low probability area. Six shovel tests were excavated in this area, one of which produced two pieces of lithic debitage between 0 and 40 cmbs (0-16 in). Two additional shovel tests were placed 12.5 m (41 ft) north and south of the productive test, with negative results.

This limited debitage assemblage consists of two medium-sized chert non-decortication flakes. Neither flake had been heat-treated. One of the flakes was complete, and the other was broken. Based on the low artifact density, relatively small flake size, and lack of cortical material, it is likely that the artifacts reflect tool maintenance.

Although of interest in terms of settlement and land-use pattern analyses, given the relatively low artifact density and diversity, absence of subsurface features, and lack of cultural diagnostic materials, the AO is not considered significant. No additional investigations are recommended.

5.2 Historical/Architectural Survey Results

As a result of field survey, eight historic structures, 8HI11295 through 8HI11302, were newly identified and recorded (Table 5-2). Locations are depicted in **Figures 5-9 through 5-11**. All are residences constructed between ca. 1945 and ca. 1960. Four buildings are of the Masonry Vernacular style, two of the Frame Vernacular style, and two of the Ranch style. Of these, six are associated with possible interchange modification areas along Old Big Bend Road and Gibsonton Drive. The eight historic buildings represent commonly occurring types of architecture for the locale, and available data did not indicate any significant historical associations. In addition, several of the resources have undergone alterations which compromise the architectural integrity of the building. Therefore, none is considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. Completed FMSF forms are included in Appendix B, and a description of each resource follows.




Figure 5-9 Location of the newly recorded historic structures located within the I-75 PD&E Study APE.

**I-75 PD&E STUDY
MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
HILLSBOROUGH AND
MANATEE COUNTIES
WPI Segment No. : 419235-2**




Figure 5-10 Location of the newly recorded historic structures located within the I-75 PD&E Study APE.

**I-75 PD&E STUDY
MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
HILLSBOROUGH AND
MANATEE COUNTIES
WPI Segment No. : 419235-2**




Figure 5-11 Location of the newly recorded historic structures located within the I-75 PD&E Study APE.

**I-75 PD&E STUDY
MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
HILLSBOROUGH AND
MANATEE COUNTIES
WPI Segment No. : 419235-2**

Table 5-2: Newly identified historic resources within the I-75 project APE

FMSF	Address	Style	App. Date of Cons.	NRHP evaluation
8HI11295	2201 18 th Avenue SE	Frame Vernacular	1945	Not eligible
8HI11296	6908 Simmons Loop Road	Ranch	1955	Not eligible
8HI11297	9922 Old Big Bend Road	Frame Vernacular	1950	Not eligible
8HI11298	9002 Gibsonton Drive	Masonry Vernacular	1955	Not eligible
8HI11299	9208 Gibsonton Drive	Ranch	1955	Not eligible
8HI11300	9212 Gibsonton Drive	Masonry Vernacular	1955	Not eligible
8HI11301	10010 Gibsonton Drive	Masonry Vernacular	1960	Not eligible
8HI11302	8007 Formby Street	Masonry Vernacular	1960	Not eligible



Photo 5-1: North elevation of 2201 18th Avenue SE (8HI11295), looking south

8HI11295: The Frame Vernacular style residence at 2201 18th Avenue SE, located along the west side of the I-75 PD&E Study corridor in Ruskin, was built ca. 1945 (Photo 5-1; **Figure 5-9**). The building features wood frame walls that rest on a pier foundation and are clad in vertical board siding (ca. 1980). It is topped with a gable roof faced in composition shingles and has one-over-one single hung sash windows (ca. 1980). An open porch wraps around on the north and west elevations. Due to access issues, other elevations and architectural features such as the main entrance were not observable. This is a typical example of the Frame Vernacular style found throughout the area, and alterations such as the replacement cladding and windows compromise its architectural integrity. In addition, research did not reveal any significant historical associations. Therefore, 8HI11295 is not considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.



Photo 5-2: South and east elevations of 6908 Simmons Loop Road (8HI11296), looking northwest

8HI11296: The Ranch style residence at 6908 Simmons Loop Road in Riverview was built ca. 1955 (Photo 5-2, **Figure 5-10**). This building is located approximately 3000 ft east of the I-75 centerline and south of Big Bend Road, in a possible interchange modification area. The slab foundation supports concrete block walls partially clad in brick and vertical board. The house is topped with a gable roof faced in composition shingles. The main entrance is accessed via an open porch (ca. 1980) on the east elevation, which has a shed roof covered in 5-V crimp sheet metal. The windows include original three-light awning and replacement one-over-one single hung sash (ca. 1965). Other architectural features include projecting window sills, gable vents, and vertical board in the gables. There is a ca. 1980 addition on the north elevation and an ancillary non-historic shed is to the west. This is an example of the Ranch style, which is commonly found throughout Hillsborough County. In addition, research did not indicate any significant persons or events associated with this building. Therefore, 8HI11296 does not appear to be potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.



Photo 5-3: South and east elevations of 9922 Old Big Bend Road (8HI11297), looking northwest

8HI11297: The Frame Vernacular style residence at 9922 Old Big Bend Road in Riverview was built ca. 1950 (Photo 5-3; **Figure 5-10**). This building is located approximately 3000 ft east of the I-75 centerline and north of Big Bend Road, in a possible interchange modification area. The wood frame walls, supported by concrete block and poured concrete piers, are clad in wood siding. The house is topped by a gable and shed roof faced with composition shingles. There are two porches on the house, one open porch on the south elevation that contains the main entrance and an open porch on the north elevation. An addition was built on the north elevation ca. 1980. The original windows are one-over-one double hung sash with storm windows added ca. 1980. Other architectural features include wood door and window surrounds, gable vents, turned porch posts, and lattice in-fill between the foundation piers. This is a typical example of the Frame Vernacular style found throughout the area. In addition, research did not reveal any significant historical associations. As a result, 8HI11297 does not appear to be potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.



Photo 5-4: South elevation of 9002 Gibsonton Drive (8HI11298), looking northwest

8HI11298: The Masonry Vernacular style residence at 9002 Gibsonton Drive in Gibsonton was built ca. 1955 (Photo 5-4; **Figure 5-11**). It is located approximately 2500 ft west of the I-75 centerline and on the north side of Gibsonton Drive in a possible interchange modification area. The concrete block walls, supported by a slab foundation, are covered with stucco and vinyl siding, and the gable roof is faced with composition shingles. The south elevation has two ca. 1980 open porches with shed roofs, one of which contains the main entrance. The windows on this building are three-light awning and some replacement two-over-two single hung sash (ca. 1970) with projecting window sills. Available research did not indicate this building as significant. It is an example of a style commonly found throughout the area and has additions that diminish its integrity. Therefore, 8HI11298 is not potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.



Photo 5-5: South and west elevations of 9208 Gibsonton Drive (8HI11299), looking northeast

8HI11299: The Ranch style residence at 9208 Gibsonton Drive in Gibsonton was built ca. 1955 (Photo 5-5, **Figure 5-11**). It is located approximately 2500 ft west of the I-75 centerline and on the north side of Gibsonton Drive, in a possible interchange modification area. The concrete block walls are supported by a continuous concrete block foundation and are clad in brick with vertical board in the gables. The house is topped with a gable and shed roof faced with composition shingles. There are two open porches with shed roofs, one on the south elevation that contains the main entrance and one on the east elevation. The windows on this building are four-light awning, two-over-two and ten-over-ten single hung sash (ca. 1970), and one-over-one single hung sash (6/6 simulated divided light; ca. 1980). Other architectural features include fixed window shutters, decorative porch posts with brackets, brick window sills, and gable vents. A carport and porch were added ca. 1980 to the east elevation. Ancillary features include a non-historic pool to the north and a non-historic shed to the northwest. This is a typical example of the Ranch style found throughout the area. In addition, the replacement windows and additions diminish its architectural integrity. Therefore, 8HI11299 does not appear to be potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.



Photo 5-6: South and west elevations of 9212 Gibsonton Drive (8HI11300), looking northeast

8HI11300: The Masonry Vernacular style residence at 9212 Gibsonton Drive in Gibsonton was constructed ca. 1955 (Photo 5-6, **Figure 5-11**). It is located approximately 3000 ft west of the I-75 centerline and on the north side of Gibsonton Drive, in a possible interchange modification area. The house is supported by a slab foundation and the concrete block walls are partially clad in wood siding and vertical board. The building is topped with a gable roof faced with composition shingles. There is a ca. 1980 enclosed porch on the south elevation that contains the main entrance. The windows on the building include three-light awning, one-light picture window flanked with three-light awning, and replacement two-over-two single hung sash (ca. 1965). Other architectural features include gable vents, projecting window sills, fixed window shutters, and wood siding in the gables. There is an ancillary non-historic carport to the south. This is a typical example of the Masonry Vernacular style found throughout Hillsborough County. Furthermore, research did not reveal any significant historical associations. Therefore, 8HI11300 is not potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.



Photo 5-7: South and east elevations of 11010 Gibsonton Drive (8HI11301), looking northwest

8HI11301: The vacant Masonry Vernacular style building at 11010 Gibsonton Drive in Riverview was built ca. 1960 (Photo 5-7; **Figure 5-11**). It is located approximately 3000 ft east of the I-75 centerline and on the north side of Gibsonton Drive, in a possible interchange modification area. The concrete block walls are supported by a slab foundation and are topped with a gable roof faced with composition shingles. The main entrance is on the south elevation and the windows, some of which are now missing, include original one-light picture window flanked by three-light awning, and replacement two-over-two and one-over-one single hung sash (ca. 1970 and 1980, respectively). Other architectural features include projecting window sills, gable vents, and vertical board in the gables. This is a typical example of the Masonry Vernacular style that is commonly found throughout the area. In addition, research did not reveal any significant historical associations. Therefore, 8HI11301 is not potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.



Photo 5-8: East elevation of 8007 Formby Street (8HI11302), looking west

8HI11302: The Masonry Vernacular style residence at 8007 Formby Street in Riverview was built ca. 1960 (Photo 5-8; **Figure 5-11**). This building is located along the east side of the I-75 PD&E Study corridor. A slab foundation supports the concrete block walls and the gable roof is faced with composition shingles. The main entrance is on the east elevation and the windows are one-light sliding and one-over-one single hung sash (some of which were replaced ca. 1990). A ca. 1990 porch with a shed roof is on the west elevation. This is a typical example of the Masonry Vernacular style found throughout the area and research did not reveal any significant historical associations with this residence. Therefore, 8HI11302 does not appear to be potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.

Section 6 - CONCLUSIONS AND SITE EVALUATIONS

All cultural resources identified as a result of this survey were evaluated for their significance, as per the criteria of eligibility for listing in the NRHP. A discussion of site evaluations follows.

6.1 Archaeological Sites

Background research indicated that 10 previously recorded archaeological sites and one historic canal were recorded previously within or adjacent to the project archaeological APE. Most of these resources originally were identified and evaluated in 1975 by B. Calvin Jones during survey of the proposed I-75 corridor. As a result of field survey, three of these sites (8HI478, 8HI524, and 8HI532) were identified within the current I-75 project APE; none is considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. Exclusive of the historic canal (8MA1337), no evidence of the other seven previously recorded sites (8HI409, 8HI479, 8HI480, 8HI525, 8HI526, 8HI527, and 8MA136) was discovered, and they have presumably been destroyed, as located within the I-75 project APE. One new archaeological site (8HI11359) and one AO were found. 8HI11359 is a common type of site for the area, with low research potential. Thus, it is not considered to meet the criteria of eligibility for listing in the NRHP. The AO is not considered significant. Thus, as the result of background research and field survey, no archaeological sites which are listed, determined eligible, or considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP, or otherwise of historical or archaeological value, are located within the I-75 project APE. No further work is recommended.

6.2 Historic Resources

Background research indicated that the one previously recorded historic resource (8HI1029) formerly located within the I-75 project APE was demolished in 1998. Field survey resulted in the identification and evaluation of eight historic resources (8HI11295 through 8HI11302). All are residential buildings, constructed between ca. 1945 and ca. 1960 in the Frame Vernacular, Masonry Vernacular, and Ranch styles. All represent commonly occurring types of architecture for the area. Available data did not indicate any significant historical associations. In addition, alterations have compromised the architectural integrity of several of the buildings. Therefore, none is considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.

6.3 Conclusions

Given the results of background research and field survey, the I-75 project improvements will have no involvement with any archaeological sites or historic resources which are listed, determined eligible, or considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.

Section 7 - REFERENCES CITED

Akerman, Joe A.

- 1976 *Florida Cowman: A History of Florida Cattle Raising*. 4th edition. Florida Cattlemen's Association, Kissimmee.

Almy, Maranda M.

- 2001 *The Cuban Fishing Ranchos of Southwest Florida 1600-1850s*. Honor's thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of Florida, Gainesville.

Almy, Marion M.

- 1981 Salvage Excavations at Curiosity Creek: An Inland, Short-Term, Multi-Period Aboriginal Occupation in Southern Hillsborough County, Florida. On file, Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Ambrosino, Meghan L.

- 2004 An Archaeological and Historical Survey of High School PPP Project Area in Hillsborough County, Florida. Panamerican Consultants, Inc., Tampa.

Archaeological Consultants, Inc. (ACI)

- 1998 Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Southpointe West Property Hillsborough County, Florida. ACI, Sarasota.
- 2001 Cultural Resource Assessment Survey South Shore Corporate Park, Hillsborough County, Florida. ACI, Sarasota.
- 2003a Cultural Resource Assessment Survey 600 Acre Parcel Manatee County, Florida. ACI, Sarasota.
- 2003b Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Covewood Development Property, Hillsborough County, Florida. ACI, Sarasota.
- 2004a Addendum to: Cultural Resource Assessment Survey River Bend Subdivision, Hillsborough County, Florida. ACI, Sarasota.
- 2004b Cultural Resource Assessment Survey McClure Property (West Parcel), Manatee County, Florida. ACI, Sarasota.
- 2004c Cultural Resource Assessment Survey River Bend Subdivision, Hillsborough County, Florida. ACI, Sarasota.
- 2004d Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Wal-Mart Supercenter Store No. 5300-01 Hillsborough County, Florida. ACI, Sarasota.
- 2004e Cultural Resource Assessment Survey, Buckeye Road Development, Manatee County, Florida. ACI, Sarasota.
- 2005a Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Mixon Subdivision Hillsborough County, Florida. ACI, Sarasota.
- 2005b Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Spencer Creek Subdivision Hillsborough County, Florida. ACI, Sarasota.
- 2005c Cultural Resource Assessment Survey, Parcel D, Buckeye Road Development, Manatee County, Florida. ACI, Sarasota.
- 2008 Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Research Design Interstate 75 (I-75) Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to South of US 310, Manatee and Hillsborough Counties, Florida WPI No. 419235 2 and I-75 from South of US 301 to North of Fletcher Avenue Hillsborough County, Florida WPI No. 419235 3. ACI, Sarasota.

- Austin, Robert J.
 1995 Yat Kitischee: A Prehistoric Coastal Hamlet 100 B.C.-A.D. 1200. Janus Research, Tampa.
 1999 A Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the Proposed Tampa Bay Water Pipeline from the Tampa Bypass Canal at Six Mile Creek to Bell Shoals Road, Hillsborough County, Florida. SEARCH, Jonesville.
 2000 Cultural Resource Assessment Survey for the Proposed Hillsborough County Water Department's Falkenburg to South County Water Main. SEARCH, Jonesville.
 2001 Paleoindian and Archaic Archaeology in the Middle Hillsborough River Basin: A Synthetic Overview. SEARCH, Jonesville.
 2005 A Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the Maury Carter Property, Hillsborough County, Florida. SEARCH, Jonesville.
- Austin, Robert J. and Janice R. Ballo
 1986 Cultural Resources Assessment Survey of the Proposed Parkway Center Development Site, Hillsborough County, Florida. Janus Research, Tampa.
- Austin, Robert J., Howard Hansen, and Charles Fuhrmeister
 1991 An Archaeological and Historical Survey of Unincorporated Areas of Pinellas County, Florida. Janus Research, Tampa.
- Austin, Robert J., Kenneth W. Hardin, Harry M. Piper, Jacquelyn G. Piper, and Barbara McCabe
 1992 Archaeological Investigations at the Site of the Tampa Convention Center, Tampa Florida. Volume 1: Prehistoric Resources, Including a Report on the Mitigative Excavation of a Prehistoric Aboriginal Cemetery. Janus Research, Tampa.
- Austin, Robert J. and Michael Russo
 1989 Limited Excavations at the Catfish Creek Site (8SO608), Sarasota, Florida. Janus Research, Tampa.
- Bakas, John and Terri Bakas
 2006 *Riverview History*.
http://www.riverviewonline.com/Past_Present_Future/Riverview%20History.htm.
- Ballo, George R.
 1987 Proposed New Southbound Rest Area in Hillsborough County, Florida. Florida Department of Transportation, Tallahassee.
- Berriault, John G., Robert Carr, Jerry Stipp, Richard Johnson, and Jack Meeder
 1981 The Archaeological Salvage of the Bay West Site, Collier County, Florida. *The Florida Anthropologist* 34(2): 39-58.
- Bradbury, Alford G. and E. Storey Hallock
 1962 A Chronology of Florida Post Offices. *Handbook 2*. The Florida Federation of Stamp Clubs.
- Branham, Charles C.
 2008 MA1337 Linear Resource. FMSF. Personal communication to E. A. Horvath, ACI, Crawfordville. 7/17/2008.

- Brown, Canter, Jr.
1991 *Florida's Peace River Frontier*. University of Central Florida Press, Orlando.
- Browning, William D.
1981a One 10 Acre Borrow Pit in T30S-R20E, sec. 19, SE 1/4 of SW 1/4, Hillsborough County. Florida Department of Transportation, Tallahassee.
1981b One 20 Acre Borrow Pit in T30S-R20E, sec. 30, NE 1/4 of NW 1/4, Hillsborough County. Florida Department of Transportation, Tallahassee.
1981c One 40 Acre Borrow Pit in T31S-R19E, sec. 1, NE 1/4 of NE 1/4, Hillsborough County. Florida Department of Transportation, Tallahassee.
1981d One 70 Acre Borrow Pit in T30S-R20E, sec. 31 W 1/2 of NW 1/4, Hillsborough County. Florida Department of Transportation, Tallahassee.
- Bruton, Quintilla Geer and David E. Bailey
1984 *Plant City: Its Origins and History*. Hunter Publishing Co., Winston-Salem.
- Bullen, Ripley P.
1959 The Transitional Period of Florida. *Southeastern Archaeological Conference Newsletter* 6(1): 43-53.
1965 Florida's Prehistory. In *Florida -- From Indian Trail to Space Age*. Edited by C. W. Tebeau and R. L. Carson, pp. 305-316. Southern Publishing Co., Delray Beach.
1975 *A Guide to the Identification of Florida Projectile Points*. Kendall Books, Gainesville.
- Bullen, Ripley P., Walter Askew, Lee M. Feder, and Richard L. McDonnell
1978 The Canton Street Site, St. Petersburg, Florida. *Florida Anthropological Society Publications* 9
- Bullen, Ripley P. and Adelaide K. Bullen
1976 The Palmer Site. *Florida Anthropological Society Publications* 8
- Burger, Brad William
1982 *Cultural Resource Management in Manatee County, Florida: The Prehistoric Resource Base*. MA thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Florida, Tampa.
- Campbell, A. Stuart
1939 *The Cigar Industry of Tampa, Florida*. University of Florida. Bureau of Economics and Business Research, Gainesville.
- Campbell, Ken and Jonathan D. Arthur
1993 Geologic Map of Hillsborough County, Florida. *Open File Map Series* 44. Florida Geological Survey, Tallahassee.
- Carbone, Victor
1983 Late Quaternary Environment in Florida and the Southeast. *The Florida Anthropologist* 36(1-2): 3-17.
- Carty, Thomas J.
2005 An Archaeological and Historical Survey of the Diehl Property Project Area in Hillsborough County, Florida. Panamerican Consultants, Inc., Tampa.

- Chamberlin, Donald L.
1968 *Fort Brooke: A History*. MA thesis, Florida State University, Tallahassee.
- Clausen, Carl J., A. D. Cohen, Cesare Emiliani, J. A. Holman, and J. J. Stipp
1979 Little Salt Spring, Florida: A Unique Underwater Site. *Science* 203(4381): 609-614.
- Cordell, Ann S.
1985 Pottery Variability and Site Chronology in the Upper St. Johns River Basin. In *Archaeological Site Types, Distribution, and Preservation within the Upper St. Johns River Basin, Florida*. Edited by B. Sigler-Eisenberg, pp. 114-134. *Miscellaneous Project and Report Series 27*. Florida Museum of Natural History, Gainesville.
1987 Ceramic Technology at a Weeden Island Period Archaeological Site in North Florida. *Ceramic Notes 2*. Occasional Publications of the Ceramic Technology Laboratory, Florida Museum of Natural History, Gainesville.
2004 Paste Variability and Possible Manufacturing Origins of Late Archaic Fiber-Tempered Pottery from Selected Sites in Peninsular Florida. In *Early Pottery: Technology, Function, Style, and Interaction in the Lower Southeast*. Edited by R. Saunders and C. T. Hays, pp. 63-104. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.
- Covington, James W.
1958 Exploring the Ten Thousand Islands: 1838. *Tequesta* 18: 7-13.
1961a The Armed Occupation Act of 1842. *Florida Historical Quarterly* 40(1): 41-53.
1961b The Indian Scare of 1849. *Tequesta* 21: 53-62.
1982 *The Billy Bowlegs War 1855-1858: The Final Stand of the Seminoles Against the Whites*. The Mickler House Publishers, Chuluota.
- Curl, Donald W.
1986 *Palm Beach County: An Illustrated History*. Windsor Publications, Northridge, CA.
- Daniel, I. Randolph and Michael Wisenbaker
1987 *Harney Flats: A Florida Paleo-Indian Site*. Baywood Publishing Co., Inc., Farmingdale.
- Davis, J. H.
1943 The Natural Features of Southern Florida. *Geological Bulletin 25*. Florida Geological Survey, Tallahassee.
- Davis, John H.
1980 General Map of Natural Vegetation of Florida. *Circular S-178*. Agriculture Experiment Station, University of Florida, Gainesville.
- Davis, T. Frederick
1939 The Disston Land Purchase. *Florida Historical Quarterly* 17(3): 200-210.
- de Montmollin, Wanda
1983 *Environmental Factors and Prehistoric Site Location in the Tampa Bay Area*. MA thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Florida, Tampa.

- Delcourt, Paul A. and Hazel R. Delcourt
 1981 Vegetation Maps for Eastern North America: 40,000 yr B.P. to the Present. In *Geobotany II*. Edited by R.C.Romans, pp. 123-165. Plenum Publishing Corp., New York.
- Deming, Joan
 1980a *The Cultural Resources of Hillsborough County: An Assessment of Prehistoric Resources*. Historic Tampa/Hillsborough County Preservation Board, Tampa.
 1980b A Cultural Resources Survey of the Hillsborough County South 201 Facilities. ACI, Sarasota.
- Doran, Glen H., Ed.
 2002 *Windover: Multidisciplinary Investigations of an Early Archaic Florida Cemetery*. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Dunbar, James S.
 1981 The Effect of Geohydrology and Natural Resource Availability on Site Utilization at the Fowler Bridge Mastodon Site (8Hi393c/uw) in Hillsborough County, Florida. In *Report on Phase II Underwater Archaeological Testing at the Fowler Bridge Mastodon Site (8Hi393c/uw), Hillsborough County, Florida*. Edited by J. Palmer, J. S. Dunbar and D. H. Clayton, pp. 63-106. *Interstate 75 Highway Phase II Archaeological Report 5*. Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- Dunn, Hampton
 1989 *Back Home: A History of Citrus County, Florida*. 2nd edition. Citrus County Historical Society, Inverness.
- Eriksen, John M.
 1994 *Brevard County, A History to 1955*. Florida Historical Society Press, Tampa.
- Estabrook, Richard W.
 1989 Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the Proposed Wolf Creek Branch DRI Property, Hillsborough County, Florida. Janus Research, Tampa.
 2001 An Archaeological and Historical Survey of the SDG Land Exchange Property, Hillsborough County, Florida. Panamerican Consultants, Inc., Tampa.
- Estabrook, Richard W., Charles Fuhrmeister, and Kenneth W. Hardin
 1991 Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the Southwest Florida Pipeline Company Corridor, Hillsborough, Polk, DeSoto, Charlotte, and Lee Counties. Janus Research, Tampa.
- Evans, Mary K.
 1972 National Register of Historic Places Nomination of the Tampa Bay Hotel. Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- Florida Archaeological Consulting, Inc. (FAC)
 2005 Section 106 Review, FCC Form 620, Drummond East Bay Road Site, Hillsborough County, Florida. Florida Archaeological Consulting, Inc., Daytona Beach.

Farr, Grayal Earle

- 2006 *A Reevaluation of Bullen's Typology for Preceramic Projectile Points*. MA thesis, Department of Anthropology, Florida State University, Tallahassee.

Federal Writers Project (FWP)

- 1939 *Florida: A Guide to the Southernmost State*. Federal Writers Project. Oxford University Press, New York.

Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)

- 1999 *Project Development and Environment Manual, Part 2, Chapter 12, Archaeological and Historical Resources*. Florida Department of Transportation, <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/emo/pubs/pdeman/pdeman.htm>.
2007 ETDM Summary Report. Project #8001 - I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to South of US 301. Florida Department of Transportation, Tallahassee. Published on 3/29/2007.

Florida Division of Historical Resources (FDHR)

- 2003 *Cultural Resource Management Standards and Operational Manual*. Florida Division of Historical Resources, <http://dhr.dos.state.fl.us/preservation/compliance/manual/>.

Florida Master Site File (FMSF)

- Various site file forms. Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
1999 Guide to the Archaeological Site Form, Version 2.2. Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Friedel, Frank

- 1985 *The Splendid Little War*. Bramhall House, New York.

Gagel, Katherine and I. Randolph Daniel, Jr.

- 1985 Archaeological Excavations of the Titus Church Site (8HI521) and the Two Horse Site (8HI522): Two Archaic Sites in Hillsborough County, Florida. Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Goggin, John M.

- 1948 Some Pottery Types from Central Florida. *Gainesville Anthropological Association, Bulletin* 1
1952 Space and Time Perspective in Northern St. Johns Archaeology, Florida. *Yale University Publications in Anthropology* 47. 1998 Reprint, University Press of Florida, Gainesville.

Goodyear, Albert C., Sam B. Upchurch, Mark J. Brooks, and Nancy N. Goodyear

- 1983 Paleo-Indian Manifestations in the Tampa Bay Region, Florida. *The Florida Anthropologist* 36(1-2): 40-66.

Goodyear, Albert C. and Lyman O. Warren

- 1972 Further Observations on the Submarine Oyster Shell Deposits of Tampa Bay. *The Florida Anthropologist* 25(2, Part 1): 52-66.

Grismer, Karl H.

- 1950 *Tampa: A History of the City of Tampa and the Tampa Bay Region of Florida*. St. Petersburg Printing Company, St. Petersburg.

- Guthrie, Sarah M. W.
 1974 *Land of Promise, Land of Change: An Examination of the Population of Hillsborough County, Florida*. MA thesis, Emory University, Atlanta.
- Hammond, E. A.
 1973 The Spanish Fisheries of Charlotte Harbor. *Florida Historical Quarterly* 51: 355-380.
- Hardin, Kenneth W. and Harry M. Piper
 1984 *Manasota: Which Way to the Border?* Paper presented at the Florida Academy of Sciences, Boca Raton.
- Historic Tampa/Hillsborough County Preservation Board (HT/HCPB)
 1980 *The Cultural Resources of the Unincorporated Portions of Hillsborough County: An Inventory of the Built Environment*. Historic Tampa/Hillsborough County Preservation Board, Tampa.
- Horvath, Elizabeth A., Joan Deming, Lee Hutchinson-Neff, Sylvia Scudder, and Susan L. White
 1998 Phase III Mitigative Excavation at the Colorado Site (8HE241), Hernando County, Florida. ACI, Sarasota.
- Hughes, Skye W.
 2006 An Archaeological and Historical Survey of the Harvest Creek Project Area in Hillsborough County, Florida. Panamerican Consultants, Inc., Tampa.
- Hunt, Jennifer
 2000 Verizon Wireless Site 86833-2 Alonso Riverview. On file, Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- Janus Research
 1992 An Archaeological Resource Inventory and Archaeological Site Predictive Model for Manatee County, Florida. Janus Research, Tampa.
 2000 Gulfstream Natural Gas System Cultural Resources Supplemental Report 1. Janus Research, Tampa.
 2001 Gulfstream Cultural Resources Supplemental Report 3. Janus Research, Tampa.
 2004a Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the South Bend DRI/NOPC Expansion, Hillsborough County, Florida. Janus Research, Tampa.
 2004b Updated Archaeological Site Predictive Model for the Unincorporated Areas of Hillsborough County, Florida. Janus Research, Tampa.
 2005a Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the Woods at Moccasin Wallow Project Area, Manatee County, Florida. Janus Research, Tampa.
 2005b Wolf Creek Branch DRI #207, Appendix C, Cultural Resource Assessment Survey, Application for NOPC/Substantial Deviation, Hillsborough County, Florida. Janus Research, Tampa.
- Jones, B. Calvin
 1980 Phase II Archaeological Salvage Proposal for Site Located Along Interstate Route 75 in Hillsborough County, Florida. Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

- Karklins, Karlis
 1970 The Fish Creek Site, Hillsborough County, Florida. *The Florida Anthropologist* 23(2): 67-73.
- Knapp, Michael S.
 1980 Environmental Geology Series: Tampa Sheet. *Map Series 97*. Florida Department of Natural Resources, Bureau of Geology, Tallahassee.
- Knight, Melinda
 1983 The Mizell Homestead: Florida's History Preserved. AMAX Chemical Corporation, Lakeland.
- Kohler, Timothy A.
 1991 The Demise of Weeden Island and Post-Weeden Island Cultural Stability in Non-Mississippianized Northern Florida. In *Stability, Transformation, and Variations: the Late Woodland Southeast*. Edited by M. S. Nassaney and C. R. Cobb, pp. 91-110. Plenum Press, New York.
- Layman, Sylvia
 1990 Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the Proposed Gateway North DRI Development Site, Manatee County, Florida. Janus Research, Tampa.
- Lonn, Ella
 1965 *Salt as a Factor in the Confederacy*. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.
- Lowry, Charles B.
 1974 The PWA in Tampa: A Case Study. *Florida Historical Quarterly* 52: 363-380.
- Luer, George M. and Marion M. Almy
 1981 Temple Mounds of the Tampa Bay Area. *The Florida Anthropologist* 34(3): 127-155.
 1982 A Definition of the Manasota Culture. *The Florida Anthropologist* 35(1): 34-58.
- Luer, George M., Marion M. Almy, Dana Ste. Claire, and Robert J. Austin
 1987 The Myakkahatchee Site (8SO397), A Large Multi-Period Inland from the Shore Site in Sarasota County, Florida. *The Florida Anthropologist* 40(2): 137-153.
- Mahon, John K.
 1985 *History of the Second Seminole War 1835-1842*. Revised edition. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Mahon, John K. and Brent R. Weisman
 1996 Florida's Seminole and Miccosukee Peoples. In *The New History of Florida*. Edited by M. Gannon, pp. 183-206. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Matthews, Janet Snyder
 1983 *Edge of Wilderness: A Settlement History of Manatee River and Sarasota Bay 1528-1885*. Coastal Press, Sarasota.

- McDuffee, Lillie B.
1961 *The Lures of Manatee: A True Story of South Florida's Glamorous Past*. 2nd edition. Manatee Historical Society, Bradenton.
- McNab, W. Henry and Peter E. Avers
1996 *Ecological Subregions of the United States*. Prepared in Cooperation with Regional Compilers and the ECOMAP Team of the Forest Service, 7/22/2002. <http://www.fs.fed.us/land/pubs/ecoregions>.
- Milanich, Jerald T.
1994 *Archaeology of Precolumbian Florida*. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Milanich, Jerald T. and Charles H. Fairbanks
1980 *Florida Archaeology*. Academic Press, New York.
- Miller, James J.
1979 A Preliminary Archaeological and Historical Survey of the Tampa-Hillsborough 201 Plan. On file, Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- Milliman, John D. and K. O. Emery
1968 Sea Levels During the Past 35,000 Years. *Science* 162: 1121-1123.
- Mitchem, Jeffrey M.
1989 *Redefining Safety Harbor: Late Prehistoric/Protohistoric Archaeology in West Peninsular Florida*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Florida, Gainesville.
- Mormino, Gary and Tony Pizzo
1983 *Tampa: the Treasure City*. Continental Heritage Press, Tulsa.
- Nodine, Bruce K.
2006 Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the Port Dolphin Permitting Project, Manatee County, Florida. SEARCH, Jonesville.
- Pettengill, George W., Jr.
1952 The Story of the Florida Railroads 1834-1903. *Bulletin* 86. The Railway and Locomotive Historical Society, Boston.
- Piper, Harry M. and Jacquelyn G. Piper
1982 Archaeological Excavations at the Quad Block Site, 8HI998, Located at the Site of the Old Fort Brooke Municipal Parking Garage, Tampa. Janus Research, Tampa.
- Pochurek, James
2000 Cultural Resource Survey of Modifications to the Proposed Bayside Lateral and Compressor Station 31, Hillsborough and Osceola Counties, Florida, Florida Gas Transmission Company Phase V Expansion. SEARCH, Jonesville.

- Pracht, Jodi B.
- 2001a Proposed Cellular Tower: Bullfrog Creek (FL-3428-G) 8749 Symmes Road Hillsborough County, Florida. ACI, Sarasota.
 - 2001b Proposed Cellular Tower: Stirling Ranch, 10011 Circle C Drive, Tampa, Hillsborough County, Florida. ACI, Sarasota.
 - 2001c Proposed Cellular Tower: Sun Point (FL 4424-A) Teco Road and 33rd Street SE, Ruskin, Hillsborough County, Florida. ACI, Sarasota.
- Purdy, Barbara A.
- 1981 *Florida's Prehistoric Stone Tool Technology*. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Robinson, Earnest L.
- 1928 *History of Hillsborough County*. The Record Company Printers, St. Augustine.
- Robinson, Major George D.
- 1979 *Outlines and Other Data on West Central Florida Projectile Points*. Central Gulf Coast Archaeological Society, St. Petersburg.
- Sassaman, Kenneth E.
- 2003 New AMS Dates on Orange Fiber-Tempered Pottery from the Middle St. Johns Valley and Their Implications for Culture History in Northeast Florida. *The Florida Anthropologist* 56(1): 5-13.
- Schwadron, Margo
- 2002 Archeological Investigations of De Soto National Memorial. *SEAC Technical Reports* 8. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.
- Scott, Thomas M.
- 2001 Text to Accompany the Geologic Map of Florida. *Open File Report* 80. Florida Geological Survey, Tallahassee.
- Scott, Thomas M., Kenneth M. Campbell, Frank R. Rupert, Jonathan D. Arthur, Thomas M. Missimer, Jacqueline M. Lloyd, J. William Yon, and Joel G. Duncan
- 2001 Geologic Map of the State of Florida. *Map Series* 146. Florida Geological Survey, Tallahassee.
- Scupholm, Carrie
- 1997 The Tamiami Trail: Connecting the East and West Coasts of the Sunshine State. *The Society for Commercial Archeology Journal* 15(2): 20-24.
- Southeast Archaeological research, Inc. (SEARCH)
- 2000 Survey Report for the Florida Gas Transmission Company Proposed Bayside Lateral Reroute Hillsborough County, Florida. SEARCH, Jonesville.
- Sheppard, William L., Margot Moore, Phillip A. Werndli, Mary McCahon, and Marion M. Almy
- 1981 A Historical, Architectural, and Archaeological Survey of the City of Bradenton, Florida. Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Shofner, Jerrell H.

- 1995 *History of Brevard County*. Vol. 1. Brevard County Historical Commission, Stuart.

State of Florida, Department of Environmental Protection

- 1843a *Field Notes*. A. M. Randolph. Volume 80.
1843b *Field Notes*. S. Reid. Volume 77.
1843c *Plat Map*. Township 32 South, Range 18 East. S. Reid.
1846a *Field Notes*. S. Reid. Volume 82.
1846b *Plat Map*. Township 33 South, Range 18 East. S. Reid.
1847a *Field Notes*. J. Jackson. Volume 79.
1847b *Plat Map*. Township 31 South, Range 19 East. J. Jackson.
1847c *Plat Map*. Township 31 South, Range 20 East. J. Jackson.
1847d *Plat Map*. Township 32 South, Range 19 East. S. Reid.
1852a *Field Notes*. C. F. Hopkins. Volume 102.
1852b *Plat Map*. Township 29 South, Range 20 East. A. M. Randolph and C. F. Hopkins.
1852c *Plat Map*. Township 30 South, Range 19 East. C. F. Hopkins.
1852d *Plat Map*. Township 30 South, Range 20 East. A. M. Randolph and C. F. Hopkins.
n.d.-a *Tract Book*. Volume 16.
n.d.-b *Tract Book*. Volume 17.

Ste. Claire, Dana

- 1987 The Development of Thermal Alteration Technologies in Florida: Implications for the Study of Prehistoric Adaptation. *The Florida Anthropologist* 40(3): 203-208.

Stokes, Anne V.

- 2002a Addendum Report for the Florida Gas Transmission Company Bayside Lateral Modification Hillsborough County, Florida. SEARCH, Jonesville.
2002b Cultural Resources Survey of Two Bayside Lateral Access Roads and One Road Crossing, Florida Gas Transmission Company (FGT) Phase V Expansion. SEARCH, Jonesville.

Sullivan, Alan P., III and Kenneth C. Rozen

- 1985 Debitage Analysis and Archaeological Interpretation. *American Antiquity* 50(4): 755-779.

Surveying and Mapping Office

- 2005 *General Highway Map Hillsborough County, Florida*. Florida Department of Transportation, Tallahassee.
2007 *General Highway Map Manatee County, Florida*. Florida Department of Transportation, Tallahassee.

Tebeau, Charlton W.

- 1980 *A History of Florida*. Revised Edition. University of Miami Press, Coral Gables.

Tebeau, Charlton W. and Ruby Leach Carson, Eds.

- 1965 *Florida -- From Indian Trail to Space Age*. Southern Publishing Co., Delray Beach.

- Tischendorf, A. P.
 1954 Florida and the British Investor: 1880-1914. *Florida Historical Quarterly* 33(2): 120-129.
- Upchurch, Sam B., Richard N. Strom, and Mark G. Nuckels
 1982 Methods of Provenance Determination of Florida Cherts. Geology Department, University of South Florida, Tampa.
- United States Census Bureau (USCB)
 1995 *Population of Counties by Decennial Census*.
www.census.gov/population/cencounts/fl190090.txt.
 2000 *Census 2000*. www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html.
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)
 1983 *Soil Survey of Manatee County, Florida*. USDA, Soil Conservation Service.
 1989 *Soil Survey of Hillsborough County, Florida*. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Washington, D.C.
 2005a *Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) Database for Hillsborough County, Florida*. USDA, Natural Resource Conservation Service, Fort Worth, TX, <http://soildatamart.nrcs.usda.gov/>.
 2005b *Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) Database for Manatee County, Florida*. USDA, Natural Resource Conservation Service, Fort Worth, TX, <http://soildatamart.nrcs.usda.gov/>.
- United States Geological Survey (USGS)
 1956a *Brandon, Fla.* PR 1987.
 1956b *Gibsonton, Fla.* PR 1981.
 1956c *Riverview, Fla.* PR 1987.
 1956d *Ruskin, Fla.* PR 1987.
 1975 *Parrish, Fla.* LABINS mrg2920.tif.
 1982a *Brandon, Fla.* LABINS mrg3219.tif.
 1982b *Cockroach Bay, Fla.* PR 1983. LABINS mrg3021.tif.
 1982c *Gibsonton, Fla.* LABINS mrg3120.tif.
 1982d *Palmetto, Fla.* PR 1987. LABINS mrg2921.tif.
 1982e *Riverview, Fla.* LABINS mrg3119.tif.
 1982f *Ruskin, Fla.* LABINS mrg3020.tif.
 1982g *Tampa, Fla.* PR 1983. LABINS mrg3220.tif.
 1982h *Wimauma, Fla.* LABINS mrg3019.tif.
- Watts, William A.
 1969 A Pollen Diagram from Mud Lake, Marion County, North-Central Florida. *Geological Society of America Bulletin* 80: 631-642.
 1971 Post Glacial and Interglacial Vegetational History of Southern Georgia and Central Florida. *Ecology* 51: 676-690.
 1975 A Late Quaternary Record of Vegetation from Lake Annie, South-Central Florida. *Geology* 3: 344-346.
- Watts, William A. and Barbara C. S. Hansen
 1988 Environments in Florida in the Late Wisconsin and Holocene. In *Wet Site Archaeology*. Edited by B. A. Purdy, pp. 307-323. Telford Press, Caldwell.

- Weisman, Brent R. and Lori Collins
2004 A GIS Archaeological Modeling and Testing of Nine ELAPP Preserves, Hillsborough County, FL. Department of Anthropology, University of South Florida, Tampa.
- Weisman, Brent R., Christine Newman, and Barbara A. Mattick
1994 National Register of Historic Places Nomination: The Portavant Mound Site. United States Department of Interior, National Park Service, Washington, D.C.
- Wharton, Barry R., George R. Ballo, and Mitchell E. Hope
1981 The Republic Groves Site, Hardee County, Florida. *The Florida Anthropologist* 34(2): 59-80.
- White, Anta M.
1963 Analytic Description of the Chipped-stone Industry from Snyders Site, Calhoun County, Illinois. *Miscellaneous Studies in Typology and Classification* 19. Anthropological Papers, Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- White, William A.
1970 Geomorphology of the Florida Peninsula. *Geological Bulletin* 51. Florida Department of Natural Resources, Bureau of Geology, Tallahassee.
- Widmer, Randolph J.
1988 *The Evolution of the Calusa*. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.
- Willey, Gordon R.
1949 Archaeology of the Florida Gulf Coast. *Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections* 113. 1982 Reprint. Florida Book Store, Gainesville.

APPENDIX A: Relevant Correspondence



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Kurt S. Browning
Secretary of State
DIVISION OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

Linda Anderson
Federal Highway Department
545 John Knox Road, Suite 200
Tallahassee, Florida 32303

January 19, 2010

RE: DHR Project File No.: 2009-7635 and 2009-7642
WPI Segment No.: 419235-2 and 419235-3
Project: *I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to South of US 301 PD&E Study and
I-75 South of US 301 to North Fletcher Avenue PD&E Study*
County: Manatee and Hillsborough

Dear Ms. Anderson:

This office received and reviewed the above referenced project in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended, 36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties, and Chapter 267, Florida Statutes. It is the responsibility of the State Historic Preservation Officer to advise and assist, as appropriate, Federal and State agencies in carrying out their historic preservation responsibilities; to cooperate with agencies to ensure that historic properties are taken into consideration at all levels of planning and development; and to consult with the appropriate agencies in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended, on undertakings that may affect historic properties.

The current submittal includes two Project and Development and Environmental (*PD&E*) studies for the portion of I-75 that extends from Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301 (WPI Segment No.: 419235-2) and from US 301 to North Fletcher Avenue (WPI Segment No.: 419235-3). The project includes the widening of I-75 in both directions within the above-stated limits in addition to the modification of existing interchanges.

Background research for the portion of the project that extends along I-75 between Moccasin Wallow Road and US 301 (WPI Segment No.: 419235-2) noted that there were 10 previously-identified archaeological sites (8HI409, 8HI478, 8HI479, 8HI480, 8HI524, 8HI525, 8HI526, 8HI527, 8HI532, and 8MA136) one previously-identified historic structure (8HI11302), and one previously-identified resource group (8MA1337) within the project's area of potential effects (APE). One of the previously-identified archaeological sites, 8HI480, was determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) by this office in 1979, while the remaining nine archaeological sites have yet to be evaluated by the SHPO. The previously-recorded resource group and historic structure were determined to be ineligible for the NRHP by

500 S. Bronough Street • Tallahassee, FL 32399-0250 • <http://www.flheritage.com>

Director's Office
850.245.6300 • FAX: 245.6436

Archaeological Research
850.245.6444 • FAX: 245.6452

Historic Preservation
850.245.6333 • FAX: 245.6437

this office. As a result of the field survey, evidence of only three of the previously-recorded archaeological sites (8HI478, 8HI524, and 8HI532) was located within the project's APE. The field survey also determined that 8HI11302, the previously-identified historic structure within the APE, was no longer extant. Newly-identified resources documented within the APE as a result of the fieldwork included eight buildings (8HI11295-8HI11302), one archaeological site (8HI11359), and two archaeological occurrences (AOs). The report concluded that none of the historic-age architectural resources within the APE were eligible for listing in the NRHP because each lacked architectural and historic import. Similarly, the portion of the three previously-recorded archaeological sites within the APE (8HI478, 8HI524, and 8HI532), the newly-recorded archaeological site 8HI11359, and the two AO's were evaluated and considered to be insignificant and thus ineligible for inclusion in the NRHP. A table in the report noted that the portions of archaeological sites 8HI409, 8HI479, 8HI480, 8HI525, 8HI526, 8HI527, and 8MA136 were ineligible for listing in the NRHP because no evidence of these previously-identified sites was found during the field study.

Background research for the portion of the project that extends along I-75 between US 301 and North Fletcher Avenue (WPI Segment No.: 419235-3) noted that there were 28 previously-identified archaeological sites and eight previously-identified historic structures within the project APE. Of the 36 previously-identified cultural resources, twelve (archaeological sites numbers 8HI99, 8HI450, 8HI472, 8HI473, 8HI476A, 8HI476B, 8HI483, 8HI485, 8HI507, 8HI509, 8HI510, and 8HI1479) were determined to eligible for listing in the NRHP by this office. As a result of the field survey, evidence of only ten of the 28 previously-recorded archaeological sites (8HI99, 8HI472, 8HI476A, 8HI476B, 8HI507, 8HI510, and 8HI5431, 8HI5432, 8HI5434, and 8HI5926) and all of the eight previously-recorded historic structures were located within the project's APE and reevaluated. Newly-identified resources documented within the APE as a result of the fieldwork include 15 buildings and two resource groups (8HI11460-11472 and 8HI11481-11482) as well as two AOs. The report found that only one of the documented historic structures, the *Tanner Residence (8HI8742)*, was eligible for listing in the NRHP. The report also concluded that the newly-recorded AOs and the portions of the 10 previously-recorded archaeological sites found within the APE were ineligible for listing in the NRHP. A table in the report noted that the portions of the remaining 18 previously-identified archaeological sites were ineligible for listing in the NRHP because no evidence of these sites was found during the field study.

After a review of the submitted reports, this office concurs with the Florida Department of Transportation's determination that the *Tanner Residence (8HI8742)* is eligible for listing in the NRHP and looks forward to continuing coordination regarding the affects, if any, that the proposed undertaking will have on this historic property.


The reports noted that the Florida Master Site Files indicated the presence of 13 archaeological sites within the project's APE that had been previously determined to be NRHP eligible by this

Ms. Linda Anderson
DHR Project File No.: 2009-7635 and 2009-7642
January 19, 2010
Page 3

office (sites 8HI99, 8HI450, 8HI472, 8HI473, 8HI476A, 8HI476B, 8HI480, 8HI483, 8HI485, 8HI507, 8HI509, 8HI510, and 8HI1479). After the field study, the reports concluded that the portion of each of these sites within the APE was ineligible because very little or no cultural material was located as a result of subsurface testing. Please note, for the sake of clarification, that this office seldom confers a dual eligibility designation to a single site (i.e., a site is either *eligible* or *not eligible* for the NRHP). This office therefore finds that sites 8HI99, 8HI450, 8HI472, 8HI473, 8HI476A, 8HI476B, 8HI480, 8HI483, 8HI485, 8HI507, 8HI509, 8HI510, and 8HI1479 should maintain their status as NRHP eligible, but finds that the project will have *no adverse affect* [as per 36 C.F.R. Part 800, § 800.5(b)] on the sites due to the location of the proposed project and the lack of cultural material present within the project's APE.

If there are any questions concerning our comments or recommendations, please contact Jennifer Ross, Architectural Historian, by phone at 850.245.6333, or via electronic mail at jross@dos.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,



Laura A. Kammerer
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
For Review and Compliance

PC: Bob Gleason, FDOT District 5, Deland
Roy Jackson, FDOT CEMO, Tallahassee/#5500



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Kurt S. Browning

Secretary of State

DIVISION OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

Mr. David C. Gibbs
Federal Highway Administration
545 John Knox Road, Suite 200
Tallahassee, FL 32303

September 5, 2008

RE: DHR Project File Number: 2008-5661
Received by DHR: July 25, 2008
Project: *I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to South of US 301 and
I-75 from South of US 301 to North of Fletcher Avenue*
Financial Management Number: 419235-2 and 419235 3
County: Manatee and Hillsborough

Dear Mr. Gibbs:

Our office received and reviewed the above referenced project in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended, 36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties, and Chapter 267, Florida Statutes. It is the responsibility of the State Historic Preservation Officer to advise and assist, as appropriate, Federal and State agencies in carrying out their historic preservation responsibilities; to cooperate with Federal and State agencies to ensure that historic properties are taken into consideration at all levels of planning and development; and to consult with the appropriate Federal agencies in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended, on Federal undertakings that may affect historic properties and the content and sufficiency of any plans developed to protect, manage, or to reduce or mitigate harm to such properties.

Based on the information provided, we concur with the Research Design submitted to our office for the above referenced project. If you have any questions, please contact Sherry Anderson, Transportation Compliance Review Program, by email sanderson@dos.state.fl.us, or at 850-245-6432.

Sincerely,

Frederick P. Gaske, Director, and
State Historic Preservation Officer

500 S. Bronough Street • Tallahassee, FL 32399-0250 • <http://www.flheritage.com>

☐ Director's Office
(850) 245-6300 • FAX: 245-6436

☐ Archaeological Research
(850) 245-6444 • FAX: 245-6452

☐ Historic Preservation
(850) 245-6333 • FAX: 245-6437



Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida

RU010 00 2:54PM

Business Council Members

Billy Cypress, Chairman

Jasper Nelson, Ass't. Chairman
Max Billie, Treasurer

Andrew Bert Sr., Secretary
William M. Osceola, Lawmaker

August 14, 2008

Mr. David Gibbs, Acting Division Administrator
USDOT - FHWA
Florida Division
545 John Knox Road, Suite 200
Tallahassee, FL 32303

RE: HPO-FL I-75 Research Design

Dear Mr. Gibbs:

The Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida received your letter concerning preliminary engineering and environmental studies of 2 segments of I-75 between Moccasin Wallow Road and North of Fletcher Avenue. We have reviewed the Research design for the Cultural Resource Assessment Survey ("CRAS") and find no fault with it. If the CRAS shows that no Cultural Resources will be impacted by this project, then no further consultation with the Tribe is necessary, and we will not need a copy of the CRAS. If the CRAS shows that there will be impacts to cultural resources by this project, then further consultation with the Tribe is necessary, and we will want to review the CRAS.

Thank you for consulting with the Miccosukee Tribe. Please contact me at the below number or via e-mail at Stevet@miccosukeetribe.com if you require additional information.

Sincerely,

Steve Terry
NAGPRA & Section 106 Representative

APPENDIX B: Florida Master Site File Forms

- Original
- Update



ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 4.0 1/07

Site #8 MA136
 Field Date / /
 Form Date 07 / 17 / 08
 Recorder #

Consult Guide to Archaeological Site Form for detailed instructions.

Site Name(s) End Field Multiple Listing (DHR only)
 Project Name CRAS PD&E I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Rd. to US 301 Survey # (DHR only)

Ownership: private-profit private-nonprofit private-individual private-nonspecific city county state federal Native American foreign unknown

LOCATION & MAPPING

USGS 7.5 Map Name & Date Ruskin 1956, PR 1987 Plat or Other Map

City/Town (within 3 miles) In City Limits? yes no unknown County Manatee

Township 33S Range 18E Section 1 ¼ section: NW SW SE NE Irregular-name:

Landgrant Tax Parcel #

UTM Coordinates: Zone 16 17 Easting 0 Northing 0

Other Coordinates: X: Y: Coordinate System & Datum

Address / Vicinity / Route to

Name of Public Tract (e.g., park)

TYPE OF SITE (check all that apply)

SETTING *	STRUCTURES OR FEATURES *	FUNCTION *
<input type="checkbox"/> Land (<i>terrestrial</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Lake/Pond (<i>lacustrine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> River/Stream/Creek (<i>riverine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Tidal (<i>estuarine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Saltwater (<i>marine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Wetland (<i>palustrine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> usually flooded <input type="checkbox"/> usually dry <input type="checkbox"/> Cave/Sink (<i>subterranean</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> terrestrial <input type="checkbox"/> aquatic	<input type="checkbox"/> aboriginal boat <input type="checkbox"/> agr/c/farm building <input type="checkbox"/> burial mound <input type="checkbox"/> building remains <input type="checkbox"/> cemetery/grave <input type="checkbox"/> dump/refuse <input type="checkbox"/> earthworks <input type="checkbox"/> fort <input type="checkbox"/> midden <input type="checkbox"/> mill <input type="checkbox"/> mission <input type="checkbox"/> mound, nonspecific <input type="checkbox"/> plantation <input type="checkbox"/> platform mound <input type="checkbox"/> road segment <input type="checkbox"/> shell midden <input type="checkbox"/> shell mound <input type="checkbox"/> shipwreck <input type="checkbox"/> subsurface features <input type="checkbox"/> surface scatter <input type="checkbox"/> well	<input type="checkbox"/> campsite <input type="checkbox"/> extractive site <input type="checkbox"/> habitation (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> homestead (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> farmstead <input type="checkbox"/> village (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> town (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> quarry
<input type="checkbox"/> Other settings, structures, features or functions <u> </u>		

CULTURE PERIODS (check all that apply)

ABORIGINAL *	CULTURE PERIODS	NON-ABORIGINAL *	
<input type="checkbox"/> Alachua <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Middle <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Belle Glade <input type="checkbox"/> Cades Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Caloosahatchee <input type="checkbox"/> Deptford	<input type="checkbox"/> Englewood <input type="checkbox"/> Fort Walton <input type="checkbox"/> Glades (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Glades I <input type="checkbox"/> Glades II <input type="checkbox"/> Glades III <input type="checkbox"/> Hickory Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Leon-Jefferson <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar I <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar II <input type="checkbox"/> Manasota <input type="checkbox"/> Mississippian <input type="checkbox"/> Mount Taylor <input type="checkbox"/> Norwood <input type="checkbox"/> Orange <input type="checkbox"/> Paleoindian <input type="checkbox"/> Pensacola <input type="checkbox"/> Perico Island <input type="checkbox"/> Safety Harbor <input type="checkbox"/> St. Augustine	<input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns I <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns II <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa-Swift Creek <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: Colonization <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 1st War To 2nd <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 2nd War To 3rd <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 3rd War & After <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Transitional <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island I <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island II <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric non-ceramic <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric ceramic	<input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1513-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1600-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1700-1763 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> British 1763-1783 <input type="checkbox"/> Second Spanish 1783-1821 <input type="checkbox"/> American Territorial 1821-45 <input type="checkbox"/> American Civil War 1861-65 <input type="checkbox"/> American 19th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American 20th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> African-American
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (List less common phases or specific sub-phases. For historic sites, give specific dates if known.) <u> </u>			

* Consult *Guide to Archaeological Site Form* for preferred descriptions not listed above (data are coded fields).

OPINION OF RESOURCE SIGNIFICANCE

Potentially eligible individually for National Register of Historic Places? yes no insufficient information
 Potentially eligible as contributor to a National Register district? yes no insufficient information
 Explanation of Evaluation (required if evaluated; use separate sheet if needed) no evidence of the site discovered within the APE

Recommendations for Owner or SHPO Action no additional investigations

DHR USE ONLY	OFFICIAL EVALUATION	DHR USE ONLY
NR List Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> <input type="checkbox"/> Owner Objection	SHPO – Appears to meet criteria for NR listing: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient info KEEPER – Determined eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no 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</i> 15, p. 2)	Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> Init. <u> </u> Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u>

FIELD METHODS (check all that apply)

SITE DETECTION*

- no field check, literature search, informant report, remote sensing, exposed ground, posthole digger, auger--size, unscreened shovel, screened shovel

SITE BOUNDARIES*

- bounds unknown, none by recorder, literature search, informant report, remote sensing, insp exposed ground, posthole tests, auger--size, unscreened shovel, screened shovel, block excavations, estimate or guess

Other methods; number, size, depth, pattern of units; screen size (attach site plan) 29 ST, all negative 25 m intervals 50 cm diameter, 1 m deep, 6.4 mm mesh screen

SITE DESCRIPTION

Extent Size (m^2) Depth/stratigraphy of cultural deposit

Temporal Interpretation - Components (check one): single component, multiple component, uncertain

Describe each occupation in plan (refer to attached large scale map) and stratigraphically. Discuss temporal and functional interpretations:

Integrity - Overall disturbance*: none seen, minor, substantial, major, redeposited, destroyed-document!, unknown Disturbances / threats / protective measures road construction / road construction / none

Surface collection: area collected m^2 # collection units Excavation: # noncontiguous blocks

ARTIFACTS

Total Artifacts # 0C (C)ount or (E)stimate? Surface # 0C (C) or (E) Subsurface # 0C (C) or (E)

COLLECTION SELECTIVITY*

- unknown, unselective (all artifacts), selective (some artifacts), mixed selectivity

SPATIAL CONTROL*

- uncollected, unknown, Other, general (not by subarea), controlled (by subarea), variable spatial control

ARTIFACT CATEGORIES* and DISPOSITIONS*

Pick exactly one code from Disposition List => => =>

- bone-animal, bone-human, bone-unspecified, bone-worked, brick/building debris, ceramic-aboriginal, ceramic-nonaboriginal, daub, exotic-nonlocal, glass, lithics-aboriginal, metal-nonprecious, metal-precious/coin, shell-unworked, shell-worked, Others:

(example: A - bone-human)

Disposition List*

- 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

Artifact Comments

DIAGNOSTICS (type or mode, and frequency: e.g., Suwanee ppk, heat-treated chert, Deptford Check-stamped, ironstone/whiteware)

- 1. N= 4. N= 7. N= 2. N= 5. N= 8. N= 3. N= 6. N= 9. N=

ENVIRONMENT

Nearest fresh water type* & name (incl. relict source) tributary of Curiosity Creek Distance (m)/bearing 85 m NE

Natural community (FNAI category* or leave blank)

Local vegetation

Topography* Min Elevation 6 meters Max Elevation 8 meters

Present land use interstate ROW

SCS soil series EauGallie fine sand Soil association

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File - including field & analysis notes, photos, plans, other important documents that are permanently accessible: For each separately maintained collection, describe (1) document type(s),* (2) maintaining organization,* (3) file or accession nos., and (4) descriptive information.

ACI P08008 - documentation;

Manuscripts or Publications on the site (use separate sheet if needed, give FMSF# if relevant) ACI (2008) Cultural Resource Assessment Survey PD&E Study I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301 Hillsborough and Manatee Counties, Florida

RECORDER & INFORMANT INFORMATION

Informant Information (name / address / phone / affiliation)

Recorder Information (name / address / phone / affiliation) Horvath, Elizabeth A., 98 Hickorywood Dr., Crawfordville, FL 32327 Archaeological Consultants, Inc., 850-926-9285, acinorth@comcast.net

Required Attachments


1 PHOTOCOPY OF 7.5' USGS QUAD MAP WITH SITE BOUNDARIES MARKED and SITE PLAN Plan at 1:3,600 or larger. Show boundaries, scale, north arrow, test/collection units, landmarks and date.



USGS MAP

Ruskin, Fla. 1982

Township 33 South, Range 18 East, Section 1



- Original
- Update



ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 4.0 1/07

Site #8 HI409
 Field Date / /
 Form Date 07 / 17 / 08
 Recorder #

Consult Guide to Archaeological Site Form for detailed instructions.

Site Name(s) Trotwood Multiple Listing (DHR only)
 Project Name CRAS PD&E I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Rd. to US 301 Survey # (DHR only)

Ownership: private-profit private-nonprofit private-individual private-nonspecific city county state federal Native American foreign unknown

LOCATION & MAPPING

USGS 7.5 Map Name & Date Riverview 1956, PR 1987 Plat or Other Map

City/Town (within 3 miles) In City Limits? yes no unknown County Hillsborough

Township 30S Range 20E Section 30 ¼ section: NW SW SE NE Irregular-name:

Landgrant Tax Parcel #

UTM Coordinates: Zone 16 17 Easting 0 Northing 0

Other Coordinates: X: Y: Coordinate System & Datum

Address / Vicinity / Route to

Name of Public Tract (e.g., park)

TYPE OF SITE (check all that apply)

SETTING *	STRUCTURES OR FEATURES *	FUNCTION *
<input type="checkbox"/> Land (<i>terrestrial</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Lake/Pond (<i>lacustrine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> River/Stream/Creek (<i>riverine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Tidal (<i>estuarine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Saltwater (<i>marine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Wetland (<i>palustrine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> usually flooded <input type="checkbox"/> usually dry <input type="checkbox"/> Cave/Sink (<i>subterranean</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> terrestrial <input type="checkbox"/> aquatic	<input type="checkbox"/> aboriginal boat <input type="checkbox"/> agr/c/farm building <input type="checkbox"/> burial mound <input type="checkbox"/> building remains <input type="checkbox"/> cemetery/grave <input type="checkbox"/> dump/refuse <input type="checkbox"/> earthworks <input type="checkbox"/> fort <input type="checkbox"/> midden <input type="checkbox"/> mill <input type="checkbox"/> mission <input type="checkbox"/> mound, nonspecific <input type="checkbox"/> plantation <input type="checkbox"/> platform mound <input type="checkbox"/> road segment <input type="checkbox"/> shell midden <input type="checkbox"/> shell mound <input type="checkbox"/> shipwreck <input type="checkbox"/> subsurface features <input type="checkbox"/> surface scatter <input type="checkbox"/> well	<input type="checkbox"/> campsite <input type="checkbox"/> extractive site <input type="checkbox"/> habitation (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> homestead (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> farmstead <input type="checkbox"/> village (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> town (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> quarry
<input type="checkbox"/> Other settings, structures, features or functions <u> </u>		

CULTURE PERIODS (check all that apply)

ABORIGINAL *	NON-ABORIGINAL *
<input type="checkbox"/> Alachua <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Middle <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Belle Glade <input type="checkbox"/> Cades Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Caloosahatchee <input type="checkbox"/> Deptford <input type="checkbox"/> Englewood <input type="checkbox"/> Fort Walton <input type="checkbox"/> Glades (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Glades I <input type="checkbox"/> Glades II <input type="checkbox"/> Glades III <input type="checkbox"/> Hickory Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Leon-Jefferson <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar I <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar II <input type="checkbox"/> Manasota <input type="checkbox"/> Mississippian <input type="checkbox"/> Mount Taylor <input type="checkbox"/> Norwood <input type="checkbox"/> Orange <input type="checkbox"/> Paleoindian <input type="checkbox"/> Pensacola <input type="checkbox"/> Perico Island <input type="checkbox"/> Safety Harbor <input type="checkbox"/> St. Augustine	<input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1513-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1600-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1700-1763 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> British 1763-1783 <input type="checkbox"/> Second Spanish 1783-1821 <input type="checkbox"/> American Territorial 1821-45 <input type="checkbox"/> American Civil War 1861-65 <input type="checkbox"/> American 19th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American 20th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> African-American <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns I <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns II <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa-Swift Creek <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: Colonization <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 1st War To 2nd <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 2nd War To 3rd <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 3rd War & After <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Transitional <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island I <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island II <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric non-ceramic <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric ceramic
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (List less common phases or specific sub-phases. For historic sites, give specific dates if known.) <u> </u>	

* Consult *Guide to Archaeological Site Form* for preferred descriptions not listed above (data are coded fields).

OPINION OF RESOURCE SIGNIFICANCE

Potentially eligible individually for National Register of Historic Places? yes no insufficient information
 Potentially eligible as contributor to a National Register district? yes no insufficient information

Explanation of Evaluation (required if evaluated; use separate sheet if needed) no evidence of the site discovered within the APE

Recommendations for Owner or SHPO Action no additional investigations

DHR USE ONLY	OFFICIAL EVALUATION	DHR USE ONLY
NR List Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u>	SHPO – Appears to meet criteria for NR listing: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient info	Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> Init. <u> </u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Owner Objection	KEEPER – Determined eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u>
	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</i> 15, p. 2)	

FIELD METHODS (check all that apply)

SITE DETECTION* and SITE BOUNDARIES* sections with checkboxes for field methods like 'no field check', 'literature search', 'remote sensing', 'screened shovel', 'remote sensing', 'insp exposed ground', etc.

Other methods; number, size, depth, pattern of units; screen size (attach site plan) 17 ST; all negative, 25 & 50 m intervals 50 cm diameter, 1 m deep, 6.4 mm mesh screen

SITE DESCRIPTION

Extent Size (m²) _____ Depth/stratigraphy of cultural deposit 0-35cm brown gray fill/sand, 35-100 cm brown gray sand

Temporal Interpretation - Components (check one): [] single component [] multiple component [x] uncertain Describe each occupation in plan (refer to attached large scale map) and stratigraphically. Discuss temporal and functional interpretations:

Integrity - Overall disturbance*: [] none seen [] minor [] substantial [x] major [] redeposited [] destroyed-document! [] unknown Disturbances / threats / protective measures road construction / road construction / none

Surface collection: area collected _____ m² # collection units _____ Excavation: # noncontiguous blocks _____

ARTIFACTS

Total Artifacts # 0C _____ (C)ount or (E)stimate? Surface # 0C _____ (C) or (E) Subsurface # 0C _____ (C) or (E)

COLLECTION SELECTIVITY* and ARTIFACT CATEGORIES* and DISPOSITIONS* sections with checkboxes for 'unknown', 'unselective', 'bone-animal', 'bone-human', etc. Includes a Disposition List box.

Artifact Comments _____

DIAGNOSTICS (type or mode, and frequency: e.g., Suwanee ppk, heat-treated chert, Deptford Check-stamped, ironstone/whiteware)

- 1. _____ N= _____ 4. _____ N= _____ 7. _____ N= _____
2. _____ N= _____ 5. _____ N= _____ 8. _____ N= _____
3. _____ N= _____ 6. _____ N= _____ 9. _____ N= _____

ENVIRONMENT

Nearest fresh water type* & name (incl. relict source) Bullfrog Creek Distance (m)/bearing 100 m E

Natural community (FNAI category* or leave blank) _____

Local vegetation _____

Topography* _____ Min Elevation 6 meters Max Elevation 8 meters

Present land use interstate ROW

SCS soil series Myakka fine sand Soil association _____

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File - including field & analysis notes, photos, plans, other important documents that are permanently accessible: For each separately maintained collection, describe (1) document type(s),* (2) maintaining organization,* (3) file or accession nos., and (4) descriptive information.

ACI P08008 - documentation;

Manuscripts or Publications on the site (use separate sheet if needed, give FMSF# if relevant) ACI (2008) Cultural Resource Assessment Survey PD&E Study I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301 Hillsborough and Manatee Counties, Florida

RECORDER & INFORMANT INFORMATION

Informant Information (name / address / phone / affiliation) _____

Recorder Information (name / address / phone / affiliation) Horvath, Elizabeth A., 98 Hickorywood Dr., Crawfordville, FL 32327 Archaeological Consultants, Inc., 850-926-9285, acinorth@comcast.net


Required Attachments 1 PHOTOCOPY OF 7.5' USGS QUAD MAP WITH SITE BOUNDARIES MARKED and SITE PLAN Plan at 1:3,600 or larger. Show boundaries, scale, north arrow, test/collection units, landmarks and date.



USGS MAP

Riverview, Fla. 1982

Township 30 South, Range 20 East, Section 30



- Original
- Update



ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 4.0 1/07

Site #8 HI478
 Field Date / /
 Form Date 07 / 17 / 08
 Recorder #

Consult Guide to Archaeological Site Form for detailed instructions.

Site Name(s) Alafia South Multiple Listing (DHR only)
 Project Name CRAS PD&E I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Rd. to US 301 Survey # (DHR only)

Ownership: private-profit private-nonprofit private-individual private-nonspecific city county state federal Native American foreign unknown

LOCATION & MAPPING

USGS 7.5 Map Name & Date Riverview 1956, PR 1987 Plat or Other Map

City/Town (within 3 miles) In City Limits? yes no unknown County Hillsborough

Township 30S Range 20E Section 19 ¼ section: NW SW SE NE Irregular-name:

Landgrant Tax Parcel #

UTM Coordinates: Zone 16 17 Easting 0 Northing 0

Other Coordinates: X: Y: Coordinate System & Datum

Address / Vicinity / Route to

Name of Public Tract (e.g., park)

TYPE OF SITE (check all that apply)

SETTING *	STRUCTURES OR FEATURES *	FUNCTION *
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land (terrestrial) <input type="checkbox"/> Lake/Pond (lacustrine) <input type="checkbox"/> River/Stream/Creek (riverine) <input type="checkbox"/> Tidal (estuarine) <input type="checkbox"/> Saltwater (marine) <input type="checkbox"/> Wetland (palustrine) <input type="checkbox"/> usually flooded <input type="checkbox"/> usually dry <input type="checkbox"/> Cave/Sink (subterranean) <input type="checkbox"/> terrestrial <input type="checkbox"/> aquatic	<input type="checkbox"/> aboriginal boat <input type="checkbox"/> agr/c/farm building <input type="checkbox"/> burial mound <input type="checkbox"/> building remains <input type="checkbox"/> cemetery/grave <input type="checkbox"/> dump/refuse <input type="checkbox"/> earthworks <input type="checkbox"/> fort <input type="checkbox"/> midden <input type="checkbox"/> mill <input type="checkbox"/> mission <input type="checkbox"/> mound, nonspecific <input type="checkbox"/> plantation <input type="checkbox"/> platform mound <input type="checkbox"/> road segment <input type="checkbox"/> shell midden <input type="checkbox"/> shell mound <input type="checkbox"/> shipwreck <input type="checkbox"/> subsurface features <input type="checkbox"/> surface scatter <input type="checkbox"/> well	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> campsite <input type="checkbox"/> extractive site <input type="checkbox"/> habitation (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> homestead (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> farmstead <input type="checkbox"/> village (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> town (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> quarry
<input type="checkbox"/> Other settings, structures, features or functions <u> </u>		

CULTURE PERIODS (check all that apply)

ABORIGINAL *	NON-ABORIGINAL *
<input type="checkbox"/> Alachua <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Middle <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Belle Glade <input type="checkbox"/> Cades Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Caloosahatchee <input type="checkbox"/> Deptford <input type="checkbox"/> Englewood <input type="checkbox"/> Fort Walton <input type="checkbox"/> Glades (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Glades I <input type="checkbox"/> Glades II <input type="checkbox"/> Glades III <input type="checkbox"/> Hickory Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Leon-Jefferson <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar I <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar II <input type="checkbox"/> Manasota <input type="checkbox"/> Mississippian <input type="checkbox"/> Mount Taylor <input type="checkbox"/> Norwood <input type="checkbox"/> Orange <input type="checkbox"/> Paleoindian <input type="checkbox"/> Pensacola <input type="checkbox"/> Perico Island <input type="checkbox"/> Safety Harbor <input type="checkbox"/> St. Augustine	<input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns I <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns II <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa-Swift Creek <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: Colonization <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 1st War To 2nd <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 2nd War To 3rd <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 3rd War & After <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Transitional <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island I <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island II <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric (nonspecific) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric non-ceramic <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric ceramic <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1513-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1600-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1700-1763 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> British 1763-1783 <input type="checkbox"/> Second Spanish 1783-1821 <input type="checkbox"/> American Territorial 1821-45 <input type="checkbox"/> American Civil War 1861-65 <input type="checkbox"/> American 19th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American 20th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> African-American
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (List less common phases or specific sub-phases. For historic sites, give specific dates if known.) <u> </u>	

* Consult *Guide to Archaeological Site Form* for preferred descriptions not listed above (data are coded fields).

OPINION OF RESOURCE SIGNIFICANCE

Potentially eligible individually for National Register of Historic Places? yes no insufficient information
 Potentially eligible as contributor to a National Register district? yes no insufficient information

Explanation of Evaluation (required if evaluated; use separate sheet if needed) low artifact density & diversity, no subsurface features
low research potential as contained within the APE

Recommendations for Owner or SHPO Action no additional investigations

DHR USE ONLY	OFFICIAL EVALUATION	DHR USE ONLY
NR List Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u>	SHPO – Appears to meet criteria for NR listing: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient info	Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> Init. <u> </u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Owner Objection	KEEPER – Determined eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u>
	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</i> 15, p. 2)	

FIELD METHODS (check all that apply)

SITE DETECTION* and SITE BOUNDARIES* sections with checkboxes for field methods like 'no field check', 'literature search', 'remote sensing', 'bounds unknown', 'remote sensing', 'unscreened shovel', etc.

SITE DESCRIPTION

Extent Size (m²), Depth/stratigraphy of cultural deposit, Temporal Interpretation - Components, Integrity - Overall disturbance*, Surface collection: area collected, # collection units, Excavation: # noncontiguous blocks

ARTIFACTS

Total Artifacts #, COLLECTION SELECTIVITY*, SPATIAL CONTROL*, ARTIFACT CATEGORIES* and DISPOSITIONS*, Disposition List* (A, S, O, R, I, U)

Artifact Comments, DIAGNOSTICS (type or mode, and frequency: e.g., Suwanee ppk, heat-treated chert, Deptford Check-stamped, ironstone/whiteware)

ENVIRONMENT

Nearest fresh water type* & name, Natural community (FNAI category*), Local vegetation, Topography*, Present land use, SCS soil series, Soil association

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File, Manuscripts or Publications on the site

RECORDER & INFORMANT INFORMATION

Informant Information, Recorder Information


Required Attachments, PHOTOCOPY OF 7.5' USGS QUAD MAP WITH SITE BOUNDARIES MARKED and SITE PLAN, Plan at 1:3,600 or larger. Show boundaries, scale, north arrow, test/collection units, landmarks and date.



USGS MAP

Riverview, Fla. 1982

Township 30 South, Range 20 East, Section 19



- Original
- Update



ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 4.0 1/07

Site #8 HI409
 Field Date / /
 Form Date 07 / 17 / 08
 Recorder #

Consult Guide to Archaeological Site Form for detailed instructions.

Site Name(s) Trotwood Multiple Listing (DHR only)
 Project Name CRAS PD&E I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Rd. to US 301 Survey # (DHR only)

Ownership: private-profit private-nonprofit private-individual private-nonspecific city county state federal Native American foreign unknown

LOCATION & MAPPING

USGS 7.5 Map Name & Date Riverview 1956, PR 1987 Plat or Other Map

City/Town (within 3 miles) In City Limits? yes no unknown County Hillsborough

Township 30S Range 20E Section 30 ¼ section: NW SW SE NE Irregular-name:

Landgrant Tax Parcel #

UTM Coordinates: Zone 16 17 Easting 0 Northing 0

Other Coordinates: X: Y: Coordinate System & Datum

Address / Vicinity / Route to

Name of Public Tract (e.g., park)

TYPE OF SITE (check all that apply)

SETTING *	STRUCTURES OR FEATURES *	FUNCTION *
<input type="checkbox"/> Land (<i>terrestrial</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Lake/Pond (<i>lacustrine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> River/Stream/Creek (<i>riverine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Tidal (<i>estuarine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Saltwater (<i>marine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Wetland (<i>palustrine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> usually flooded <input type="checkbox"/> usually dry <input type="checkbox"/> Cave/Sink (<i>subterranean</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> terrestrial <input type="checkbox"/> aquatic	<input type="checkbox"/> aboriginal boat <input type="checkbox"/> agr/c/farm building <input type="checkbox"/> burial mound <input type="checkbox"/> building remains <input type="checkbox"/> cemetery/grave <input type="checkbox"/> dump/refuse <input type="checkbox"/> earthworks <input type="checkbox"/> fort <input type="checkbox"/> midden <input type="checkbox"/> mill <input type="checkbox"/> mission <input type="checkbox"/> mound, nonspecific <input type="checkbox"/> plantation <input type="checkbox"/> platform mound <input type="checkbox"/> road segment <input type="checkbox"/> shell midden <input type="checkbox"/> shell mound <input type="checkbox"/> shipwreck <input type="checkbox"/> subsurface features <input type="checkbox"/> surface scatter <input type="checkbox"/> well	<input type="checkbox"/> campsite <input type="checkbox"/> extractive site <input type="checkbox"/> habitation (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> homestead (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> farmstead <input type="checkbox"/> village (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> town (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> quarry
<input type="checkbox"/> Other settings, structures, features or functions <u> </u>		

CULTURE PERIODS (check all that apply)

ABORIGINAL *	NON-ABORIGINAL *
<input type="checkbox"/> Alachua <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Middle <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Belle Glade <input type="checkbox"/> Cades Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Caloosahatchee <input type="checkbox"/> Deptford <input type="checkbox"/> Englewood <input type="checkbox"/> Fort Walton <input type="checkbox"/> Glades (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Glades I <input type="checkbox"/> Glades II <input type="checkbox"/> Glades III <input type="checkbox"/> Hickory Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Leon-Jefferson <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar I <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar II <input type="checkbox"/> Manasota <input type="checkbox"/> Mississippian <input type="checkbox"/> Mount Taylor <input type="checkbox"/> Norwood <input type="checkbox"/> Orange <input type="checkbox"/> Paleoindian <input type="checkbox"/> Pensacola <input type="checkbox"/> Perico Island <input type="checkbox"/> Safety Harbor <input type="checkbox"/> St. Augustine	<input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns I <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns II <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa-Swift Creek <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: Colonization <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 1st War To 2nd <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 2nd War To 3rd <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 3rd War & After <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Transitional <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island I <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island II <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric non-ceramic <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric ceramic <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1513-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1600-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1700-1763 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> British 1763-1783 <input type="checkbox"/> Second Spanish 1783-1821 <input type="checkbox"/> American Territorial 1821-45 <input type="checkbox"/> American Civil War 1861-65 <input type="checkbox"/> American 19th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American 20th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> African-American
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (List less common phases or specific sub-phases. For historic sites, give specific dates if known.) <u> </u>	

* Consult *Guide to Archaeological Site Form* for preferred descriptions not listed above (data are coded fields).

OPINION OF RESOURCE SIGNIFICANCE

Potentially eligible individually for National Register of Historic Places? yes no insufficient information
 Potentially eligible as contributor to a National Register district? yes no insufficient information

Explanation of Evaluation (required if evaluated; use separate sheet if needed) no evidence of the site discovered within the APE

Recommendations for Owner or SHPO Action no additional investigations

DHR USE ONLY	OFFICIAL EVALUATION	DHR USE ONLY
NR List Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u>	SHPO – Appears to meet criteria for NR listing: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient info	Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> Init. <u> </u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Owner Objection	KEEPER – Determined eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u>
	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</i> 15, p. 2)	

FIELD METHODS (check all that apply)

SITE DETECTION* and SITE BOUNDARIES* sections with checkboxes for field methods like 'no field check', 'literature search', 'remote sensing', 'screened shovel', etc.

Other methods; number, size, depth, pattern of units; screen size (attach site plan) 17 ST; all negative, 25 & 50 m intervals 50 cm diameter, 1 m deep, 6.4 mm mesh screen

SITE DESCRIPTION

Extent Size (m²) _____ Depth/stratigraphy of cultural deposit 0-35cm brown gray fill/sand, 35-100 cm brown gray sand

Temporal Interpretation - Components (check one): [] single component [] multiple component [x] uncertain Describe each occupation in plan (refer to attached large scale map) and stratigraphically. Discuss temporal and functional interpretations:

Integrity - Overall disturbance*: [] none seen [] minor [] substantial [x] major [] redeposited [] destroyed-document! [] unknown Disturbances / threats / protective measures road construction / road construction / none

Surface collection: area collected _____ m² # collection units _____ Excavation: # noncontiguous blocks _____

ARTIFACTS

Total Artifacts # 0C (C)ount or (E)stimate? Surface # 0C (C) or (E) Subsurface # 0C (C) or (E)

COLLECTION SELECTIVITY* and ARTIFACT CATEGORIES* and DISPOSITIONS* sections with checkboxes for artifact types and disposition codes.

Disposition List* table with categories: 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

Artifact Comments _____

DIAGNOSTICS (type or mode, and frequency: e.g., Suwanee ppk, heat-treated chert, Deptford Check-stamped, ironstone/whiteware)

- 1. _____ N= _____ 4. _____ N= _____ 7. _____ N= _____
2. _____ N= _____ 5. _____ N= _____ 8. _____ N= _____
3. _____ N= _____ 6. _____ N= _____ 9. _____ N= _____

ENVIRONMENT

Nearest fresh water type* & name (incl. relict source) Bullfrog Creek Distance (m)/bearing 100 m E
Natural community (FNAI category* or leave blank) _____
Local vegetation _____
Topography* _____ Min Elevation 6 meters Max Elevation 8 meters
Present land use interstate ROW
SCS soil series Myakka fine sand Soil association _____

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File - including field & analysis notes, photos, plans, other important documents that are permanently accessible: For each separately maintained collection, describe (1) document type(s),* (2) maintaining organization,* (3) file or accession nos., and (4) descriptive information.

ACI P08008 - documentation;

Manuscripts or Publications on the site (use separate sheet if needed, give FMSF# if relevant) ACI (2008) Cultural Resource Assessment Survey PD&E Study I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301 Hillsborough and Manatee Counties, Florida

RECORDER & INFORMANT INFORMATION

Informant Information (name / address / phone / affiliation) _____

Recorder Information (name / address / phone / affiliation) Horvath, Elizabeth A., 98 Hickorywood Dr., Crawfordville, FL 32327 Archaeological Consultants, Inc., 850-926-9285, acinorth@comcast.net


Required Attachments 1 PHOTOCOPY OF 7.5' USGS QUAD MAP WITH SITE BOUNDARIES MARKED and SITE PLAN Plan at 1:3,600 or larger. Show boundaries, scale, north arrow, test/collection units, landmarks and date.



USGS MAP

Riverview, Fla. 1982

Township 30 South, Range 20 East, Section 30



- Original
- Update



ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 4.0 1/07

Site #8 HI480
 Field Date / /
 Form Date 07/17/08
 Recorder #

Consult Guide to Archaeological Site Form for detailed instructions.

Site Name(s) Curiosity Creek Multiple Listing (DHR only)
 Project Name CRAS PD&E I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Rd. to US 301 Survey # (DHR only)

Ownership: private-profit private-nonprofit private-individual private-nonspecific city county state federal Native American foreign unknown

LOCATION & MAPPING

USGS 7.5 Map Name & Date Ruskin 1956, PR 1987 Plat or Other Map

City/Town (within 3 miles) In City Limits? yes no unknown County Hillsborough

Township 32S Range 19E Section 31 ¼ section: NW SW SE NE Irregular-name:

Landgrant Tax Parcel #

UTM Coordinates: Zone 16 17 Easting 0 Northing 0

Other Coordinates: X: Y: Coordinate System & Datum

Address / Vicinity / Route to

Name of Public Tract (e.g., park)

TYPE OF SITE (check all that apply)

SETTING *	STRUCTURES OR FEATURES *	FUNCTION *
<input type="checkbox"/> Land (<i>terrestrial</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Lake/Pond (<i>lacustrine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> River/Stream/Creek (<i>riverine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Tidal (<i>estuarine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Saltwater (<i>marine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Wetland (<i>palustrine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> usually flooded <input type="checkbox"/> usually dry <input type="checkbox"/> Cave/Sink (<i>subterranean</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> terrestrial <input type="checkbox"/> aquatic	<input type="checkbox"/> aboriginal boat <input type="checkbox"/> agr/c/farm building <input type="checkbox"/> burial mound <input type="checkbox"/> building remains <input type="checkbox"/> cemetery/grave <input type="checkbox"/> dump/refuse <input type="checkbox"/> earthworks <input type="checkbox"/> fort <input type="checkbox"/> midden <input type="checkbox"/> mill <input type="checkbox"/> mission <input type="checkbox"/> mound, nonspecific <input type="checkbox"/> plantation <input type="checkbox"/> platform mound <input type="checkbox"/> road segment <input type="checkbox"/> shell midden <input type="checkbox"/> shell mound <input type="checkbox"/> shipwreck <input type="checkbox"/> subsurface features <input type="checkbox"/> surface scatter <input type="checkbox"/> well	<input type="checkbox"/> campsite <input type="checkbox"/> extractive site <input type="checkbox"/> habitation (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> homestead (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> farmstead <input type="checkbox"/> village (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> town (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> quarry
<input type="checkbox"/> Other settings, structures, features or functions <u> </u>		

CULTURE PERIODS (check all that apply)

ABORIGINAL *	NON-ABORIGINAL *
<input type="checkbox"/> Alachua <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Middle <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Belle Glade <input type="checkbox"/> Cades Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Caloosahatchee <input type="checkbox"/> Deptford <input type="checkbox"/> Englewood <input type="checkbox"/> Fort Walton <input type="checkbox"/> Glades (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Glades I <input type="checkbox"/> Glades II <input type="checkbox"/> Glades III <input type="checkbox"/> Hickory Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Leon-Jefferson <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar I <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar II <input type="checkbox"/> Manasota <input type="checkbox"/> Mississippian <input type="checkbox"/> Mount Taylor <input type="checkbox"/> Norwood <input type="checkbox"/> Orange <input type="checkbox"/> Paleoindian <input type="checkbox"/> Pensacola <input type="checkbox"/> Perico Island <input type="checkbox"/> Safety Harbor <input type="checkbox"/> St. Augustine	<input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns I <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns II <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa-Swift Creek <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: Colonization <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 1st War To 2nd <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 2nd War To 3rd <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 3rd War & After <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Transitional <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island I <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island II <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric non-ceramic <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric ceramic <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1513-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1600-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1700-1763 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> British 1763-1783 <input type="checkbox"/> Second Spanish 1783-1821 <input type="checkbox"/> American Territorial 1821-45 <input type="checkbox"/> American Civil War 1861-65 <input type="checkbox"/> American 19th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American 20th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> African-American
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (List less common phases or specific sub-phases. For historic sites, give specific dates if known.) <u> </u>	

* Consult *Guide to Archaeological Site Form* for preferred descriptions not listed above (data are coded fields).

OPINION OF RESOURCE SIGNIFICANCE

Potentially eligible individually for National Register of Historic Places? yes no insufficient information
 Potentially eligible as contributor to a National Register district? yes no insufficient information
 Explanation of Evaluation (required if evaluated; use separate sheet if needed) no evidence of the site discovered within the APE

Recommendations for Owner or SHPO Action no additional investigations

DHR USE ONLY	OFFICIAL EVALUATION	DHR USE ONLY
NR List Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u>	SHPO – Appears to meet criteria for NR listing: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient info	Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> Init. <u> </u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Owner Objection	KEEPER – Determined eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u>
	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</i> 15, p. 2)	

FIELD METHODS (check all that apply)

SITE DETECTION* and SITE BOUNDARIES* sections with checkboxes for field methods like 'no field check', 'literature search', 'remote sensing', 'screened shovel', 'remote sensing', 'insp exposed ground', etc.

Other methods; number, size, depth, pattern of units; screen size (attach site plan) 15 ST; all negative, 25 m interval 50 cm diameter, 1 m deep, 6.4 mm mesh screen

SITE DESCRIPTION

Extent Size (m2) 0-35 cm gray brown sand, 35-100 cm light brown sand

Temporal Interpretation - Components (check one): single component, multiple component, uncertain

Integrity - Overall disturbance*: none seen, minor, substantial, major, redeposited, destroyed-document!, unknown

Surface collection: area collected m2, # collection units, Excavation: # noncontiguous blocks

ARTIFACTS

Total Artifacts # 0C (C)ount or (E)stimate? Surface # 0C (C) or (E) Subsurface # 0C (C) or (E)

COLLECTION SELECTIVITY* and ARTIFACT CATEGORIES* and DISPOSITIONS* sections with checkboxes for artifact types and disposition codes.

Disposition List* table with categories: 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

Artifact Comments

DIAGNOSTICS (type or mode, and frequency: e.g., Suwanee ppk, heat-treated chert, Deptford Check-stamped, ironstone/whiteware)

- 1. N= 4. N= 7. N=
2. N= 5. N= 8. N=
3. N= 6. N= 9. N=

ENVIRONMENT

Nearest fresh water type* & name (incl. relict source) Curiosity Creek Distance (m)/bearing 100 m SE
Natural community (FNAI category* or leave blank)
Local vegetation
Topography* Min Elevation 5 meters Max Elevation 6 meters
Present land use interstate ROW
SCS soil series Myakka fine sand Soil association

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File - including field & analysis notes, photos, plans, other important documents that are permanently accessible: For each separately maintained collection, describe (1) document type(s),* (2) maintaining organization,* (3) file or accession nos., and (4) descriptive information.

ACI P08008 - documentation;

Manuscripts or Publications on the site (use separate sheet if needed, give FMSF# if relevant) ACI (2008) Cultural Resource Assessment Survey PD&E Study I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301 Hillsborough and Manatee Counties, Florida

RECORDER & INFORMANT INFORMATION

Informant Information (name / address / phone / affiliation)

Recorder Information (name / address / phone / affiliation) Horvath, Elizabeth A., 98 Hickorywood Dr., Crawfordville, FL 32327 Archaeological Consultants, Inc., 850-926-9285, acinorth@comcast.net


Required Attachments 1 PHOTOCOPY OF 7.5' USGS QUAD MAP WITH SITE BOUNDARIES MARKED and SITE PLAN Plan at 1:3,600 or larger. Show boundaries, scale, north arrow, test/collection units, landmarks and date.



USGS MAP

Ruskin, Fla. 1982

Township 32 South, Range 19 East, Section 31



- Original
- Update



ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 4.0 1/07

Site #8 HI524
 Field Date / /
 Form Date 07 / 17 / 08
 Recorder #

Consult Guide to Archaeological Site Form for detailed instructions.

Site Name(s) Symmes Road Multiple Listing (DHR only)
 Project Name CRAS PD&E I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Rd. to US 301 Survey # (DHR only)

Ownership: private-profit private-nonprofit private-individual private-nonspecific city county state federal Native American foreign unknown

LOCATION & MAPPING

USGS 7.5 Map Name & Date Riverview 1956, PR 1987 Plat or Other Map

City/Town (within 3 miles) In City Limits? yes no unknown County Hillsborough

Township 30S Range 20E Section 30 ¼ section: NW SW SE NE Irregular-name: also 31 NW

Landgrant Tax Parcel #

UTM Coordinates: Zone 16 17 Easting 0 Northing 0

Other Coordinates: X: Y: Coordinate System & Datum

Address / Vicinity / Route to

Name of Public Tract (e.g., park)

TYPE OF SITE (check all that apply)

SETTING *	STRUCTURES OR FEATURES *	FUNCTION *
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land (terrestrial) <input type="checkbox"/> Lake/Pond (lacustrine) <input type="checkbox"/> River/Stream/Creek (riverine) <input type="checkbox"/> Tidal (estuarine) <input type="checkbox"/> Saltwater (marine)	<input type="checkbox"/> aboriginal boat <input type="checkbox"/> agr/c/farm building <input type="checkbox"/> burial mound <input type="checkbox"/> building remains <input type="checkbox"/> cemetery/grave <input type="checkbox"/> dump/refuse <input type="checkbox"/> earthworks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> campsite <input type="checkbox"/> extractive site <input type="checkbox"/> habitation (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> homestead (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> farmstead <input type="checkbox"/> village (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> town (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> quarry
<input type="checkbox"/> Wetland (palustrine) <input type="checkbox"/> usually flooded <input type="checkbox"/> usually dry <input type="checkbox"/> Cave/Sink (subterranean) <input type="checkbox"/> terrestrial <input type="checkbox"/> aquatic	<input type="checkbox"/> fort <input type="checkbox"/> midden <input type="checkbox"/> mill <input type="checkbox"/> mission <input type="checkbox"/> mound, nonspecific <input type="checkbox"/> plantation <input type="checkbox"/> platform mound	<input type="checkbox"/> road segment <input type="checkbox"/> shell midden <input type="checkbox"/> shell mound <input type="checkbox"/> shipwreck <input type="checkbox"/> subsurface features <input type="checkbox"/> surface scatter <input type="checkbox"/> well
<input type="checkbox"/> Other settings, structures, features or functions <u> </u>		

CULTURE PERIODS (check all that apply)

ABORIGINAL *	NON-ABORIGINAL *
<input type="checkbox"/> Alachua <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Middle <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Belle Glade <input type="checkbox"/> Cades Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Caloosahatchee <input type="checkbox"/> Deptford	<input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1513-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1600-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1700-1763 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> British 1763-1783 <input type="checkbox"/> Second Spanish 1783-1821 <input type="checkbox"/> American Territorial 1821-45 <input type="checkbox"/> American Civil War 1861-65 <input type="checkbox"/> American 19th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American 20th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> African-American
<input type="checkbox"/> Englewood <input type="checkbox"/> Fort Walton <input type="checkbox"/> Glades (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Glades I <input type="checkbox"/> Glades II <input type="checkbox"/> Glades III <input type="checkbox"/> Hickory Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Leon-Jefferson <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar I <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar II	<input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns I <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns II <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa-Swift Creek <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: Colonization <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 1st War To 2nd <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 2nd War To 3rd <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 3rd War & After
<input type="checkbox"/> Manasota <input type="checkbox"/> Mississippian <input type="checkbox"/> Mount Taylor <input type="checkbox"/> Norwood <input type="checkbox"/> Orange <input type="checkbox"/> Paleoindian <input type="checkbox"/> Pensacola <input type="checkbox"/> Perico Island <input type="checkbox"/> Safety Harbor <input type="checkbox"/> St. Augustine	<input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Transitional <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island I <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island II <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric (nonspecific) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric non-ceramic <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric ceramic
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (List less common phases or specific sub-phases. For historic sites, give specific dates if known.) <u> </u>	

* Consult *Guide to Archaeological Site Form* for preferred descriptions not listed above (data are coded fields).

OPINION OF RESOURCE SIGNIFICANCE

Potentially eligible individually for National Register of Historic Places? yes no insufficient information
 Potentially eligible as contributor to a National Register district? yes no insufficient information
 Explanation of Evaluation (required if evaluated; use separate sheet if needed) low artifact density & diversity, no subsurface features
low research potential as contained within the APE

Recommendations for Owner or SHPO Action no additional investigations

DHR USE ONLY	OFFICIAL EVALUATION	DHR USE ONLY
NR List Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u>	SHPO – Appears to meet criteria for NR listing: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient info	Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> Init. <u> </u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Owner Objection	KEEPER – Determined eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u>
	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</i> 15, p. 2)	

FIELD METHODS (check all that apply)

SITE DETECTION* and SITE BOUNDARIES* sections with checkboxes for field methods like 'no field check', 'literature search', 'remote sensing', etc.

SITE DESCRIPTION

Extent Size, Depth/stratigraphy of cultural deposit, Temporal Interpretation - Components, Integrity - Overall disturbance*, Surface collection, etc.

ARTIFACTS

Total Artifacts #, COLLECTION SELECTIVITY*, SPATIAL CONTROL*, ARTIFACT CATEGORIES* and DISPOSITIONS*, Disposition List* (A, S, O, R, I, U)

Artifact Comments, DIAGNOSTICS (type or mode, and frequency: e.g., Suwanee ppk, heat-treated chert, Deptford Check-stamped, ironstone/whiteware)

ENVIRONMENT

Nearest fresh water type* & name, Natural community (FNAI category*), Local vegetation, Topography*, Present land use, SCS soil series, Soil association

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File, Manuscripts or Publications on the site (use separate sheet if needed, give FMSF# if relevant)

RECORDER & INFORMANT INFORMATION

Informant Information, Recorder Information (name / address / phone / affiliation)


Required Attachments: 1 PHOTOCOPY OF 7.5' USGS QUAD MAP WITH SITE BOUNDARIES MARKED and SITE PLAN. Plan at 1:3,600 or larger. Show boundaries, scale, north arrow, test/collection units, landmarks and date.



USGS MAP

Riverview, Fla. 1982

Township 30 South, Range 20 East, Sections 30 and 31



- Original
- Update



ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 4.0 1/07

Site #8 HI525
 Field Date / /
 Form Date 07/17/08
 Recorder #

Consult Guide to Archaeological Site Form for detailed instructions.

Site Name(s) South Symmes Multiple Listing (DHR only)
 Project Name CRAS PD&E I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Rd. to US 301 Survey # (DHR only)
 Ownership: private-profit private-nonprofit private-individual private-nonspecific city county state federal Native American foreign unknown

LOCATION & MAPPING

USGS 7.5 Map Name & Date Riverview 1956, PR 1987 Plat or Other Map
 City/Town (within 3 miles) In City Limits? yes no unknown County Hillsborough
 Township 30S Range 20E Section 31 ¼ section: NW SW SE NE Irregular-name:
 Landgrant Tax Parcel #
 UTM Coordinates: Zone 16 17 Easting 0 Northing 0
 Other Coordinates: X: Y: Coordinate System & Datum
 Address / Vicinity / Route to
 Name of Public Tract (e.g., park)

TYPE OF SITE (check all that apply)

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>SETTING *</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Land (<i>terrestrial</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Wetland (<i>palustrine</i>)
<input type="checkbox"/> Lake/Pond (<i>lacustrine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> usually flooded
<input type="checkbox"/> River/Stream/Creek (<i>riverine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> usually dry
<input type="checkbox"/> Tidal (<i>estuarine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Cave/Sink (<i>subterranean</i>)
<input type="checkbox"/> Saltwater (<i>marine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> terrestrial
<input type="checkbox"/> aquatic | <p>STRUCTURES OR FEATURES *</p> <input type="checkbox"/> aboriginal boat <input type="checkbox"/> fort <input type="checkbox"/> road segment
<input type="checkbox"/> agric/farm building <input type="checkbox"/> midden <input type="checkbox"/> shell midden
<input type="checkbox"/> burial mound <input type="checkbox"/> mill <input type="checkbox"/> shell mound
<input type="checkbox"/> building remains <input type="checkbox"/> mission <input type="checkbox"/> shipwreck
<input type="checkbox"/> cemetery/grave <input type="checkbox"/> mound, nonspecific <input type="checkbox"/> subsurface features
<input type="checkbox"/> dump/refuse <input type="checkbox"/> plantation <input type="checkbox"/> surface scatter
<input type="checkbox"/> earthworks <input type="checkbox"/> platform mound <input type="checkbox"/> well | <p>FUNCTION *</p> <input type="checkbox"/> campsite
<input type="checkbox"/> extractive site
<input type="checkbox"/> habitation (prehistoric)
<input type="checkbox"/> homestead (historic)
<input type="checkbox"/> farmstead
<input type="checkbox"/> village (prehistoric)
<input type="checkbox"/> town (historic)
<input type="checkbox"/> quarry |
|---|--|---|
- Other settings, structures, features or functions

CULTURE PERIODS (check all that apply)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>ABORIGINAL *</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Alachua <input type="checkbox"/> Englewood <input type="checkbox"/> Manasota <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns (nonspecific)
<input type="checkbox"/> Archaic (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Fort Walton <input type="checkbox"/> Mississippian <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns I
<input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Glades (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Mount Taylor <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns II
<input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Middle <input type="checkbox"/> Glades I <input type="checkbox"/> Norwood <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa
<input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Glades II <input type="checkbox"/> Orange <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa-Swift Creek
<input type="checkbox"/> Belle Glade <input type="checkbox"/> Glades III <input type="checkbox"/> Paleoindian <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole (nonspecific)
<input type="checkbox"/> Cades Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Hickory Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Pensacola <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: Colonization
<input type="checkbox"/> Caloosahatchee <input type="checkbox"/> Leon-Jefferson <input type="checkbox"/> Perico Island <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 1st War To 2nd
<input type="checkbox"/> Deptford <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar I <input type="checkbox"/> Safety Harbor <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 2nd War To 3rd
<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar II <input type="checkbox"/> St. Augustine <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 3rd War & After | <p>NON-ABORIGINAL *</p> <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1513-99
<input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1600-99
<input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1700-1763
<input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish (nonspecific)
<input type="checkbox"/> British 1763-1783
<input type="checkbox"/> Second Spanish 1783-1821
<input type="checkbox"/> American Territorial 1821-45
<input type="checkbox"/> American Civil War 1861-65
<input type="checkbox"/> American 19th Century
<input type="checkbox"/> American 20th Century
<input type="checkbox"/> American (nonspecific)
<input type="checkbox"/> African-American |
|---|--|
- Other (List less common phases or specific sub-phases. For historic sites, give specific dates if known.)

* Consult *Guide to Archaeological Site Form* for preferred descriptions not listed above (data are coded fields).

OPINION OF RESOURCE SIGNIFICANCE

Potentially eligible individually for National Register of Historic Places? yes no insufficient information
 Potentially eligible as contributor to a National Register district? yes no insufficient information
 Explanation of Evaluation (required if evaluated; use separate sheet if needed) no evidence of the site discovered within the APE

Recommendations for Owner or SHPO Action no additional investigations

DHR USE ONLY	OFFICIAL EVALUATION	DHR USE ONLY
NR List Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> <input type="checkbox"/> Owner Objection	SHPO – Appears to meet criteria for NR listing: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient info KEEPER – Determined eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no 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</i> 15, p. 2)	Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> Init. <u> </u> Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u>

FIELD METHODS (check all that apply)

SITE DETECTION* and SITE BOUNDARIES* sections with checkboxes for field methods like 'no field check', 'literature search', 'remote sensing', 'bounds unknown', 'remote sensing', 'unscreened shovel', etc.

Other methods; number, size, depth, pattern of units; screen size (attach site plan) 11 ST; all negative; 50 m intervals and judgmentally placed, 50 cm diameter, 1 m deep, 6.4 mm mesh screen

SITE DESCRIPTION

Extent Size (m²) _____ Depth/stratigraphy of cultural deposit 0-10 cm dark gray sand, 10-30 cm gray brown sand, 30-80 cm gray sand, 80+ cm dark brown hardpan

Temporal Interpretation - Components (check one): [] single component [] multiple component [] uncertain Describe each occupation in plan (refer to attached large scale map) and stratigraphically. Discuss temporal and functional interpretations:

Integrity - Overall disturbance*: [] none seen [] minor [] substantial [x] major [] redeposited [] destroyed-document! [] unknown Disturbances / threats / protective measures road construction / road construction / none

Surface collection: area collected _____ m² # collection units _____ Excavation: # noncontiguous blocks _____

ARTIFACTS

Total Artifacts # 0C (C)ount or (E)stimate? Surface # 0C (C) or (E) Subsurface # 0C (C) or (E)

COLLECTION SELECTIVITY* and ARTIFACT CATEGORIES* and DISPOSITIONS* sections with checkboxes for artifact types and disposition codes.

Disposition List* table with categories: 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

Artifact Comments _____

DIAGNOSTICS (type or mode, and frequency: e.g., Suwanee ppk, heat-treated chert, Deptford Check-stamped, ironstone/whiteware)

- 1. _____ N= _____ 4. _____ N= _____ 7. _____ N= _____
2. _____ N= _____ 5. _____ N= _____ 8. _____ N= _____
3. _____ N= _____ 6. _____ N= _____ 9. _____ N= _____

ENVIRONMENT

Nearest fresh water type* & name (incl. relict source) wetland Distance (m)/bearing 5 m E
Natural community (FNAI category* or leave blank) _____
Local vegetation _____
Topography* _____ Min Elevation 8 meters Max Elevation 11 meters
Present land use interstate ROW
SCS soil series Myakka fine sand Soil association _____

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File - including field & analysis notes, photos, plans, other important documents that are permanently accessible: For each separately maintained collection, describe (1) document type(s),* (2) maintaining organization,* (3) file or accession nos., and (4) descriptive information.

ACI P08008 - documentation;

Manuscripts or Publications on the site (use separate sheet if needed, give FMSF# if relevant) ACI (2008) Cultural Resource Assessment Survey PD&E Study I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301 Hillsborough and Manatee Counties, Florida

RECORDER & INFORMANT INFORMATION

Informant Information (name / address / phone / affiliation) _____

Recorder Information (name / address / phone / affiliation) Horvath, Elizabeth A., 98 Hickorywood Dr., Crawfordville, FL 32327 Archaeological Consultants, Inc., 850-926-9285, acinorth@comcast.net


Required Attachments 1 PHOTOCOPY OF 7.5' USGS QUAD MAP WITH SITE BOUNDARIES MARKED and SITE PLAN Plan at 1:3,600 or larger. Show boundaries, scale, north arrow, test/collection units, landmarks and date.



USGS MAP

Riverview, Fla. 1982

Township 30 South, Range 20 East, Section 31



- Original
- Update



ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 4.0 1/07

Site #8 HI526
 Field Date / /
 Form Date 07 / 17 / 08
 Recorder #

Consult Guide to Archaeological Site Form for detailed instructions.

Site Name(s) Dickman Multiple Listing (DHR only)
 Project Name CRAS PD&E I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Rd. to US 301 Survey # (DHR only)

Ownership: private-profit private-nonprofit private-individual private-nonspecific city county state federal Native American foreign unknown

LOCATION & MAPPING

USGS 7.5 Map Name & Date Ruskin 1956, PR 1987 Plat or Other Map

City/Town (within 3 miles) In City Limits? yes no unknown County Hillsborough

Township 32S Range 19E Section 29 ¼ section: NW SW SE NE Irregular-name:

Landgrant Tax Parcel #

UTM Coordinates: Zone 16 17 Easting 0 Northing 0

Other Coordinates: X: Y: Coordinate System & Datum

Address / Vicinity / Route to

Name of Public Tract (e.g., park)

TYPE OF SITE (check all that apply)

SETTING *	STRUCTURES OR FEATURES *	FUNCTION *
<input type="checkbox"/> Land (<i>terrestrial</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Lake/Pond (<i>lacustrine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> River/Stream/Creek (<i>riverine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Tidal (<i>estuarine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Saltwater (<i>marine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Wetland (<i>palustrine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> usually flooded <input type="checkbox"/> usually dry <input type="checkbox"/> Cave/Sink (<i>subterranean</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> terrestrial <input type="checkbox"/> aquatic	<input type="checkbox"/> aboriginal boat <input type="checkbox"/> agr/c/farm building <input type="checkbox"/> burial mound <input type="checkbox"/> building remains <input type="checkbox"/> cemetery/grave <input type="checkbox"/> dump/refuse <input type="checkbox"/> earthworks <input type="checkbox"/> fort <input type="checkbox"/> midden <input type="checkbox"/> mill <input type="checkbox"/> mission <input type="checkbox"/> mound, nonspecific <input type="checkbox"/> plantation <input type="checkbox"/> platform mound <input type="checkbox"/> road segment <input type="checkbox"/> shell midden <input type="checkbox"/> shell mound <input type="checkbox"/> shipwreck <input type="checkbox"/> subsurface features <input type="checkbox"/> surface scatter <input type="checkbox"/> well	<input type="checkbox"/> campsite <input type="checkbox"/> extractive site <input type="checkbox"/> habitation (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> homestead (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> farmstead <input type="checkbox"/> village (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> town (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> quarry
<input type="checkbox"/> Other settings, structures, features or functions <u> </u>		

CULTURE PERIODS (check all that apply)

ABORIGINAL *	CULTURE PERIODS	NON-ABORIGINAL *	
<input type="checkbox"/> Alachua <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Middle <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Belle Glade <input type="checkbox"/> Cades Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Caloosahatchee <input type="checkbox"/> Deptford	<input type="checkbox"/> Englewood <input type="checkbox"/> Fort Walton <input type="checkbox"/> Glades (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Glades I <input type="checkbox"/> Glades II <input type="checkbox"/> Glades III <input type="checkbox"/> Hickory Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Leon-Jefferson <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar I <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar II <input type="checkbox"/> Manasota <input type="checkbox"/> Mississippian <input type="checkbox"/> Mount Taylor <input type="checkbox"/> Norwood <input type="checkbox"/> Orange <input type="checkbox"/> Paleoindian <input type="checkbox"/> Pensacola <input type="checkbox"/> Perico Island <input type="checkbox"/> Safety Harbor <input type="checkbox"/> St. Augustine	<input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns I <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns II <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa-Swift Creek <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: Colonization <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 1st War To 2nd <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 2nd War To 3rd <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 3rd War & After <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Transitional <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island I <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island II <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric non-ceramic <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric ceramic	<input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1513-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1600-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1700-1763 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> British 1763-1783 <input type="checkbox"/> Second Spanish 1783-1821 <input type="checkbox"/> American Territorial 1821-45 <input type="checkbox"/> American Civil War 1861-65 <input type="checkbox"/> American 19th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American 20th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> African-American
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (List less common phases or specific sub-phases. For historic sites, give specific dates if known.) <u> </u>			

* Consult *Guide to Archaeological Site Form* for preferred descriptions not listed above (data are coded fields).

OPINION OF RESOURCE SIGNIFICANCE

Potentially eligible individually for National Register of Historic Places? yes no insufficient information
 Potentially eligible as contributor to a National Register district? yes no insufficient information

Explanation of Evaluation (required if evaluated; use separate sheet if needed) no evidence of the site discovered within the APE

Recommendations for Owner or SHPO Action no additional investigations

DHR USE ONLY	OFFICIAL EVALUATION	DHR USE ONLY
NR List Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u>	SHPO – Appears to meet criteria for NR listing: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient info	Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> Init. <u> </u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Owner Objection	KEEPER – Determined eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u>
	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</i> 15, p. 2)	

FIELD METHODS (check all that apply)

SITE DETECTION* and SITE BOUNDARIES* sections with checkboxes for field methods like 'no field check', 'literature search', 'remote sensing', 'bounds unknown', 'remote sensing', 'unscreened shovel', etc.

Other methods; number, size, depth, pattern of units; screen size (attach site plan) 14 ST; all negative; 25 m intervals 50 cm diameter, 1 m deep, 6.4 mm mesh screen

SITE DESCRIPTION

Extent Size (m2) Depth/stratigraphy of cultural deposit 0-60 cm gray brown sand, 60-100 cm light gray sand

Temporal Interpretation - Components (check one): single component, multiple component, uncertain. Describe each occupation in plan (refer to attached large scale map) and stratigraphically.

Integrity - Overall disturbance*: none seen, minor, substantial, major, redeposited, destroyed-document!, unknown. Disturbances / threats / protective measures road construction / road construction / none

Surface collection: area collected m2 # collection units Excavation: # noncontiguous blocks

ARTIFACTS

Total Artifacts # 0C (C)ount or (E)stimate? Surface # 0C (C) or (E) Subsurface # 0C (C) or (E)

COLLECTION SELECTIVITY* and ARTIFACT CATEGORIES* and DISPOSITIONS* sections with checkboxes for 'unknown', 'unselective', 'bone-animal', 'bone-human', etc. Includes a Disposition List box.

Artifact Comments

DIAGNOSTICS (type or mode, and frequency: e.g., Suwanee ppk, heat-treated chert, Deptford Check-stamped, ironstone/whiteware)

- 1. N= 4. N= 7. N=
2. N= 5. N= 8. N=
3. N= 6. N= 9. N=

ENVIRONMENT

Nearest fresh water type* & name (incl. relict source) Little Manatee River Distance (m)/bearing 50 m S
Natural community (FNAI category* or leave blank)
Local vegetation
Topography* Min Elevation 2 meters Max Elevation 5 meters
Present land use interstate ROW
SCS soil series Myakka fine sand Soil association

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File - including field & analysis notes, photos, plans, other important documents that are permanently accessible: For each separately maintained collection, describe (1) document type(s),* (2) maintaining organization,* (3) file or accession nos., and (4) descriptive information.

ACI P08008 - documentation;

Manuscripts or Publications on the site (use separate sheet if needed, give FMSF# if relevant) ACI (2008) Cultural Resource Assessment Survey PD&E Study I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301 Hillsborough and Manatee Counties, Florida

RECORDER & INFORMANT INFORMATION

Informant Information (name / address / phone / affiliation)

Recorder Information (name / address / phone / affiliation) Horvath, Elizabeth A., 98 Hickorywood Dr., Crawfordville, FL 32327 Archaeological Consultants, Inc., 850-926-9285, acinorth@comcast.net


Required Attachments 1 PHOTOCOPY OF 7.5' USGS QUAD MAP WITH SITE BOUNDARIES MARKED and SITE PLAN Plan at 1:3,600 or larger. Show boundaries, scale, north arrow, test/collection units, landmarks and date.



USGS MAP

Ruskin, Fla. 1982

Township 32 South, Range 19 East, Section 29



- Original
- Update



ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 4.0 1/07

Site #8 HI527
 Field Date / /
 Form Date 07/17/08
 Recorder #

Consult Guide to Archaeological Site Form for detailed instructions.

Site Name(s) Gainey Ranch 1 Multiple Listing (DHR only)
 Project Name CRAS PD&E I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Rd. to US 301 Survey # (DHR only)

Ownership: private-profit private-nonprofit private-individual private-nonspecific city county state federal Native American foreign unknown

LOCATION & MAPPING

USGS 7.5 Map Name & Date Ruskin 1956, PR 1987 Plat or Other Map

City/Town (within 3 miles) In City Limits? yes no unknown County Hillsborough

Township 32S Range 19E Section 29 ¼ section: NW SW SE NE Irregular-name:

Landgrant Tax Parcel #

UTM Coordinates: Zone 16 17 Easting 0 Northing 0

Other Coordinates: X: Y: Coordinate System & Datum

Address / Vicinity / Route to

Name of Public Tract (e.g., park)

TYPE OF SITE (check all that apply)

SETTING *	STRUCTURES OR FEATURES *	FUNCTION *
<input type="checkbox"/> Land (<i>terrestrial</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Lake/Pond (<i>lacustrine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> River/Stream/Creek (<i>riverine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Tidal (<i>estuarine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Saltwater (<i>marine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Wetland (<i>palustrine</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> usually flooded <input type="checkbox"/> usually dry <input type="checkbox"/> Cave/Sink (<i>subterranean</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> terrestrial <input type="checkbox"/> aquatic	<input type="checkbox"/> aboriginal boat <input type="checkbox"/> agr/c/farm building <input type="checkbox"/> burial mound <input type="checkbox"/> building remains <input type="checkbox"/> cemetery/grave <input type="checkbox"/> dump/refuse <input type="checkbox"/> earthworks <input type="checkbox"/> fort <input type="checkbox"/> midden <input type="checkbox"/> mill <input type="checkbox"/> mission <input type="checkbox"/> mound, nonspecific <input type="checkbox"/> plantation <input type="checkbox"/> platform mound <input type="checkbox"/> road segment <input type="checkbox"/> shell midden <input type="checkbox"/> shell mound <input type="checkbox"/> shipwreck <input type="checkbox"/> subsurface features <input type="checkbox"/> surface scatter <input type="checkbox"/> well	<input type="checkbox"/> campsite <input type="checkbox"/> extractive site <input type="checkbox"/> habitation (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> homestead (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> farmstead <input type="checkbox"/> village (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> town (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> quarry
<input type="checkbox"/> Other settings, structures, features or functions <u> </u>		

CULTURE PERIODS (check all that apply)

ABORIGINAL *	CULTURE PERIODS	NON-ABORIGINAL *	
<input type="checkbox"/> Alachua <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Middle <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Belle Glade <input type="checkbox"/> Cades Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Caloosahatchee <input type="checkbox"/> Deptford	<input type="checkbox"/> Englewood <input type="checkbox"/> Fort Walton <input type="checkbox"/> Glades (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Glades I <input type="checkbox"/> Glades II <input type="checkbox"/> Glades III <input type="checkbox"/> Hickory Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Leon-Jefferson <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar I <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar II <input type="checkbox"/> Manasota <input type="checkbox"/> Mississippian <input type="checkbox"/> Mount Taylor <input type="checkbox"/> Norwood <input type="checkbox"/> Orange <input type="checkbox"/> Paleoindian <input type="checkbox"/> Pensacola <input type="checkbox"/> Perico Island <input type="checkbox"/> Safety Harbor <input type="checkbox"/> St. Augustine	<input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns I <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns II <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa-Swift Creek <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: Colonization <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 1st War To 2nd <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 2nd War To 3rd <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 3rd War & After <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Transitional <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island I <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island II <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric non-ceramic <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric ceramic	<input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1513-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1600-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1700-1763 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> British 1763-1783 <input type="checkbox"/> Second Spanish 1783-1821 <input type="checkbox"/> American Territorial 1821-45 <input type="checkbox"/> American Civil War 1861-65 <input type="checkbox"/> American 19th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American 20th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> African-American
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (List less common phases or specific sub-phases. For historic sites, give specific dates if known.) <u> </u>			

* Consult *Guide to Archaeological Site Form* for preferred descriptions not listed above (data are coded fields).

OPINION OF RESOURCE SIGNIFICANCE

Potentially eligible individually for National Register of Historic Places? yes no insufficient information
 Potentially eligible as contributor to a National Register district? yes no insufficient information
 Explanation of Evaluation (required if evaluated; use separate sheet if needed) no evidence of the site discovered within the APE

Recommendations for Owner or SHPO Action no additional investigations

DHR USE ONLY	OFFICIAL EVALUATION	DHR USE ONLY
NR List Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> <input type="checkbox"/> Owner Objection	SHPO – Appears to meet criteria for NR listing: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient info KEEPER – Determined eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no 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</i> 15, p. 2)	Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> Init. <u> </u> Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u>

FIELD METHODS (check all that apply)

SITE DETECTION* and SITE BOUNDARIES* sections with checkboxes for field methods like 'no field check', 'literature search', 'remote sensing', 'screened shovel', 'remote sensing', 'insp exposed ground', etc.

Other methods; number, size, depth, pattern of units; screen size (attach site plan) 14 ST; all negative; 25 m intervals 50 cm diameter, 1 m deep, 6.4 mm mesh screen

SITE DESCRIPTION

Extent Size (m²) and Depth/stratigraphy of cultural deposit 0-30 cm gray sand, 30-85 cm tan/brown sand, 85-100 cm gray sand

Temporal Interpretation - Components (check one): single component, multiple component, uncertain. Describe each occupation in plan (refer to attached large scale map) and stratigraphically.

Integrity - Overall disturbance*: none seen, minor, substantial, major, redeposited, destroyed-document!, unknown. Disturbances / threats / protective measures road construction / road construction / none

Surface collection: area collected m² # collection units. Excavation: # noncontiguous blocks

ARTIFACTS

Total Artifacts # 0C (C)ount or (E)stimate? Surface # 0C (C) or (E) Subsurface # 0C (C) or (E)

COLLECTION SELECTIVITY* and ARTIFACT CATEGORIES* and DISPOSITIONS* sections with checkboxes for 'unknown', 'unselective', 'selective', 'mixed selectivity', 'uncollected', 'general', 'controlled', 'variable spatial control', 'Other', and artifact categories like 'bone-animal', 'bone-human', 'ceramic-aboriginal', etc.

Disposition List* table with categories: 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

Artifact Comments

DIAGNOSTICS (type or mode, and frequency: e.g., Suwanee ppk, heat-treated chert, Deptford Check-stamped, ironstone/whiteware)

- 1. N= 4. N= 7. N=
2. N= 5. N= 8. N=
3. N= 6. N= 9. N=

ENVIRONMENT

Nearest fresh water type* & name (incl. relict source) Little Manatee River Distance (m)/bearing 130 m N
Natural community (FNAI category* or leave blank)
Local vegetation
Topography* Min Elevation 6 meters Max Elevation meters
Present land use interstate ROW
SCS soil series Archbold fine sand Soil association

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File - including field & analysis notes, photos, plans, other important documents that are permanently accessible: For each separately maintained collection, describe (1) document type(s),* (2) maintaining organization,* (3) file or accession nos., and (4) descriptive information.

ACI P08008 - documentation;

Manuscripts or Publications on the site (use separate sheet if needed, give FMSF# if relevant) ACI (2008) Cultural Resource Assessment Survey PD&E Study I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301 Hillsborough and Manatee Counties, Florida

RECORDER & INFORMANT INFORMATION

Informant Information (name / address / phone / affiliation)

Recorder Information (name / address / phone / affiliation) Horvath, Elizabeth A., 98 Hickorywood Dr., Crawfordville, FL 32327 Archaeological Consultants, Inc., 850-926-9285, acinorth@comcast.net


Required Attachments 1 PHOTOCOPY OF 7.5' USGS QUAD MAP WITH SITE BOUNDARIES MARKED and SITE PLAN Plan at 1:3,600 or larger. Show boundaries, scale, north arrow, test/collection units, landmarks and date.



USGS MAP

Ruskin, Fla. 1982

Township 32 South, Range 19 East, Section 29



- Original
- Update



ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 4.0 1/07

Site #8 HI532
 Field Date / /
 Form Date 07 / 17 / 08
 Recorder #

Consult Guide to Archaeological Site Form for detailed instructions.

Site Name(s) Mad Woman West Multiple Listing (DHR only)
 Project Name CRAS PD&E I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Rd. to US 301 Survey # (DHR only)
 Ownership: private-profit private-nonprofit private-individual private-nonspecific city county state federal Native American foreign unknown

LOCATION & MAPPING

USGS 7.5 Map Name & Date Ruskin 1956, PR 1987 Plat or Other Map
 City/Town (within 3 miles) In City Limits? yes no unknown County Hillsborough
 Township 31S Range 19E Section 13 ¼ section: NW SW SE NE Irregular-name:
 Landgrant Tax Parcel #
 UTM Coordinates: Zone 16 17 Easting 0 Northing 0
 Other Coordinates: X: Y: Coordinate System & Datum
 Address / Vicinity / Route to
 Name of Public Tract (e.g., park)

TYPE OF SITE (check all that apply)

SETTING *	STRUCTURES OR FEATURES *	FUNCTION *
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land (terrestrial) <input type="checkbox"/> Wetland (palustrine) <input type="checkbox"/> Lake/Pond (lacustrine) <input type="checkbox"/> usually flooded <input type="checkbox"/> River/Stream/Creek (riverine) <input type="checkbox"/> usually dry <input type="checkbox"/> Tidal (estuarine) <input type="checkbox"/> Cave/Sink (subterranean) <input type="checkbox"/> Saltwater (marine) <input type="checkbox"/> terrestrial <input type="checkbox"/> aquatic	<input type="checkbox"/> aboriginal boat <input type="checkbox"/> fort <input type="checkbox"/> road segment <input type="checkbox"/> agr/c/farm building <input type="checkbox"/> midden <input type="checkbox"/> shell midden <input type="checkbox"/> burial mound <input type="checkbox"/> mill <input type="checkbox"/> shell mound <input type="checkbox"/> building remains <input type="checkbox"/> mission <input type="checkbox"/> shipwreck <input type="checkbox"/> cemetery/grave <input type="checkbox"/> mound, nonspecific <input type="checkbox"/> subsurface features <input type="checkbox"/> dump/refuse <input type="checkbox"/> plantation <input type="checkbox"/> surface scatter <input type="checkbox"/> earthworks <input type="checkbox"/> platform mound <input type="checkbox"/> well	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> campsite <input type="checkbox"/> extractive site <input type="checkbox"/> habitation (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> homestead (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> farmstead <input type="checkbox"/> village (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> town (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> quarry
<input type="checkbox"/> Other settings, structures, features or functions <u> </u>		

CULTURE PERIODS (check all that apply)

ABORIGINAL *	NON-ABORIGINAL *
<input type="checkbox"/> Alachua <input type="checkbox"/> Englewood <input type="checkbox"/> Manasota <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Fort Walton <input type="checkbox"/> Mississippian <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns I <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Glades (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Mount Taylor <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns II <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Middle <input type="checkbox"/> Glades I <input type="checkbox"/> Norwood <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa <input type="checkbox"/> Transitional <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Glades II <input type="checkbox"/> Orange <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa-Swift Creek <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Belle Glade <input type="checkbox"/> Glades III <input type="checkbox"/> Paleoindian <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island I <input type="checkbox"/> Cades Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Hickory Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Pensacola <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: Colonization <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island II <input type="checkbox"/> Caloosahatchee <input type="checkbox"/> Leon-Jefferson <input type="checkbox"/> Perico Island <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 1st War To 2nd <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Deptford <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar I <input type="checkbox"/> Safety Harbor <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 2nd War To 3rd <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric non-ceramic <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar II <input type="checkbox"/> St. Augustine <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 3rd War & After <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric ceramic	<input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1513-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1600-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1700-1763 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> British 1763-1783 <input type="checkbox"/> Second Spanish 1783-1821 <input type="checkbox"/> American Territorial 1821-45 <input type="checkbox"/> American Civil War 1861-65 <input type="checkbox"/> American 19th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American 20th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> African-American
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (List less common phases or specific sub-phases. For historic sites, give specific dates if known.) <u> </u>	

* Consult *Guide to Archaeological Site Form* for preferred descriptions not listed above (data are coded fields).

OPINION OF RESOURCE SIGNIFICANCE

Potentially eligible individually for National Register of Historic Places? yes no insufficient information
 Potentially eligible as contributor to a National Register district? yes no insufficient information
 Explanation of Evaluation (required if evaluated; use separate sheet if needed) low artifact density & diversity, no subsurface features
low research potential as contained within the APE
 Recommendations for Owner or SHPO Action no additional investigations

DHR USE ONLY	OFFICIAL EVALUATION	DHR USE ONLY
NR List Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> <input type="checkbox"/> Owner Objection	SHPO – Appears to meet criteria for NR listing: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient info KEEPER – Determined eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no 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</i> 15, p. 2)	Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> Init. <u> </u> Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u>

FIELD METHODS (check all that apply)

SITE DETECTION* and SITE BOUNDARIES* sections with checkboxes for field methods like 'no field check', 'literature search', 'remote sensing', 'bounds unknown', etc.

Other methods; number, size, depth, pattern of units; screen size (attach site plan) 30 ST; 13 positive; 25 m interval and judgmentally placed, 50 cm diameter, 1 m deep, 6.4 mm mesh screen

SITE DESCRIPTION

Extent Size (m²) Depth/stratigraphy of cultural deposit artifacts @ 0-100 cmbs 0-30 cm gray sand, 30-100 cm light gray sand

Temporal Interpretation - Components (check one): single component, multiple component, uncertain. Describe each occupation in plan (refer to attached large scale map) and stratigraphically.

Integrity - Overall disturbance*: none seen, minor, substantial, major, redeposited, destroyed-document!, unknown. Disturbances / threats / protective measures road construction / road construction / none

Surface collection: area collected m² # collection units Excavation: # noncontiguous blocks

ARTIFACTS

Total Artifacts # 21C (C)ount or (E)stimate? Surface # 0C (C) or (E) Subsurface # 21C (C) or (E)

COLLECTION SELECTIVITY* and ARTIFACT CATEGORIES* and DISPOSITIONS* sections with checkboxes for 'unknown', 'unselective', 'bone-animal', etc., and a Disposition List box.

Artifact Comments 21 flakes (1 coral)

DIAGNOSTICS (type or mode, and frequency: e.g., Suwanee ppk, heat-treated chert, Deptford Check-stamped, ironstone/whiteware)

Diagnostic list with 9 numbered items and counts (N=) for thermal alteration, etc.

ENVIRONMENT

Environment section with fields for Nearest fresh water type* & name (Bullfrog Creek), Distance (200 m E), Local vegetation, Topography, Present land use (interstate ROW), SCS soil series (Pomello fine sand), Soil association.

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File - including field & analysis notes, photos, plans, other important documents that are permanently accessible: For each separately maintained collection, describe (1) document type(s), (2) maintaining organization, (3) file or accession nos., and (4) descriptive information. ACI P08008 - documentation; artifacts to be turned over to FDOT for curation

Manuscripts or Publications on the site (use separate sheet if needed, give FMSF# if relevant) ACI (2008) Cultural Resource Assessment Survey PD&E Study I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301 Hillsborough and Manatee Counties, Florida

RECORDER & INFORMANT INFORMATION

Informant Information (name / address / phone / affiliation)

Recorder Information (name / address / phone / affiliation) Horvath, Elizabeth A., 98 Hickorywood Dr., Crawfordville, FL 32327 Archaeological Consultants, Inc., 850-926-9285, acinorth@comcast.net


Required Attachments: 1 PHOTOCOPY OF 7.5' USGS QUAD MAP WITH SITE BOUNDARIES MARKED and SITE PLAN. Plan at 1:3,600 or larger. Show boundaries, scale, north arrow, test/collection units, landmarks and date.



USGS MAP

Ruskin, Fla. 1982

Township 31 South, Range 19 East, Section 13



- Original
- Update



ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 4.0 1/07

Site # HI11359
 Field Date / /
 Form Date 07 / 17 / 08
 Recorder #

Consult Guide to Archaeological Site Form for detailed instructions.

Site Name(s) 409 North Multiple Listing (DHR only)
 Project Name CRAS PD&E I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Rd. to US 301 Survey # (DHR only)
 Ownership: private-profit private-nonprofit private-individual private-nonspecific city county state federal Native American foreign unknown

LOCATION & MAPPING

USGS 7.5 Map Name & Date Ruskin 1956, PR 1987 Plat or Other Map
 City/Town (within 3 miles) In City Limits? yes no unknown County Hillsborough
 Township 30S Range 20E Section 30 ¼ section: NW SW SE NE Irregular-name:
 Landgrant Tax Parcel #
 UTM Coordinates: Zone 16 17 Easting 367232 0 Northing 3080387 0
 Other Coordinates: X: Y: Coordinate System & Datum
 Address / Vicinity / Route to
 Name of Public Tract (e.g., park)

TYPE OF SITE (check all that apply)

SETTING *	STRUCTURES OR FEATURES *	FUNCTION *
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land (terrestrial) <input type="checkbox"/> Wetland (palustrine) <input type="checkbox"/> Lake/Pond (lacustrine) <input type="checkbox"/> usually flooded <input type="checkbox"/> River/Stream/Creek (riverine) <input type="checkbox"/> usually dry <input type="checkbox"/> Tidal (estuarine) <input type="checkbox"/> Cave/Sink (subterranean) <input type="checkbox"/> Saltwater (marine) <input type="checkbox"/> terrestrial <input type="checkbox"/> aquatic	<input type="checkbox"/> aboriginal boat <input type="checkbox"/> fort <input type="checkbox"/> road segment <input type="checkbox"/> agr/c/farm building <input type="checkbox"/> midden <input type="checkbox"/> shell midden <input type="checkbox"/> burial mound <input type="checkbox"/> mill <input type="checkbox"/> shell mound <input type="checkbox"/> building remains <input type="checkbox"/> mission <input type="checkbox"/> shipwreck <input type="checkbox"/> cemetery/grave <input type="checkbox"/> mound, nonspecific <input type="checkbox"/> subsurface features <input type="checkbox"/> dump/refuse <input type="checkbox"/> plantation <input type="checkbox"/> surface scatter <input type="checkbox"/> earthworks <input type="checkbox"/> platform mound <input type="checkbox"/> well	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> campsite <input type="checkbox"/> extractive site <input type="checkbox"/> habitation (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> homestead (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> farmstead <input type="checkbox"/> village (prehistoric) <input type="checkbox"/> town (historic) <input type="checkbox"/> quarry
<input type="checkbox"/> Other settings, structures, features or functions <u> </u>		

CULTURE PERIODS (check all that apply)

ABORIGINAL *	NON-ABORIGINAL *
<input type="checkbox"/> Alachua <input type="checkbox"/> Englewood <input type="checkbox"/> Manasota <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Fort Walton <input type="checkbox"/> Mississippian <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns I <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Early <input type="checkbox"/> Glades (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Mount Taylor <input type="checkbox"/> St. Johns II <input type="checkbox"/> Swift Creek, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Middle <input type="checkbox"/> Glades I <input type="checkbox"/> Norwood <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa <input type="checkbox"/> Transitional <input type="checkbox"/> Archaic, Late <input type="checkbox"/> Glades II <input type="checkbox"/> Orange <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Rosa-Swift Creek <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Belle Glade <input type="checkbox"/> Glades III <input type="checkbox"/> Paleoindian <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island I <input type="checkbox"/> Cades Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Hickory Pond <input type="checkbox"/> Pensacola <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: Colonization <input type="checkbox"/> Weeden Island II <input type="checkbox"/> Caloosahatchee <input type="checkbox"/> Leon-Jefferson <input type="checkbox"/> Perico Island <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 1st War To 2nd <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> Deptford <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar I <input type="checkbox"/> Safety Harbor <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 2nd War To 3rd <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric non-ceramic <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Malabar II <input type="checkbox"/> St. Augustine <input type="checkbox"/> Seminole: 3rd War & After <input type="checkbox"/> Prehistoric ceramic	<input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1513-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1600-99 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish 1700-1763 <input type="checkbox"/> First Spanish (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> British 1763-1783 <input type="checkbox"/> Second Spanish 1783-1821 <input type="checkbox"/> American Territorial 1821-45 <input type="checkbox"/> American Civil War 1861-65 <input type="checkbox"/> American 19th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American 20th Century <input type="checkbox"/> American (nonspecific) <input type="checkbox"/> African-American
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (List less common phases or specific sub-phases. For historic sites, give specific dates if known.) <u> </u>	

* Consult *Guide to Archaeological Site Form* for preferred descriptions not listed above (data are coded fields).

OPINION OF RESOURCE SIGNIFICANCE

Potentially eligible individually for National Register of Historic Places? yes no insufficient information
 Potentially eligible as contributor to a National Register district? yes no insufficient information
 Explanation of Evaluation (required if evaluated; use separate sheet if needed) low artifact density & diversity, no subsurface features
low research potential as contained within the APE
 Recommendations for Owner or SHPO Action no additional investigations

DHR USE ONLY	OFFICIAL EVALUATION	DHR USE ONLY
NR List Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> <input type="checkbox"/> Owner Objection	SHPO – Appears to meet criteria for NR listing: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient info KEEPER – Determined eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no 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</i> 15, p. 2)	Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> Init. <u> </u> Date <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u>

FIELD METHODS (check all that apply)

SITE DETECTION* and SITE BOUNDARIES* sections with checkboxes for field check, literature search, informant report, remote sensing, exposed ground, posthole digger, auger--size, screened shovel, bounds unknown, remote sensing, uninscreened shovel, none by recorder, insp exposed ground, screened shovel, literature search, posthole tests, block excavations, informant report, auger--size, estimate or guess.

Other methods; number, size, depth, pattern of units; screen size (attach site plan) 23 ST; 5 positive; 25 and 50 m intervals 50 cm diameter, 1 m deep, 6.4 mm mesh screen

SITE DESCRIPTION

Extent Size (m²) Depth/stratigraphy of cultural deposit artifacts @ 30-100 cmbs 0-15 cm gray sand, 15-110 cm white sand 240 m N/S x 100 m E/W

Temporal Interpretation - Components (check one): [x] single component [] multiple component [] uncertain Describe each occupation in plan (refer to attached large scale map) and stratigraphically. Discuss temporal and functional interpretations:

Integrity - Overall disturbance*: [] none seen [] minor [] substantial [x] major [] redeposited [] destroyed-document! [] unknown Disturbances / threats / protective measures road construction / road construction / none

Surface collection: area collected m² # collection units Excavation: # noncontiguous blocks

ARTIFACTS

Total Artifacts # 31C (C)ount or (E)stimate? Surface # 0C (C) or (E) Subsurface # 31C (C) or (E)

COLLECTION SELECTIVITY* and ARTIFACT CATEGORIES* and DISPOSITIONS* sections with checkboxes for unknown, unselective, selective, mixed selectivity, uncollected, general, controlled, variable spatial control, and artifact categories like bone-animal, lithics-aboriginal, metal-nonprecious, etc.

Disposition List* table with categories: 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

Artifact Comments 31 flakes (3 coral)

DIAGNOSTICS (type or mode, and frequency: e.g., Suwanee ppk, heat-treated chert, Deptford Check-stamped, ironstone/whiteware)

- 1. thermal alteration N= 9 4. N= 7. N=
2. N= 5. N= 8. N=
3. N= 6. N= 9. N=

ENVIRONMENT

Nearest fresh water type* & name (incl. relict source) Bullfrog Creek Distance (m)/bearing 130 m E
Natural community (FNAI category* or leave blank)
Local vegetation
Topography* Min Elevation 8 meters Max Elevation 9 meters
Present land use interstate ROW
SCS soil series Archbold fine sand Soil association Myakka-Basinger-Holopaw

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File - including field & analysis notes, photos, plans, other important documents that are permanently accessible: For each separately maintained collection, describe (1) document type(s),* (2) maintaining organization,* (3) file or accession nos., and (4) descriptive information. ACI P08008 - documentation; artifacts to be turned over to FDOT for curation

Manuscripts or Publications on the site (use separate sheet if needed, give FMSF# if relevant) ACI (2008) Cultural Resource Assessment Survey PD&E Study I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301 Hillsborough and Manatee Counties, Florida

RECORDER & INFORMANT INFORMATION

Informant Information (name / address / phone / affiliation)
Recorder Information (name / address / phone / affiliation) Horvath, Elizabeth A., 98 Hickorywood Dr., Crawfordville, FL 32327 Archaeological Consultants, Inc., 850-926-9285, acinorth@comcast.net


Required Attachments 1 PHOTOCOPY OF 7.5' USGS QUAD MAP WITH SITE BOUNDARIES MARKED and SITE PLAN Plan at 1:3,600 or larger. Show boundaries, scale, north arrow, test/collection units, landmarks and date.



USGS MAP

Riverview, Fla. 1982

Township 30 South, Range 20 East, Section 30



Original
 Update



HISTORICAL STRUCTURE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 4.0 1/07

Site #8 HI11295
Field Date 4 / 10 / 08
Form Date 4 / 15 / 08
Recorder # 2-45, 46, 47

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) 2201 18th Avenue SE Multiple Listing (DHR only) _____
Survey Project Name CRAS PD&E I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301, Manatee and Hillsborough Cos 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

Address (include N,S,E,W; #; St., Ave., etc.) 2201 18th Avenue SE
Cross Streets (nearest / between) _____
USGS 7.5' Map Name & Date Ruskin, Fla. 1956, PR 1987 Plat or Other Map _____
City / Town (within 3 miles) Ruskin In City Limits? yes no unknown County Hillsborough
Township 31S Range 19E Section 16 ¼ section: NW SW SE NE Irregular-name: _____
Tax Parcel # 055612-0100 Landgrant _____
Subdivision Name _____ Block _____ Lot _____
UTM: Zone 16 17 Easting 361483 ___ 0 Northing 3064570 ___ 0
Other Coordinates: X: _____ Y: _____ Coordinate System & Datum _____
Name of Public Tract (e.g., park) _____

HISTORY

Construction Year: 1945 approximately year listed or earlier year listed or later
Original Use* unknown From (year): orig To (year): c1980
Current Use* residence From (year): c1980 To (year): curr
Other Use* _____ From (year): _____ To (year): _____
Moves: yes no unknown Dates _____ Original address (if moved) _____
Alterations: yes no unknown Dates c1980 Nature* windows, vertical board
Additions: yes no unknown Dates _____ Nature* _____
Architect (last name first): unknown Builder (last name first): unknown
Ownership History (especially original owner, dates, profession, etc.) Cearley, Alvin (1980-curr); Stroud, Roger (unk-1980)

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

DESCRIPTION

Style* Frame Vernacular Exterior Plan* irregular Number of Stories 1
Exterior Fabric(s)* vertical board
Roof Type(s)* gable Roof Material(s)* composition shingles
Roof secondary strucs. (dormers etc.)* _____
Windows (types, materials, etc.)* 1/1 SHS, metal, independent

Distinguishing Architectural Features (exterior or interior ornaments) _____

Ancillary Features / Outbuildings (record outbuildings, major landscape features; use continuation sheet if needed.) _____

* Consult *Guide to Historical Structure Forms* for preferred descriptions (coded fields at the Site File).

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</i> 15, p. 2)				

DESCRIPTION (continued)

Chimney: No. 0 Material(s) * _____
 Structural System(s) * wood frame
 Foundation: Type(s) * pier Material(s) * obscured
 Main Entrance (stylistic details) obscured
 Porch Descriptions (types, locations, roof types, etc.) open, north and west, none

Condition (overall resource condition): excellent good fair deteriorated ruinous
 Narrative Description of Resource This Frame Vernacular residence was built ca. 1945. It rests on a pier foundation, has wood frame walls, and has a gable roof. A porch wraps around the north and west elevations. Other elevations and architectural features of the building were not observable due to access issues.

Archaeological Remains _____ Check if Archaeological Form Completed

* Consult *Guide to Historical Structure Forms* for preferred descriptions (coded fields at the Site File).

RESEARCH METHODS (check 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 historic photos interior inspection HABS/HAER record search
 other methods (describe) _____

Bibliographic References (give FMSF manuscript # if relevant, use continuation sheet if needed) Hillsborough County Property Appraiser

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) This is a typical example of the Frame Vernacular style found throughout the area and alterations such as the replacement cladding and windows compromise its architectural integrity. In addition, research did not reveal any significant historical associations. Therefore, 8HI11295 is not potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.
 Area(s) of Historical Significance (see *National Register Bulletin 15*, p. 8 for categories: e.g. "architecture", "ethnic heritage", "community planning & development", etc.)
Community Planning and Development

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File - including field & analysis notes, photos, plans, other important documents that are permanently accessible:
 For each separately maintained collection, describe (1) document type(s),* (2) maintaining organization,* (3) file or accession nos., and (4) descriptive information. _____
All field maps, notes, and photographs on file at ACI, P08008 I-75 Moccasin Wallow to US 301

RECORDER INFORMATION

Recorder Name Lumang, Marielle and Trish Slovinac
 Recorder Contact Information (address / phone / fax / e-mail) 8110 Blaikie Ct, Suite A, Sarasota, Florida 34243/941-379-6206/ ACIFlorida@comcast.net
 Recorder Affiliation Archaeological Consultants, Inc.

Use a *Supplement for Site Forms* or other continuation sheet for descriptions that do not fit in the spaces provided.

Required Attachments

- ① USGS 7.5' MAP WITH STRUCTURE LOCATION PINPOINTED IN RED
- ② LARGE SCALE STREET, PLAT OR PARCEL MAP (available from most property appraiser web sites)
- ③ PHOTO OF MAIN FACADE, ARCHIVAL B&W PRINT OR DIGITAL IMAGE FILE

If submitting an image file, it must be included on disk or CD AND in hard copy format (plain paper is acceptable).
 Digital image must be at least 1600 x 1200 pixels, 24-bit color, jpeg or tiff.

PHOTOGRAPH




STREET OR PLAT MAP



USGS MAP

**Township 31 South, Range 19 East, Section 16
Ruskin, Fla. 1956, PR 1987**



Original
 Update



HISTORICAL STRUCTURE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 4.0 1/07

Site #8 HI11296
Field Date 4 / 10 / 08
Form Date 4 / 15 / 08
Recorder # 2-32, 33

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) 6908 Simmons Loop Road Multiple Listing (DHR only) _____
Survey Project Name CRAS PD&E I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301, Manatee and Hillsborough Cos 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

Address (include N,S,E,W; #; St., Ave., etc.) 6908 Simmons Loop Road
Cross Streets (nearest / between) _____
USGS 7.5' Map Name & Date Riverview, Fla. 1956, PR 1987 Plat or Other Map _____
City / Town (within 3 miles) Riverview In City Limits? yes no unknown County Hillsborough
Township 31S Range 20E Section 18 ¼ section: NW SW SE NE Irregular-name: _____
Tax Parcel # 077734-0000 Landgrant _____
Subdivision Name _____ Block _____ Lot _____
UTM: Zone 16 17 Easting 367590 ___ 0 Northing 3074721 ___ 0
Other Coordinates: X: _____ Y: _____ Coordinate System & Datum _____
Name of Public Tract (e.g., park) _____

HISTORY

Construction Year: 1955 approximately year listed or earlier year listed or later
Original Use* residence From (year): orig _____ To (year): _____
Current Use* residence From (year): _____ To (year): curr _____
Other Use* _____ From (year): _____ To (year): _____
Moves: yes no unknown Dates _____ Original address (if moved) _____
Alterations: yes no unknown Dates c1965 Nature* repl windows (SHS)
Additions: yes no unknown Dates c1980 Nature* north addition, east porch
Architect (last name first): unknown Builder (last name first): unknown
Ownership History (especially original owner, dates, profession, etc.) Davis, Timothy and Marguerite (1980-curr); Franklin, Winlon and Genevieve (unk-1980)
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)* brick, vertical board
Roof Type(s)* gable Roof Material(s)* composition shingles; 5-V crimp
Roof secondary strucs. (dormers etc.)* _____
Windows (types, materials, etc.)* 1/1 SHS, metal, independent; 3-light awning, metal, paired
Distinguishing Architectural Features (exterior or interior ornaments) projecting window sills; gable vents; vertical board in gables
Ancillary Features / Outbuildings (record outbuildings, major landscape features; use continuation sheet if needed.) non-historic shed to west

* Consult *Guide to Historical Structure Forms* for preferred descriptions (coded fields at the Site File).

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</i> 15, p. 2)			

DESCRIPTION (continued)

Chimney: No. 0 Material(s) * _____
 Structural System(s) * concrete block
 Foundation: Type(s) * slab Material(s) * poured concrete
 Main Entrance (stylistic details) wood swing door on east
 Porch Descriptions (types, locations, roof types, etc.) open, east, shed

Condition (overall resource condition): excellent good fair deteriorated ruinous
 Narrative Description of Resource This Ranch style house was built ca. 1955. It has a slab foundation, gable roof faced with composition shingles, and concrete block walls partially clad in brick and vertical board. The ca. 1980 east porch has a shed roof with 5-V crimp. Windows are 3-light awning and 1/1 SHS.

Archaeological Remains _____ Check if Archaeological Form Completed

* Consult *Guide to Historical Structure Forms* for preferred descriptions (coded fields at the Site File).

RESEARCH METHODS (check 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 historic photos interior inspection HABS/HAER record search
 other methods (describe) _____

Bibliographic References (give FMSF manuscript # if relevant, use continuation sheet if needed) Hillsborough County Property Appraiser

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) This is an example of the Ranch style that is commonly found throughout Hillsborough County. In addition, research did not indicate any significant persons or events associated with this building. Therefore, 8HI11296 is not potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.

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

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File - including field & analysis notes, photos, plans, other important documents that are permanently accessible:
 For each separately maintained collection, describe (1) document type(s),* (2) maintaining organization,* (3) file or accession nos., and (4) descriptive information. _____
All field maps, notes, and photographs on file at ACI, P08008 I-75 Moccasin Wallow to US 301

RECORDER INFORMATION

Recorder Name Lumang, Marielle and Trish Slovinac

Recorder Contact Information (address / phone / fax / e-mail) 8110 Blaikie Ct, Suite A, Sarasota, Florida 34243/941-379-6206/
 ACIFlorida@comcast.net

Recorder Affiliation Archaeological Consultants, Inc.

Use a *Supplement for Site Forms* or other continuation sheet for descriptions that do not fit in the spaces provided.

Required Attachments

❶ USGS 7.5' MAP WITH STRUCTURE LOCATION PINPOINTED IN RED

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

❸ PHOTO OF MAIN FACADE, ARCHIVAL B&W PRINT OR DIGITAL IMAGE FILE


If submitting an image file, it must be included on disk or CD AND in hard copy format (plain paper is acceptable).

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

PHOTOGRAPH




STREET OR PLAT MAP



USGS MAP

**Township 31 South, Range 20 East, Section 18
Riverview, Fla. 1956, PR 1987**



Original
 Update



HISTORICAL STRUCTURE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 4.0 1/07

Site #8 HI11297
Field Date 4 / 10 / 08
Form Date 4 / 15 / 08
Recorder # 2-34, 35, 36

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) 9922 Old Big Bend Road Multiple Listing (DHR only) _____
Survey Project Name CRAS PD&E I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301, Manatee and Hillsborough Cos 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

Address (include N,S,E,W; #; St., Ave., etc.) 9922 Old Big Bend Road
Cross Streets (nearest / between) _____
USGS 7.5' Map Name & Date Riverview, Fla. 1956, PR 1987 Plat or Other Map _____
City / Town (within 3 miles) Riverview In City Limits? yes no unknown County Hillsborough
Township 31S Range 20E Section 7 ¼ section: NW SW SE NE Irregular-name: _____
Tax Parcel # 077567-0000 Landgrant _____
Subdivision Name _____ Block _____ Lot _____
UTM: Zone 16 17 Easting 367220 ___ 0 Northing 3074937 ___ 0
Other Coordinates: X: _____ Y: _____ Coordinate System & Datum _____
Name of Public Tract (e.g., park) _____

HISTORY

Construction Year: 1950 approximately year listed or earlier year listed or later
Original Use* residence From (year): orig _____ To (year): _____
Current Use* residence From (year): _____ To (year): curr _____
Other Use* _____ From (year): _____ To (year): _____
Moves: yes no unknown Dates _____ Original address (if moved) _____
Alterations: yes no unknown Dates c1980 Nature* storm windows
Additions: yes no unknown Dates c1980 Nature* north addition
Architect (last name first): unknown Builder (last name first): unknown
Ownership History (especially original owner, dates, profession, etc.) Kestner & Palmisano Partnership (1982-curr); Kerns, Minla and Stuart (1971-1982); Safran, Steve and Della (unk-1971)
Is the Resource Affected by a Local Preservation Ordinance? yes no unknown Describe _____

DESCRIPTION

Style* Frame Vernacular Exterior Plan* irregular Number of Stories 1
Exterior Fabric(s)* wood siding
Roof Type(s)* gable; shed Roof Material(s)* composition shingles
Roof secondary strucs. (dormers etc.)* _____
Windows (types, materials, etc.)* 1/1 DHS, wood, independent and paired with storm windows

Distinguishing Architectural Features (exterior or interior ornaments) wood window surrounds; wood door surrounds; gable vents; lattice in-fill between piers; turned porch posts

Ancillary Features / Outbuildings (record outbuildings, major landscape features; use continuation sheet if needed.) _____

* Consult *Guide to Historical Structure Forms* for preferred descriptions (coded fields at the Site File).

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</i> 15, p. 2)			

DESCRIPTION (continued)

Chimney: No. 0 Material(s) * _____
 Structural System(s) * wood frame
 Foundation: Type(s) * pier Material(s) * concrete block, poured concrete
 Main Entrance (stylistic details) 6-panel wood swing door on south
 Porch Descriptions (types, locations, roof types, etc.) open, north, shed; open, south, gable (entry)

Condition (overall resource condition): excellent good fair deteriorated ruinous
 Narrative Description of Resource This Frame Vernacular residence was built ca. 1950. It has a pier foundation, wood frame walls clad in wood siding, and a gable and shed roof. There are two porches, one on the south and one on the north elevation. A ca. 1980 addition is also on the north elevation.

Archaeological Remains _____ Check if Archaeological Form Completed

* Consult *Guide to Historical Structure Forms* for preferred descriptions (coded fields at the Site File).

RESEARCH METHODS (check 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 historic photos interior inspection HABS/HAER record search
 other methods (describe) _____

Bibliographic References (give FMSF manuscript # if relevant, use continuation sheet if needed) Hillsborough County Property Appraiser

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) This is a typical example of the Frame Vernacular style found throughout the area. In addition, research did not reveal any significant historical associations. As a result, 8HI11297 does not appear to be potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.

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

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File - including field & analysis notes, photos, plans, other important documents that are permanently accessible:
 For each separately maintained collection, describe (1) document type(s),* (2) maintaining organization,* (3) file or accession nos., and (4) descriptive information. _____
All field maps, notes, and photographs on file at ACI, P08008 I-75 Moccasin Wallow to US 301

RECORDER INFORMATION

Recorder Name Lumang, Marielle and Trish Slovinac
 Recorder Contact Information (address / phone / fax / e-mail) 8110 Blaikie Ct, Suite A, Sarasota, Florida 34243/941-379-6206/ ACIFlorida@comcast.net
 Recorder Affiliation Archaeological Consultants, Inc.

Use a *Supplement for Site Forms* or other continuation sheet for descriptions that do not fit in the spaces provided.

Required Attachments


- ① USGS 7.5' MAP WITH STRUCTURE LOCATION PINPOINTED IN RED
- ② LARGE SCALE STREET, PLAT OR PARCEL MAP (available from most property appraiser web sites)
- ③ PHOTO OF MAIN FACADE, ARCHIVAL B&W PRINT OR DIGITAL IMAGE FILE

If submitting an image file, it must be included on disk or CD AND in hard copy format (plain paper is acceptable).
 Digital image must be at least 1600 x 1200 pixels, 24-bit color, jpeg or tiff.

PHOTOGRAPH




STREET OR PLAT MAP



USGS MAP

**Township 31 South, Range 20 East, Section 7
Riverview, Fla. 1956, PR 1987**



Original
 Update



HISTORICAL STRUCTURE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 4.0 1/07

Site #8 HI1298
Field Date 4 / 10 / 08
Form Date 4 / 15 / 08
Recorder # 2-11, 12

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) 9002 Gibsonton Drive Multiple Listing (DHR only) _____
Survey Project Name CRAS PD&E I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301, Manatee and Hillsborough Cos 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

Address (include N,S,E,W; #; St., Ave., etc.) 9002 Gibsonton Drive
Cross Streets (nearest / between) _____
USGS 7.5' Map Name & Date Riverview, Fla. 1956, PR 1987 Plat or Other Map _____
City / Town (within 3 miles) Gibsonton In City Limits? yes no unknown County Hillsborough
Township 30S Range 19E Section 24 ¼ section: NW SW SE NE Irregular-name: _____
Tax Parcel # 050149-0000 Landgrant _____
Subdivision Name _____ Block _____ Lot _____
UTM: Zone 16 17 Easting 366462 ___ 0 Northing 3081315 ___ 0
Other Coordinates: X: _____ Y: _____ Coordinate System & Datum _____
Name of Public Tract (e.g., park) _____

HISTORY

Construction Year: 1955 approximately year listed or earlier year listed or later
Original Use* residence From (year): orig To (year): _____
Current Use* residence From (year): _____ To (year): curr
Other Use* _____ From (year): _____ To (year): _____
Moves: yes no unknown Dates _____ Original address (if moved) _____
Alterations: yes no unknown Dates c1970 Nature* repl windows (SHS)
Additions: yes no unknown Dates c1980 Nature* south porches
Architect (last name first): unknown Builder (last name first): unknown
Ownership History (especially original owner, dates, profession, etc.) Poole, Clyde and Cynthia (2001-curr); Moody, William (1987-2001); Anderson, Inez and Flaven (1976-1987); Hopkin, Edythe and Clifford (unk-1976)
Is the Resource Affected by a Local Preservation Ordinance? yes no unknown Describe _____

DESCRIPTION

Style* Masonry Vernacular Exterior Plan* irregular Number of Stories 1
Exterior Fabric(s) * concrete block, stucco, vinyl siding
Roof Type(s) * gable Roof Material(s) * composition shingles
Roof secondary strucs. (dormers etc.) * _____
Windows (types, materials, etc.) * 3-light awning, metal, independent; 2/2 SHS, metal, ribbon (4)
Distinguishing Architectural Features (exterior or interior ornaments) projecting window sills
Ancillary Features / Outbuildings (record outbuildings, major landscape features; use continuation sheet if needed.) _____

* Consult *Guide to Historical Structure Forms* for preferred descriptions (coded fields at the Site File).

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</i> 15, p. 2)			

DESCRIPTION (continued)

Chimney: No. 0 Material(s) * _____
 Structural System(s) * concrete block
 Foundation: Type(s) * slab Material(s) * poured concrete
 Main Entrance (stylistic details) wood swing door on south
 Porch Descriptions (types, locations, roof types, etc.) open, south, shed (2)

Condition (overall resource condition): excellent good fair deteriorated ruinous
 Narrative Description of Resource This Masonry Vernacular building was built ca. 1955. It has a slab foundation, concrete block walls covered in stucco and vinyl siding, and a gable roof faced in composition shingles. There are two porches on the south elevation (ca. 1980). Windows are 3-light awning and 2/2 SHS.

Archaeological Remains _____ Check if Archaeological Form Completed

* Consult *Guide to Historical Structure Forms* for preferred descriptions (coded fields at the Site File).

RESEARCH METHODS (check 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 historic photos interior inspection HABS/HAER record search
 other methods (describe) _____

Bibliographic References (give FMSF manuscript # if relevant, use continuation sheet if needed) Hillsborough County Property Appraiser

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) Available research did not indicate this building as significant. It is an example of a style commonly found throughout the area and has additions that diminish its integrity. Therefore, 8HI11298 is not potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.

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

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File - including field & analysis notes, photos, plans, other important documents that are permanently accessible:
 For each separately maintained collection, describe (1) document type(s),* (2) maintaining organization,* (3) file or accession nos., and (4) descriptive information. _____
All field maps, notes, and photographs on file at ACI, P08008 I-75 Moccasin Wallow to US 301

RECORDER INFORMATION

Recorder Name Lumang, Marielle and Trish Slovinac
 Recorder Contact Information (address / phone / fax / e-mail) 8110 Blaikie Ct, Suite A, Sarasota, Florida 34243/941-379-6206/
 ACIFlorida@comcast.net
 Recorder Affiliation Archaeological Consultants, Inc.

Use a *Supplement for Site Forms* or other continuation sheet for descriptions that do not fit in the spaces provided.

Required Attachments

- ① USGS 7.5' MAP WITH STRUCTURE LOCATION PINPOINTED IN RED
- ② LARGE SCALE STREET, PLAT OR PARCEL MAP (available from most property appraiser web sites)
- ③ PHOTO OF MAIN FACADE, ARCHIVAL B&W PRINT OR DIGITAL IMAGE FILE

If submitting an image file, it must be included on disk or CD AND in hard copy format (plain paper is acceptable).
 Digital image must be at least 1600 x 1200 pixels, 24-bit color, jpeg or tiff.

PHOTOGRAPH




STREET OR PLAT MAP



USGS MAP

**Township 30 South, Range 19 East, Section 24
Riverview, Fla. 1956, PR 1987**



Original
 Update



HISTORICAL STRUCTURE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 4.0 1/07

Site #8 HI11299
Field Date 4 / 10 / 08
Form Date 4 / 15 / 08
Recorder # 2-9, 10

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) 9208 Gibsonton Drive Multiple Listing (DHR only) _____
Survey Project Name CRAS PD&E I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301, Manatee and Hillsborough Cos 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

Address (include N,S,E,W; #; St., Ave., etc.) 9208 Gibsonton Drive
Cross Streets (nearest / between) _____
USGS 7.5' Map Name & Date Riverview, Fla. 1956, PR 1987 Plat or Other Map _____
City / Town (within 3 miles) Gibsonton In City Limits? yes no unknown County Hillsborough
Township 30S Range 19E Section 24 ¼ section: NW SW SE NE Irregular-name: _____
Tax Parcel # 050009-0000 Landgrant _____
Subdivision Name _____ Block _____ Lot _____
UTM: Zone 16 17 Easting 366610 ___ 0 Northing 3081309 ___ 0
Other Coordinates: X: _____ Y: _____ Coordinate System & Datum _____
Name of Public Tract (e.g., park) _____

HISTORY

Construction Year: 1955 approximately year listed or earlier year listed or later
Original Use* residence From (year): orig _____ To (year): _____
Current Use* residence From (year): _____ To (year): curr _____
Other Use* _____ From (year): _____ To (year): _____
Moves: yes no unknown Dates _____ Original address (if moved) _____
Alterations: yes no unknown Dates c1970; 1980 Nature* repl windows (SHS); repl windows (6/6 SDL)
Additions: yes no unknown Dates c1980 Nature* attached carport, east porch
Architect (last name first): unknown Builder (last name first): unknown
Ownership History (especially original owner, dates, profession, etc.) Rule, Charlotte and William (1969-curr); Prevatt, L. and J. (unk-1969)
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)* brick; vertical board
Roof Type(s)* gable; shed Roof Material(s)* composition shingles
Roof secondary strucs. (dormers etc.)* _____
Windows (types, materials, etc.)* 2/2 SHS, metal, independent; 1/1 SHS (6/6 SDL), metal, independent; 10/10 SHS, metal, independent; 4-light awning, metal, independent
Distinguishing Architectural Features (exterior or interior ornaments) fixed window shutters; decorative porch posts with brackets; brick window sills; gable vents; vertical board in the gables
Ancillary Features / Outbuildings (record outbuildings, major landscape features; use continuation sheet if needed.) non-historic pool to north; non-historic shed to the northwest

* Consult *Guide to Historical Structure Forms* for preferred descriptions (coded fields at the Site File).

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</i> 15, p. 2)			

DESCRIPTION (continued)

Chimney: No. 0 Material(s) * _____
 Structural System(s) * concrete block
 Foundation: Type(s) * continuous Material(s) * concrete block
 Main Entrance (stylistic details) 10-panel wood swing door on south
 Porch Descriptions (types, locations, roof types, etc.) open, south, shed (entry); open, east, shed

Condition (overall resource condition): excellent good fair deteriorated ruinous
 Narrative Description of Resource This Ranch style residence was built ca. 1955. The continuous concrete block foundation supports the concrete block walls clad in brick and vertical board. It has a gable and shed roof faced in composition shingles. There are two open porches, one on the south and one on the east. Windows are 2/2, 10/10, & 1/1 (6/6 SDL) SHS, and 4-light awning.

Archaeological Remains _____ Check if Archaeological Form Completed

* Consult *Guide to Historical Structure Forms* for preferred descriptions (coded fields at the Site File).

RESEARCH METHODS (check 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 historic photos interior inspection HABS/HAER record search
 other methods (describe) _____

Bibliographic References (give FMSF manuscript # if relevant, use continuation sheet if needed) Hillsborough County Property Appraiser

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) This is a typical example of the Ranch style found throughout the area. In addition, the replacement windows and additions diminish its architectural integrity. Therefore, 8HI11299 does not appear to be potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.

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

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File - including field & analysis notes, photos, plans, other important documents that are permanently accessible:
 For each separately maintained collection, describe (1) document type(s),* (2) maintaining organization,* (3) file or accession nos., and (4) descriptive information. _____
All field maps, notes, and photographs on file at ACI, P08008 I-75 Moccasin Wallow to US 301

RECORDER INFORMATION

Recorder Name Lumang, Marielle and Trish Slovinac
 Recorder Contact Information (address / phone / fax / e-mail) 8110 Blaikie Ct, Suite A, Sarasota, Florida 34243/941-379-6206/ ACIFlorida@comcast.net
 Recorder Affiliation Archaeological Consultants, Inc.

Use a *Supplement for Site Forms* or other continuation sheet for descriptions that do not fit in the spaces provided.

Required Attachments

- ① USGS 7.5' MAP WITH STRUCTURE LOCATION PINPOINTED IN RED
- ② LARGE SCALE STREET, PLAT OR PARCEL MAP (available from most property appraiser web sites)
- ③ PHOTO OF MAIN FACADE, ARCHIVAL B&W PRINT OR DIGITAL IMAGE FILE

If submitting an image file, it must be included on disk or CD AND in hard copy format (plain paper is acceptable).
 Digital image must be at least 1600 x 1200 pixels, 24-bit color, jpeg or tiff.

PHOTOGRAPH




STREET OR PLAT MAP



USGS MAP

Township 30 South, Range 19 East, Section 24
Riverview, Fla. 1956, PR 1987



Original
 Update



HISTORICAL STRUCTURE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 4.0 1/07

Site #8 HI11300
Field Date 4 / 10 / 08
Form Date 4 / 15 / 08
Recorder # 2-6, 7, 8

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) 9212 Gibsonton Drive Multiple Listing (DHR only) _____
Survey Project Name CRAS PD&E I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301, Manatee and Hillsborough Cos 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

Address (include N,S,E,W; #; St., Ave., etc.) 9212 Gibsonton Drive
Cross Streets (nearest / between) _____
USGS 7.5' Map Name & Date Riverview, Fla. 1956, PR 1987 Plat or Other Map _____
City / Town (within 3 miles) Gibsonton In City Limits? yes no unknown County Hillsborough
Township 30S Range 19E Section 24 ¼ section: NW SW SE NE Irregular-name: _____
Tax Parcel # 050021-0000 Landgrant _____
Subdivision Name _____ Block _____ Lot _____
UTM: Zone 16 17 Easting 366648 ___ 0 Northing 3081313 ___ 0
Other Coordinates: X: _____ Y: _____ Coordinate System & Datum _____
Name of Public Tract (e.g., park) _____

HISTORY

Construction Year: 1955 approximately year listed or earlier year listed or later
Original Use* residence From (year): orig To (year): _____
Current Use* residence From (year): _____ To (year): curr
Other Use* _____ From (year): _____ To (year): _____
Moves: yes no unknown Dates _____ Original address (if moved) _____
Alterations: yes no unknown Dates c1965; 1980 Nature* repl windows (SHS); encl porch
Additions: yes no unknown Dates _____ Nature* _____
Architect (last name first): unknown Builder (last name first): unknown
Ownership History (especially original owner, dates, profession, etc.) Eaken, Robert and Marilyn (1975-curr); McDaniel, Vernon and Diane (1970-1975); Charron, Blanche (unk-1970)
Is the Resource Affected by a Local Preservation Ordinance? yes no unknown Describe _____

DESCRIPTION

Style* Masonry Vernacular Exterior Plan* irregular Number of Stories 1
Exterior Fabric(s)* concrete block, wood siding, vertical board
Roof Type(s)* gable Roof Material(s)* composition shingles
Roof secondary strucs. (dormers etc.)* _____
Windows (types, materials, etc.)* 2/2 SHS, metal, independent and paired; 1-light picture window flanked with 3-light awning, metal, independent; 3-light awning, metal, independent
Distinguishing Architectural Features (exterior or interior ornaments) gable vents; wood siding in gables; projecting window sills; fixed window shutters
Ancillary Features / Outbuildings (record outbuildings, major landscape features; use continuation sheet if needed.) non-historic carport to south

* Consult *Guide to Historical Structure Forms* for preferred descriptions (coded fields at the Site File).

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</i> 15, p. 2)				

DESCRIPTION (continued)

Chimney: No. 0 Material(s) * _____
 Structural System(s) * concrete block
 Foundation: Type(s) * slab Material(s) * poured concrete
 Main Entrance (stylistic details) 1/1 SHS metal swing door on south
 Porch Descriptions (types, locations, roof types, etc.) closed, south, shed (entry)

Condition (overall resource condition): excellent good fair deteriorated ruinous
 Narrative Description of Resource This Masonry Vernacular style residence was built ca. 1955. The slab foundation supports the concrete block walls clad in wood siding and vertical board. It has a gable roof faced in composition shingles. There is one enclosed porch on the south. Windows are 3-light awning, 2/2 SHS, 1-light picture flanked with 3-light awning.
 Archaeological Remains _____ Check if Archaeological Form Completed

* Consult *Guide to Historical Structure Forms* for preferred descriptions (coded fields at the Site File).

RESEARCH METHODS (check 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 historic photos interior inspection HABS/HAER record search
 other methods (describe) _____

Bibliographic References (give FMSF manuscript # if relevant, use continuation sheet if needed) Hillsborough County Property Appraiser

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) This is a typical example of the Masonry Vernacular style found throughout Hillsborough County. Furthermore, research did not reveal any significant historical associations. Therefore, 8HI11300 is not potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.

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

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File - including field & analysis notes, photos, plans, other important documents that are permanently accessible:
 For each separately maintained collection, describe (1) document type(s),* (2) maintaining organization,* (3) file or accession nos., and (4) descriptive information. _____
All field maps, notes, and photographs on file at ACI, P08008 I-75 Moccasin Wallow to US 301

RECORDER INFORMATION

Recorder Name Lumang, Marielle and Trish Slovinac
 Recorder Contact Information (address / phone / fax / e-mail) 8110 Blaikie Ct, Suite A, Sarasota, Florida 34243/941-379-6206/ACIFlorida@comcast.net
 Recorder Affiliation Archaeological Consultants, Inc.

Use a *Supplement for Site Forms* or other continuation sheet for descriptions that do not fit in the spaces provided.

Required Attachments

- ① USGS 7.5' MAP WITH STRUCTURE LOCATION PINPOINTED IN RED
- ② LARGE SCALE STREET, PLAT OR PARCEL MAP (available from most property appraiser web sites)
- ③ PHOTO OF MAIN FACADE, ARCHIVAL B&W PRINT OR DIGITAL IMAGE FILE

If submitting an image file, it must be included on disk or CD AND in hard copy format (plain paper is acceptable).
 Digital image must be at least 1600 x 1200 pixels, 24-bit color, jpeg or tiff.

PHOTOGRAPH




STREET OR PLAT MAP



USGS MAP

**Township 30 South, Range 19 East, Section 24
Riverview, Fla. 1956, PR 1987**



Original
 Update



HISTORICAL STRUCTURE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 4.0 1/07

Site #8 HI11301
Field Date 4 / 10 / 08
Form Date 4 / 15 / 08
Recorder # 2-27

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) 10010 Gibsonton Drive Multiple Listing (DHR only) _____
Survey Project Name CRAS PD&E I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301, Manatee and Hillsborough Cos 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

Address (include N,S,E,W; #; St., Ave., etc.) 10010 Gibsonton Drive
Cross Streets (nearest / between) _____
USGS 7.5' Map Name & Date Riverview, Fla. 1956, PR 1987 Plat or Other Map _____
City / Town (within 3 miles) Riverview In City Limits? yes no unknown County Hillsborough
Township 30S Range 20E Section 19 ¼ section: NW SW SE NE Irregular-name: _____
Tax Parcel # 076343-1000 Landgrant _____
Subdivision Name _____ Block _____ Lot _____
UTM: Zone 16 17 Easting 368301 ___ 0 Northing 3082042 ___ 0
Other Coordinates: X: _____ Y: _____ Coordinate System & Datum _____
Name of Public Tract (e.g., park) _____

HISTORY

Construction Year: 1960 approximately year listed or earlier year listed or later
Original Use* residence From (year): orig To (year): unk
Current Use* vacant From (year): unk To (year): curr
Other Use* _____ From (year): _____ To (year): _____
Moves: yes no unknown Dates _____ Original address (if moved) _____
Alterations: yes no unknown Dates c1970; 1980 Nature* repl windows (2/2); repl windows (1/1)
Additions: yes no unknown Dates _____ Nature* _____
Architect (last name first): unknown Builder (last name first): unknown
Ownership History (especially original owner, dates, profession, etc.) Alafia River Property Group, LLC (2006-curr); Klaver, Peter and Clava (1979-2006); Leneau, Felix (unk-1979)
Is the Resource Affected by a Local Preservation Ordinance? yes no unknown Describe _____

DESCRIPTION

Style* Masonry Vernacular Exterior Plan* rectangular Number of Stories 1
Exterior Fabric(s)* concrete block
Roof Type(s)* gable Roof Material(s)* composition shingles
Roof secondary strucs. (dormers etc.)* _____
Windows (types, materials, etc.)* some missing; 1/1 SHS, metal, independent; 1-light picture window flanked with 3-light awning, metal, independent; 2/2 SHS, metal, independent
Distinguishing Architectural Features (exterior or interior ornaments) gable vents; vertical board in gables; projecting window sills
Ancillary Features / Outbuildings (record outbuildings, major landscape features; use continuation sheet if needed.) _____

* Consult *Guide to Historical Structure Forms* for preferred descriptions (coded fields at the Site File).

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</i> 15, p. 2)				

DESCRIPTION (continued)

Chimney: No. 0 Material(s) * _____
 Structural System(s) * concrete block
 Foundation: Type(s) * slab Material(s) * poured concrete
 Main Entrance (stylistic details) 1/1 SHS metal swing door on south
 Porch Descriptions (types, locations, roof types, etc.) _____

Condition (overall resource condition): excellent good fair deteriorated ruinous
 Narrative Description of Resource This Masonry Vernacular style residence was built ca. 1960. The slab foundation supports the concrete block walls. It has a gable roof faced in composition shingles. Windows (some missing) are 1/1 and 2/2 SHS, 1-light picture flanked with 3-light awning.

Archaeological Remains _____ Check if Archaeological Form Completed

* Consult *Guide to Historical Structure Forms* for preferred descriptions (coded fields at the Site File).

RESEARCH METHODS (check 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 historic photos interior inspection HABS/HAER record search
 other methods (describe) _____

Bibliographic References (give FMSF manuscript # if relevant, use continuation sheet if needed) Hillsborough County Property Appraiser

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) This is a typical example of the Masonry Vernacular style that is commonly found throughout the area. In addition, research did not reveal any significant historical associations. Therefore, 8HI11301 is not potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.

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

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File - including field & analysis notes, photos, plans, other important documents that are permanently accessible:
 For each separately maintained collection, describe (1) document type(s),* (2) maintaining organization,* (3) file or accession nos., and (4) descriptive information. _____
All field maps, notes, and photographs on file at ACI, P08008 I-75 Moccasin Wallow to US 301

RECORDER INFORMATION

Recorder Name Lumang, Marielle and Trish Slovinac
 Recorder Contact Information (address / phone / fax / e-mail) 8110 Blaikie Ct, Suite A, Sarasota, Florida 34243/941-379-6206/
 ACIFlorida@comcast.net
 Recorder Affiliation Archaeological Consultants, Inc.

Use a *Supplement for Site Forms* or other continuation sheet for descriptions that do not fit in the spaces provided.

Required Attachments

- ① USGS 7.5' MAP WITH STRUCTURE LOCATION PINPOINTED IN RED
- ② LARGE SCALE STREET, PLAT OR PARCEL MAP (available from most property appraiser web sites)
- ③ PHOTO OF MAIN FACADE, ARCHIVAL B&W PRINT OR DIGITAL IMAGE FILE

If submitting an image file, it must be included on disk or CD AND in hard copy format (plain paper is acceptable).
 Digital image must be at least 1600 x 1200 pixels, 24-bit color, jpeg or tiff.

PHOTOGRAPH




STREET OR PLAT MAP



USGS MAP

**Township 30 South, Range 20 East, Section 19
Riverview, Fla. 1956, PR 1987**



Original
 Update



HISTORICAL STRUCTURE FORM

FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

Version 4.0 1/07

Site #8 HI11302
Field Date 4 / 10 / 08
Form Date 4 / 15 / 08
Recorder # 2-28, 29

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) 8007 Formby Street Multiple Listing (DHR only) _____
Survey Project Name CRAS PD&E I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301, Manatee and Hillsborough Cos 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

Address (include N,S,E,W; #; St., Ave., etc.) 8007 Formby Street
Cross Streets (nearest / between) _____
USGS 7.5' Map Name & Date Riverview, Fla. 1956, PR 1987 Plat or Other Map _____
City / Town (within 3 miles) Riverview In City Limits? yes no unknown County Hillsborough
Township 30S Range 20E Section 18 ¼ section: NW SW SE NE Irregular-name: _____
Tax Parcel # 076079-0000 Landgrant _____
Subdivision Name _____ Block _____ Lot _____
UTM: Zone 16 17 Easting 367421 ___ 0 Northing 3083615 ___ 0
Other Coordinates: X: _____ Y: _____ Coordinate System & Datum _____
Name of Public Tract (e.g., park) _____

HISTORY

Construction Year: 1960 approximately year listed or earlier year listed or later
Original Use* residence From (year): orig _____ To (year): _____
Current Use* residence From (year): _____ To (year): curr _____
Other Use* _____ From (year): _____ To (year): _____
Moves: yes no unknown Dates _____ Original address (if moved) _____
Alterations: yes no unknown Dates c1990 Nature* repl windows (some SHS)
Additions: yes no unknown Dates c1990 Nature* west porch
Architect (last name first): unknown Builder (last name first): unknown
Ownership History (especially original owner, dates, profession, etc.) Merritt, Irvin and Kathryn (2001-curr); Harris, Cindy (1992-2001); Higgins, Donald (unk-1992)
Is the Resource Affected by a Local Preservation Ordinance? yes no unknown Describe _____

DESCRIPTION

Style* Masonry Vernacular Exterior Plan* vertical board Number of Stories 1
Exterior Fabric(s)* concrete block
Roof Type(s)* gable Roof Material(s)* composition shingles
Roof secondary strucs. (dormers etc.)* _____
Windows (types, materials, etc.)* 1/1 SHS, metal, independent; 1/1 SHS, vinyl, independent; 1-light sliding, metal, paired
Distinguishing Architectural Features (exterior or interior ornaments) _____
Ancillary Features / Outbuildings (record outbuildings, major landscape features; use continuation sheet if needed.) _____

* Consult *Guide to Historical Structure Forms* for preferred descriptions (coded fields at the Site File).

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</i> 15, p. 2)				

DESCRIPTION (continued)

Chimney: No. 0 Material(s) * _____Structural System(s) * concrete blockFoundation: Type(s) * slab Material(s) * poured concreteMain Entrance (stylistic details) wood swing door on eastPorch Descriptions (types, locations, roof types, etc.) open, west, shedCondition (overall resource condition): excellent good fair deteriorated ruinousNarrative Description of Resource This Masonry Vernacular style residence was built ca. 1960. The slab foundation supports the concrete block walls. It has a gable roof faced in composition shingles. Windows are 1/1 SHS and 2-light sliding.Archaeological Remains _____ Check if Archaeological Form Completed* Consult *Guide to Historical Structure Forms* for preferred descriptions (coded fields at the Site File).

RESEARCH METHODS (check all that apply)

- | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FMSF record search (sites/surveys) | <input type="checkbox"/> library research | <input type="checkbox"/> building permits | <input type="checkbox"/> Sanborn maps |
| <input type="checkbox"/> FL State Archives/photo collection | <input type="checkbox"/> city directory | <input type="checkbox"/> occupant/owner interview | <input type="checkbox"/> plat maps |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> property appraiser / tax records | <input type="checkbox"/> newspaper files | <input type="checkbox"/> neighbor interview | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Lands Survey (DEP) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> cultural resource survey | <input type="checkbox"/> historic photos | <input type="checkbox"/> interior inspection | <input type="checkbox"/> HABS/HAER record search |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other methods (describe) _____ | | | |

Bibliographic References (give FMSF manuscript # if relevant, use continuation sheet if needed) Hillsborough County Property Appraiser

OPINION OF RESOURCE SIGNIFICANCE

Appears to meet the criteria for National Register listing individually? yes no insufficient informationAppears to meet the criteria for National Register listing as part of a district? yes no insufficient informationExplanation of Evaluation (required, whether significant or not; use separate sheet if needed) This is a typical example of the Masonry Vernacular style found throughout the county and research did not reveal any significant historical associations with this residence. Therefore, 8HI11302 does not appear to be potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.Area(s) of Historical Significance (see *National Register Bulletin 15*, p. 8 for categories: e.g. "architecture", "ethnic heritage", "community planning & development", etc.) Community Planning and Development

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File - including field & analysis notes, photos, plans, other important documents that are permanently accessible: For each separately maintained collection, describe (1) document type(s),* (2) maintaining organization,* (3) file or accession nos., and (4) descriptive information. All field maps, notes, and photographs on file at ACI, P08008 I-75 Moccasin Wallow to US 301

RECORDER INFORMATION

Recorder Name Lumang, Marielle and Trish SlovinacRecorder Contact Information (address / phone / fax / e-mail) 8110 Blaikie Ct, Suite A, Sarasota, Florida 34243/941-379-6206/ ACIFlorida@comcast.netRecorder Affiliation Archaeological Consultants, Inc.Use a *Supplement for Site Forms* or other continuation sheet for descriptions that do not fit in the spaces provided.

Required Attachments

① USGS 7.5' MAP WITH STRUCTURE LOCATION PINPOINTED IN RED

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

③ PHOTO OF MAIN FACADE, ARCHIVAL B&W PRINT OR DIGITAL IMAGE FILE


If submitting an image file, it must be included on disk or CD AND in hard copy format (plain paper is acceptable).

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

PHOTOGRAPH




STREET OR PLAT MAP



USGS MAP

**Township 30 South, Range 20 East, Section 18
Riverview, Fla. 1956, PR 1987**



APPENDIX C: Survey Log

Ent D (FMSF only) ___/___/___



Survey Log Sheet

Florida Master Site File
Version 4.1 1/07

Survey # (FMSF only) _____

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

Identification and Bibliographic Information

Survey Project (name and project phase) CRAS PD&E Study I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Rd. to US 301 Manatee & Hillsborough Counties

Report Title (exactly as on title page) Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to South of US Highway 301, Manatee and Hillsborough Counties, Florida

Report Author(s) (as on title page— individual or corporate; last names first) ACI

Publication Date (year) 2009 **Total Number of Pages in Report** (count text, figures, tables, not site forms) 108

Publication Information (Give series and no. in series, publisher and city. For article or chapter, cite page numbers. Use the style of *American Antiquity*.)
ACI (2009) Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study I-75 from Moccasin Wallow Road to South of US 301, Hillsborough and Manatee Counties, Florida. ACI, Sarasota.

Supervisor(s) of Fieldwork (whether or not the same as author(s); last name first) Deming, Joan

Affiliation of Fieldworkers (organization, city) Archaeological Consultants, Inc., Sarasota

Key Words/Phrases (Don't use the county, or common words like *archaeology, structure, survey, architecture*. Limit each word or phrase to 25 characters.) _____

Survey Sponsors (corporation, government unit, or person who is directly paying for fieldwork)

Name FDOT, District 7

Address/Phone Tampa, Florida

Recorder of Log Sheet Horvath, Elizabeth A. **Date Log Sheet Completed** 10 /09 /09

Is this survey or project a continuation of a previous project? No Yes: Previous survey #(s) (FMSF only)

Mapping

Counties (List each one in which field survey was done - do not abbreviate; use supplement sheet if necessary) Hillsborough, Manatee

USGS 1:24,000 Map(s) : Map Name/Date of Latest Revision (use supplement sheet if necessary): Brandon, Fla. 1982
Gibsonton, Fla. 1982, Riverview, Fla. 1982, Ruskin 1982

Description of Survey Area

Dates for Fieldwork: Start 02/___/08 End 08/___/08 **Total Area Surveyed** (fill in one) _____ hectares 909 acres

Number of Distinct Tracts or Areas Surveyed 1

If Corridor (fill in one for each): **Width** _____ meters 300 feet **Length** _____ kilometers 25 miles

Research and Field Methods

Types of Survey (check all that apply): archaeological architectural historical/archival underwater other: _____

Preliminary Methods (✓ Check 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
 Florida Photo Archives (Gray Building) library-special collection - nonlocal newspaper files soils maps or data
 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 (✓ Check as many as apply to the project as a whole.)

- Check here if NO archaeological methods were used.
 surface collection, controlled other screen shovel test (size: _____) block excavation (at least 2x2 M)
 surface collection, uncontrolled water screen (finest size: _____) soil resistivity
 shovel test-1/4" screen posthole tests magnetometer
 shovel test-1/8" screen auger (size: _____) side scan sonar
 shovel test 1/16" screen coring unknown
 shovel test-unscreened test excavation (at least 1x2 M)
 other (describe): _____

Historical/Architectural Methods (✓ Check 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 exposed ground inspected occupant interview tax records
 interior documentation local property records occupation permits unknown
 other (describe): _____

Scope/Intensity/Procedures background research, surface reconnaissance, systematic (12.5, 25, 50 & 100 m) and judgmental subsurface testing, 50 cm diameter, 1 m deep, 6.4 mm mesh screen, historic structure documentation


Survey Results (cultural resources recorded)

Site Significance Evaluated? Yes No If Yes, circle NR-eligible/significant site numbers below.
Site Counts: Previously Recorded Sites 12 Newly Recorded Sites 9
Previously Recorded Site #'s with Site File Update Forms (List site #'s without "8." Attach supplementary pages if necessary)
HI409, -478, -479, -480, -524, -525, -526, -527, -532, -1029, MA136, MA1337
Newly Recorded Site #'s (Are you sure all are originals and not updates? Identify methods used to check for updates, i.e., researched Site File records. List site #'s without "8." Attach supplementary pages if necessary.) HI11295-11302, HI11359

Site Form Used: Site File Paper Form SmartForm II Electronic Recording Form


REQUIRED: ATTACH PLOT OF SURVEY AREA ON PHOTOCOPIES OF USGS 1:24,000 MAP(S)

Table with 3 columns: DO NOT USE, SITE FILE USE ONLY, DO NOT USE. Rows include BAR Related (872, CARL, 1A32 #, UW) and BHP Related (State Historic Preservation Grant, Compliance Review: CRAT #).




I-75 PD&E Study corridor - Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301
 USGS Cockroach Bay, Fla. 1982, Palmetto Fla. 1982, Parrish, Fla. 1982 and
 Ruskin, Fla. 1982
 Hillsborough and Manatee Counties

I-75 PD&E STUDY
MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
HILLSBOROUGH AND
MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2




I-75 PD&E Study corridor - Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301
 USGS Parrish Fla. 1975 and Ruskin, Fla. 1982
 Hillsborough County

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2



I-75 PD&E Study corridor - Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301
 USGS Cockroach Bay, Fla. 1982, Riverview, Fla. 1982, Ruskin, Fla. 1982, and
 Wimauma, Fla. 1982
 Hillsborough County

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2



I-75 PD&E Study corridor - Moccasin Wallow Road to US 301
 USGS Brandon, Fla. 1982, Gibsonton, Fla. 1982, Riverview, Fla. 1982, and
 Tampa, Fla. 1982, PR 1983
 Hillsborough County

I-75 PD&E STUDY
 MOCCASIN WALLOW ROAD TO US 301
 HILLSBOROUGH AND
 MANATEE COUNTIES
 WPI Segment No. : 419235-2