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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Archaeological Consultants, Inc. (ACI) performed a cultural resource assessment survey (CRAS) of the Carriage Pointe South property in Hillsborough County for the Carriage Pointe Partners, LLC. The purpose of the survey, conducted in September 2013, was to locate and identify any archaeological sites and historic resources within the project area and to assess their significance in terms of eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). This CRAS was conducted at the request of the Florida Division of Historical Resources (FDHR) who reviewed this project in accordance with Chapters 267 and 373, Florida Statutes (FS), Florida’s Coastal Management Program, and implementing state regulations for possible impact to historic properties listed, or eligible for listing in the NRHP, or otherwise of historical, architectural, or archaeological value (Bendus 2013) (Appendix A). The fieldwork meets the standards contained in the FDHR’s Cultural Resource Management Standards and Operational Manual (FDHR 2003) and the report meets the specifications set forth in Chapter 1A-46, Florida Administrative Code (FAC).

A review of the Florida Master Site File (FMSF) and NRHP indicated that 16 archaeological sites have been recorded within one mile of the project area. None of the sites is located within the property. The background research suggested a moderate to low probability for archaeological site occurrence. As a result of field survey, no archaeological sites were discovered.

A review of the FMSF and NRHP revealed that no historic buildings, bridges, cemeteries, resource groups, or NRHP-listed sites are located within or proximate to the Carriage Pointe South property. A review of the relevant historic aerial maps and the Hillsborough County property appraiser’s web site indicated no possibility for historic structures. Field survey confirmed the absence of historic resources.

In conclusions, no archaeological sites or historic resources are located within the Carriage Pointe South property. Therefore, development of the property will have no effect on any cultural resources that are listed, determined eligible, or considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. No further work is recommended.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Description

Archaeological Consultants, Inc. (ACI) performed a CRAS of the Carriage Pointe South property in Hillsborough County for the Carriage Pointe Partners, LLC. The project area is located between US 41 and I-75 and south of Symmes Road (Figure 1.1). This CRAS was conducted at the request of the FDHR who reviewed this project in accordance with Chapters 267 and 373, FS, Florida’s Coastal Management Program, and implementing state regulations, for possible impact to historic properties listed, or eligible for listing in the NRHP, or otherwise of historical, architectural, or archaeological value (Bendus 2013) (Appendix A). The fieldwork, conducted in September 2013, meets the standards contained in the FDHR’s Cultural Resource Management Standards and Operational Manual (FDHR 2003) and the report meets the specifications set forth in Chapter 1A-46, FAC.

1.2 Purpose

The purpose of this CRAS was to locate and identify any archaeological sites and historic resources located within the project area and to assess, to the extent possible, their significance as to eligibility for listing in the NRHP. Background research preceded field survey. Such research provides an informed set of expectations concerning the kinds of cultural resources that might occur within the project area, as well as a basis for evaluating any newly discovered sites.
Figure 1.1. Location of the Carriage Pointe South project area, Hillsborough County (ESRI 2013b - Streets).
2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

2.1 Location and Setting

The Carriage Pointe South property is located in Section 36 of Township 30 South, Range 19 East (Figure 2.1) (United States Geological Survey [USGS] Riverview). The 152-acre project area is located south of Symmes Road between I-75 and US 41. At the time of survey, the land was characterized by overgrown pasture and fish ponds (Photos 2.1 and 2.2).

Photo 2.1. Overgrown pasture.

Photo 2.2. Abandoned fish pond in northern portion of project area.
Figure 2.1. Environmental setting of the Carriage Pointe South project area; Section 36 of Township 30 South, Range 19 East; USGS Riverview (National Geographic Society 2013 - USA Topo Maps).
2.2 Physiography and Geology

The project area is located within the Mid-peninsula physiographic zone (White 1970), which is characterized by gently rolling topography with a series of low hills and valleys paralleling the coast. The proposed development tract ranges in elevation from 3 to 5 meters (m) (10-15 feet [ft]) above mean sea level, sloping down from east to west. The property is situated within the Gulf Coastal Lowlands. The surface lithology consists of the Peace River formation, which is evidenced as shelly sand and clay (Knapp 1980; Scott 2001; Scott et al. 2001).

2.3 Soils and Vegetation

The project area occurs within the Myakka-Basinger-Holopaw soil association, which is characterized by nearly level, poorly and very poorly drained soils of the flatwoods (U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA] 1989). Table 2.1 provides a list of the specific soil types within the project area, their drainage classification, and environmental setting (USDA 1989, 2012).

Table 2.1. Soil types within the Carriage Pointe South property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Type</th>
<th>Drainage</th>
<th>Environmental setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basinger, Holopaw, and Samsula soils</td>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>Swamps and depressions on the flatwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malabar fine sand</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Low-lying sloughs and shallow depressions on the flatwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myakka fine sand</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Broad plains on the flatwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns fine sand</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Low-lying plains on the flatwoods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.4 Paleoenvironmental Considerations

The early environment of the region was different from that seen 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 5,000 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 due to spring discharge from the Floridan aquifer (Dunbar 1981:99).
Around 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 BCE (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.
3.0 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 an 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 Carriage Pointe South property 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, Formative, and Mississippian stages have been defined based on unique sets of material culture traits such as stone tools and ceramics as well as subsistence, settlement, and burial patterns. These broad temporal units are further subdivided into culture phases or periods.

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 U.S. 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 by 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.

3.1 Paleo-Indian

The Paleo-Indian stage is the earliest known cultural manifestation in Florida, dating from roughly 12,000 to 7500 BCE (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. In general, the climate was cooler and drier with vegetation typified by xerophytic species with scrub oak, pine, open grassy prairies, and savannas (Milanich 1994:40). When human populations were arriving in Florida, the sea levels were still as much as 40 to 60 m (130-200 ft) below present levels and coastal regions of Florida extended miles beyond present-day shorelines (Faught 2004). Thus, many sites have been inundated (Faught and Donoghue 1997).

The Paleo-Indian period has been sub-divided into three horizons based upon characteristic tool forms (Austin 2001). Traditionally, it is believed that the Clovis Horizon (10,500-9000 BCE) represents the initial occupation of Florida and is defined based upon the presence of the fluted Clovis points. These are somewhat more common in north Florida. Research suggests that Suwannee and Simpson points may be contemporary with or predate Clovis (Dunbar 2006a; Stanford 1991).
Figure 3.1. Florida Archaeological Regions. The project area (★) is within the Central Peninsular Gulf Coast Region.
The Suwannee Horizon (9000-8500 BCE) is the best known of the three Paleo-Indian horizons. The lanceolate-shaped, unfluted Simpson and Suwannee projectile points are diagnostic of this time (Bullen 1975; Daniel and Wisenbaker 1987; Purdy 1981). The Suwannee tool kit includes a variety of scrapers, adzes, spokeshaves, unifacially retouched flakes, 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 Horizon (8500-8000 BCE). 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). Florida notched or pseudo-notched points, including the Union, Greenbriar, and Hardaway-like points may represent late Paleo-Indian types, but these types have not been recovered from datable contexts and their temporal placement remains uncertain (Dunbar 2006a:410).

Archaeologists hypothesize that Paleo-Indians lived in migratory bands and subsisted by gathering and hunting, including the now-extinct Pleistocene megafauna. 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, thus providing food and drink. In addition to being tethered to water sources, most of the Paleo-Indian sites are close to good quality lithic resources. The settlement pattern consisted of 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).

Although the Paleo-Indian period is generally considered to have been cooler and drier, there were major variations in the inland water tables resulting from large-scale environmental fluctuations. There have been two major theories as to why most Paleo-Indian materials have been recovered from inundated sites. The Oasis theory, put forth by Wilfred T. Neill, was that due to low water tables and scarcity of potable water, the Paleo-Indians and the game animals upon which they depended clustered around the few available water holes that were associated with sinkholes (Neill 1964). Whereas, Ben Waller postulated that the Paleo-Indians gathered around river-crossings to ambush the large Pleistocene animals as they crossed the rivers (Waller 1970). This implies periods of elevated water levels. Based on the research along the Aucilla and Wacissa Rivers, it appears that both theories are correct, depending upon what the local environmental conditions were at that time (Dunbar 2006b). As such, during the wetter periods, populations became more dispersed because the water resources were abundant and the animals they relied on could roam over a wider range.

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). Investigations along the Aucilla and Wacissa Rivers, as well as other sites within the north Florida rivers, have provided important information on the Paleo-Indian period and how the aboriginals adapted to their environmental setting (Webb 2006). Studies of the Pleistocene faunal remains from these sites clearly demonstrate the importance of these animals not for food alone, but as the raw material for their bone tool industry (Dunbar and Webb 1996).
3.2 **Archaic**

Climatic changes occurred, resulting in the disappearance of the Pleistocene megafauna and the demise of the Paleo-Indian culture. The disappearance of the mammoths and mastodons resulted in a reduction of open grazing lands, and thus, the subsequent disappearance of grazers such as horse, bison, and camels. With the reduction of open habitat, the herd animals were replaced by the more solitary, woodland browser: the white-tailed deer (Dunbar 2006a:426). The intertwined data of megafauna’ extinction and cultural change suggests a rapid and significant disruption in both faunal and floral assemblages. The Bolen people represent the first culture adapted to the Holocene environment (Carter and Dunbar 2006). This included a more specialized toolkit and the introduction of chipped-stone woodworking implements.

Due to a lack of excavated collections and the poor preservation of bone and other organic materials in the upland sites, our knowledge of the Early Archaic artifact assemblage is limited (Carter and Dunbar 2006; Milanich 1994). Discoveries at the Page-Ladson, Little Salt Spring, and Windover sites indicate that bone and wood tools were used (Clausen et al. 1979; Doran 2002; Webb 2006). 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 previously, the Early Archaic peoples could sustain larger populations, occupy sites for longer periods, and perform activities requiring longer occupations at a specific locale (Milanich 1994:67).

Marked environmental changes, which occurred some 6500 years ago, had a profound influence upon human settlement and subsistence practices. Among the landscape alterations were rises in sea and water table levels that resulted in the creation of more available surface water. In addition to changed hydrological conditions, this period is characterized by the spread of mesic forests and the beginnings of modern vegetation communities including pine forests and cypress swamps. Humans adapted to this changing environment and regional and local differences are reflected in the archaeological record (Russo 1994a, 1994b; Sassaman 2008).

The Middle Archaic archaeological record is better understood than the Early Archaic. The material culture inventory included several stemmed, broad blade projectile point types including the Newman, Levy, Marion, and Putnam types (Bullen 1975). Population growth, as evidenced by the increased number of Middle Archaic sites and accompanied by increased socio-cultural complexity, is assumed for this time (Milanich and Fairbanks 1980). Site types included large base camps, smaller special-use campsites, quarries, and burial areas. The most common sites are the smaller campsites, which were most likely used for hunting or served as special-use extractive sites for such activities as gathering nuts or other botanical materials. At quarry sites, aboriginal populations mined stone for their tools. They usually roughly shaped the stone prior to transporting it to another locale for finishing. Base camps are identified by their larger artifact assemblages and wider variety of tools.

During the Late Archaic period, population increased and became more sedentary. The broad-bladed, stemmed projectile styles of the Middle Archaic continued to be made with the addition of Culbreath, Lafayette, Clay, and Westo point types (Bullen 1975). A greater reliance on marine resources is indicated in coastal areas. Subsistence strategies and technologies reflect the beginnings of an adaptation to these resources. Around 4000 years ago, evidence of fired clay pottery appears in Florida. The first ceramic types, tempered with fibers (Spanish moss or palmetto), are referred to as the Orange series. Initially, it was thought that they lacked decoration until about 1700 BCE, when they were decorated with geometric designs and punctuations. Research has called this ceramic chronology into question; AMS dates from a series of incised Orange sherds from the middle St. Johns River Valley, have produced dates contemporaneous with the plain varieties (Sassaman 2003).
Milanich (1994:86-87) suggests that while there may be little difference between Middle and Late Archaic populations, there are more Late Archaic sites and they were primarily located near wetlands. The abundant wetland resources allowed larger settlements to be maintained. It is likely that the change in settlement patterns was related to the 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). Sea levels rose, inundating many sites located along the shoreline. The adaptation to this environment allowed for a wider variety of resources to be exploited and a wider variation in settlement patterns. No longer were the scarce waterholes dictating the location of sites. Shellfish, fish, and other food sources were now available from coastal and freshwater wetlands resulting in an increased population size.

The Late Archaic Transitional stage refers to that portion of the ceramic Archaic when sand was mixed with the fibers as a tempering agent. The same settlement and subsistence patterns were being followed. It has been suggested that during this period there was a diffusion of cultural traits as a result of the movement of small groups (Bullen 1959, 1965). This resulted in the appearance of several different ceramic and lithic tool traditions, and the beginning of cultural regionalism.

3.3 **Formative**

The Formative stage is comprised of the Manasota and Weeden Island-related cultures (ca. 500 BCE to 800 CE [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). The subsistence economy focused on the coastal exploitation of maritime resources, supplemented by the hunting and gathering of 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 shore with smaller sites being located up to 19-29 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 BCE to 400 CE) are characterized as flattened globular bowls with incurring rims and chamfered lips. Pot forms with rounded lips and inward curving rims were utilized from about 200 BCE until 700 CE. Deeper pot forms with straight sides and rounded lips were developed around 400 CE 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 CE) 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 consistent. Hunting and gathering of the inland and coastal resources continued. Evidence of a widespread trade network is seen by the ceramic types 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 period. Similarly, the subsistence economy, divided between maritime and terrestrial animals and perhaps horticultural products, represents the maximum effective adjustment to the environment. 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, punctations, 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 in the coastal area (Milanich 1994:215).

3.4 Mississippian

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 CE) and Pinellas (1000-1500 CE) and two colonial period phases: Tatham (1500-1567 CE) and Bayview (1567-1725 CE) (Mitchem 1989). The Safety Harbor variant in Hillsborough, northern Manatee, Pinellas, and southern Pasco counties is identified as the Circum-Tampa Bay regional variant.

Although inland sites do occur, the Safety Harbor culture was primarily a coastal phenomenon (Mitchem 1989, 2012). Large coastal towns or villages often had a temple mound, plaza, midden, and a burial mound associated with them. Although some maize agriculture may have been practiced by the Safety Harbor peoples, the coastal environment was not suitable for intensive maize agriculture (Luer and Almy 1981; Mitchem 2012). Away from the coastal plain, a more dispersed pattern of smaller settlements was evident and the burial mounds appear to have been located away from the habitation areas (Mitchem 1988, 1989).

Influences from the north led to the incorporation of some Mississippian traits by the late Manasota peoples, which became the Safety Harbor culture. Most, Safety Harbor components are located on top of the earlier Manasota deposits and there is evidence of significant continuity from Manasota into Safety Harbor. However, in some areas, Manasota continued later than previously
thought, while in other areas Englewood did not appear to have occurred at all (Austin et al. 2008). The lack of the diagnostic Englewood ceramics at many sites may indicate that the Englewood phase was skipped in the developmental sequence from Manasota to Safety Harbor (Mitchem 2012).

The primary difference between Manasota and Safety Harbor is the ceramic assemblage. The utilitarian ceramics include the Pasco (limestone tempered), Pinellas (laminated paste), and sand tempered plain varieties. The decorated ceramics, primarily recovered from burial mounds, include Englewood Incised, Sarasota Incised, Lemon Bay Incised, St. Johns Check Stamped, Safety Harbor, Incised, and Pinellas Incised (Willey 1949). The adoption of Mississippian traits such as jar and bottle forms, and the guilloche or loop design, are indicative of this period. However, unlike most Mississippi period ceramics, the use of mussel shell as the aplastic is not present (Mitchem 2012).

Trade between the Safety Harbor people and other Southeastern Mississippian cultures took place. It is likely that marine whelks and conchs were traded with groups in the Southeast and Midwest. In turn, items such as copper and ground-stone artifacts made their way south. Based on Spanish accounts, the Safety Harbor culture had evolved into a chiefdom form of government, albeit minus the maize agriculture of other Mississippian period groups in the Southeast. This lack of agriculture was likely due to the extremely successful adaptation to the local environment and the lack of suitable soils for the production of maize. Mitchem notes that although contact with Mississippian people may have led to political and religious changes, there was not a compelling reason to change their lifestyle completely (Mitchem 2012:185).

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, extending from roughly Tarpon Springs southward to the Sarasota area (Bullen 1978). The Tocobaga consisted of a number of small chiefdoms whose leaders frequently waged war against each other. The most powerful chiefdom was Tocobaga, located at the head of Old Tampa Bay at the Safety Harbor site; other major chiefdoms included the Mocoço (at the mouth of the Alafia River) and Ucita (at the mouth of the Little Manatee River) (Hann 2003).

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. The Spaniards briefly established a fort and garrison at Tocobaga in the 1560s. In 1568, the Tocobaga killed all of the soldiers and when a Spanish supply ship arrived, the Tocobaga left and the Spanish burned the village (Hann 2003).

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, members of the Muskogean Creek, Yamassee, and Oconee tribes 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 as the 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.

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 Florida in 1818, which became known as the First Seminole War.

3.6 Territorial and Statehood

Florida became a United States territory in 1821 due to the war and the Adams-Onis Treaty of 1819. Settlement was slow and scattered at that time. 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, 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 treaty satisfied neither the Indians nor the settlers. The inadequacy of the reservation, the desperate situation of the Seminoles, and the mounting demand of the settlers for their removal, produced another conflict.

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 (Historic Tampa/Hillsborough County Preservation Board [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 U.S. War Department found it necessary to establish a military reserve around Fort Brooke with boundaries extending 16 miles to the north, west, and east (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. Hillsborough County was established in 1834 by the Territorial Legislature of Florida; it reached north to Dade City and south to Charlotte Harbor, encompassing an area that today comprises Pasco, Polk, Manatee, Sarasota, DeSoto, Charlotte, Highlands, Hardee, Pinellas, and Hillsborough counties. 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 (Brown 1999:46).

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 U.S. Army and Navy converged on southwest Florida attempting 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. It also served as a haven for settlers who left their farms to seek protection from the warring Seminoles (Piper et al. 1982). Several other forts, including Fort Alabama (later Fort Foster), Fort Thonotosassa, and Fort Simmons were established during the Seminole War years (Bruton and Bailey 1984). Their uses varied from military garrisons to military supply depots; others were built to protect the nearby settlers during Indian uprisings.

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 their 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 1985).

In 1840, the population of Hillsborough County was 452, with 360 of those residing at Fort Brooke (HT/HCPB 1980). 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 US 301 and Balm-Riverview Road, northeast of the project area (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 and George Simmons became the earliest settlers of the area (Bakas and Bakas 2006; HT/HCPB 1980).

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. It 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). In 1845, the State of Florida was admitted to the Union, and Tallahassee was selected as the capital. The land 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 (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 1928:34-35).

To hasten settlement of central Florida, the U.S. government commenced the official surveys of public lands. The exterior lines of Township 30 South, Range 19 East, in which the Carriage Pointe South property is located, were surveyed by A.M. Randolph in 1843 (State of Florida 1843). Charles F. Hopkins surveyed the subdivision lines in 1852 (State of Florida 1852a). They both described the general project area as third rate pine and palmetto (State of Florida 1843:128, 1852a:168-180). There were no historic features noted on the Plat other than the military reserve line that ran through the southern half of Sections 33-36 (State of Florida 1852b).

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).

In December 1855, the Third Seminole War, or the Billy Bowlegs War, started because 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.

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 123 Seminoles; 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 over (Covington 1982).

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 the area. 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 were major cattle shipping points for southwest Florida.

### 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 as $35,127,721 and the value of the slaves 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 larger rivers throughout the state preventing the shipment of raw materials. The war lasted until 1865.

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.

In 1866, W. B. Moody, the oldest son of Benjamin Moody, opened a general store in Peru. Citrus became a major economic stimulus to the area. Pickers would be brought into Peru from Valrico and Plant City to harvest the fruit and transport it to packinghouses. In December of 1879, the settlement of Peru obtained a post office (Bradbury and Hallock 1962:66), and one of the local settlers, J. M. Boyette, became the first postmaster (Maio et al. 1998:82). During this time, transportation across the Alafia was via the Lesley Ferry. The ferry was also the main connecting link between Tampa and interior southwest Florida (HT/HCPB 1980).

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 an 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 areas.

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 Florida 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 with the State. This contract provided one-half of the acreage that they could drain, reclaim, and make fit for cultivation. The 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). In 1881, Disston purchased all of Section 36 (State of Florida n.d.:226).

The first significant influence on the growth of Hillsborough County as a whole was the investment of capital in railroad construction during the 1880s. Such activity was encouraged by the State of Florida, which granted sizeable amounts of land to the railroad companies. In general, railroad development increased access, stimulated commerce, and promoted tourism, thus resulting in population growth and economic prosperity. In March of 1887, the town of Peru had grown to such an extent that it was platted, and in 1891 Riverview, on the north bank of the Alafia, was platted (Maio et al. 1998).

In the late 1880s, phosphate was discovered on the Alafia; but 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). 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. Agriculture expanded in the rural areas as locally grown fruits and vegetables could now be shipped to northern markets by rail (HT/HCPB 1980:36).

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 5, 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. Developers used propaganda promoting Florida as the eternal garden to attract tourists and new residents. A series of communities developed along the US 41 corridor, west of the project area, at this time including Gibsonton (south of the Alafia River), Gardenville (between Gibsonton and Bullfrog Creek), Garden City (straddled Bullfrog Creek), and Adamsville, at the south end of the
corridor. Remlap, located between Adamsville and Garden City referred to lands owned by Mrs. Potter Palmer (Morris 1995:206).

James Gibson and his family arrived from Alabama in 1884 and homesteaded 150 acres of land along the south shore of the Alafia River, from its mouth inland about a half mile (Maio et al. 1998). Gibsonton, along with Granville Platt and F. L. Henderson, became trustees of the school that was erected in 1888. At that time, the area was known as Platt’s Settlement (HT/HCPB 1980). The road to Tampa was paved with shell and a ferry was used to cross the Alafia River. The shell for the road was obtained from the many aboriginal shell mounds that had been located in the area (Federal Writers Project [FWP] 1939).

In 1907, T. M. Wier had Gardenville Town surveyed. In 1910, W. D. Davis filed the plat for Florida Gardenlands, which was the “rural” counterpart to his suburban Garden City subdivision that straddled Bullfrog Creek, though at that time it was called the Roosevelt River. Davis was the president and treasurer of the Davis Mercantile Company, based in Tampa. His promotion of the properties was so effective that Earl Lincoln Adams and Rosie Manners Adams bought land in the southern portion of Florida Gardenlands and raised their ten children there (Maio et al. 1998). This area then became known as Adamsville. In 1911, Gardenville opened its school, and the next year, the Gardenville post office was established, though it closed in 1925 (Bradbury and Hallock 1962:32).

The early settlers of the region built 25 miles of road by 1913. During this initial road-building era, the foundation of U.S. Highway 301 was laid, but it was known then as “The Wire Road” because of telegraph and telephone lines along it. At this time, US 41 constituted nothing more than a nine-foot wide shell road paid for by a $30,000 local bond issue. Because of the growing importance of truck farming, these roads and others were built to facilitate the transportation of produce to local markets throughout the 1920s (VisitRuskin 2012).

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.

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 many workers into the Tampa area.

As World War II ended, Hillsborough County, like most of Florida, experienced a population boom in the 1950s. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (USCB), Florida’s population increased from 1,897,414 in 1940 to 2,771,305 in 1950 (Forstall 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.

In the 1960s, construction of Interstate 75 (I-75) in Florida began, generating a spurt of activity that has continued into the 21st century. Completion of I-275 provided convenient access within the metropolitan Tampa area. I-75, completed through eastern Hillsborough County in the early 1980s, provided access allowing continued growth. Throughout the last twenty years, commercial development, including tourist attractions such as Busch Gardens, restaurants, and hotels, have exploded along the interstate system, keeping tourism as a primary revenue source in Florida.

With the population explosion in Hillsborough County, 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 2010, the population of Hillsborough County totaled 1,229,226, making the county the fourth most populous in the state (USCB 2013). The largest employers are in the retail trade, services, and government sectors. Hillsborough, Hernando, Pasco, and Pinellas Counties have been designated as the Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater Metropolitan Area. Most of the population is centered on Tampa Bay and the Gulf Coast, although the interior lands are increasingly becoming developed.

3.9 **Project Area Specifics**

A review of the aerial photographs available from the Publication of Archival Library & Museum Materials (PALMM) revealed little development of the project area over the past 75 years (PALMM 1938, 1957, 1968). In 1938 (Figure 3.2), no development had taken place, but by 1957, the powerline corridor than parallels much of the western project area boundary had been cleared. The area also appears to have been used for cattle grazing at that time. No additional development of the property was visible on the 1968 aerial. According to Ryan Motko of Carriage Point Partners, LLC, the property had been used for cattle grazing and fish farming for years (Motko 2013).
Figure 3.2. 1938 aerial photo of the project area (PALMM 1938).
4.0 RESEARCH CONSIDERATIONS AND METHODS

4.1 Background Research and Literature Review

A comprehensive review of archaeological and historical literature, records, and other documents and data pertaining to the project area was conducted. The focus of this research was to ascertain the types of cultural resources known in the general area, their temporal/cultural affiliations, site location information, and other relevant data. This included a review of the sites listed in the NRHP, the FMSF (July 2013 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.

4.2 Archaeological Considerations

Typically, for CRAS projects, 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 a basis for evaluating any new sites discovered.

Sixteen previously recorded archaeological sites are located within one mile of the project area (Figure 4.1; Table 4.1). These include one burial mound, seven shell middens, and eight lithic/artifact scatters. Most of them are temporally indeterminate due to a lack of investigation or temporally diagnostic artifacts. Those site that have been evaluated by the SHPO are ineligible for listing in the NRHP; however, almost half have not been evaluated.

Many of the sites were recorded by William Plowden in the 1950s and have not been subject to in-depth archaeological investigations (FMSF). Susan Henefield, then a University of South Florida student, also recorded an archaeological site based on informant information. B. Calvin Jones recorded a number of sites during his survey along the proposed I-75 corridor. Several of those sites were further investigated during the more recent survey of the I-75 corridor (ACI 2008). The other sites were recorded or investigated during the surveys of the Southpointe West property (ACI 1998), a reroute of the Florida Gas Transmission line corridor (Austin 2000b), the SDG Land Excavation property (Estabrook 2001), and for the wetland restoration of the Southwest Florida Water Management District Ekker parcel (Burger 2005).

A number of other surveys have been conducted in the area for borrow pits (Browning 1981a, 1981b); utility, natural gas, and ammonia transmission lines (Austin 2000a; Janus Research 2006; Miller 1979; Stokes 2000a, 2000b; Stokes et al. 1999); development properties (ACI 2004a, 2004b); cell towers (FAC 2005; Pracht 2001); and the CSXT Big Bend project (Swann 2009).

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 1980; Janus Research 1992, 2004; Weisman and Collins 2004) informed expectations concerning the types of sites likely to occur within the project area, as well as their probable environmental settings, was generated.
Figure 4.1. Previously recorded archaeological sites within one mile of the project area; USGS Riverview (National Geographic Society 2013 - USA Topo Maps).
Table 4.1. Previously recorded archaeological sites within one mile of the project area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>SITE NAME</th>
<th>SITE TYPE</th>
<th>CULTURE</th>
<th>SHPO EVAL</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HI00035</td>
<td>FPS HB-32</td>
<td>Shell midden</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>Plowden-FMSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI00036</td>
<td>Adamsville</td>
<td>Shell midden</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>Plowden-FMSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI00054</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>Shell midden; mound</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>Plowden-FMSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI00055</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>Campsite; shell midden; mound</td>
<td>Indeterminate with pottery</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>Plowden-FMSF; ACI 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI00073</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>Burial mound</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>Plowden-FMSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI00087</td>
<td>Adamsville III</td>
<td>Shell midden</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>Plowden-FMSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI00409</td>
<td>Trotwood</td>
<td>Artifact scatter; lithic scatter</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>Seabury-FMSF; Jones 1978; ACI 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI00524</td>
<td>Symmes Road</td>
<td>Campsite; lithic scatter</td>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>Jones 1978; ACI 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI00525</td>
<td>South Symmes</td>
<td>Lithic scatter</td>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>Jones 1978; ACI 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI02127</td>
<td>Walter Gatlin</td>
<td>Shell midden</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>Henefield-FMSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI06812</td>
<td>North Bullfrog</td>
<td>Ceramic scatter; lithic scatter</td>
<td>Indeterminate with pottery</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>Austin 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI07698</td>
<td>Tomato Cow</td>
<td>Artifact scatter</td>
<td>Weeden Island; Safety Harbor</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>Estabrook 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI07699</td>
<td>Bullfrog Cow</td>
<td>Artifact scatter</td>
<td>Indeterminate with pottery</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>Estabrook 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI09828</td>
<td>Ekker</td>
<td>Campsite; shell midden</td>
<td>Paleo-Indian; Middle-Late Archaic; Transitional; 20th century</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>Burger 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI10296</td>
<td>Harter</td>
<td>Lithic scatter</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>Janssen 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI11359</td>
<td>409 North</td>
<td>Campsite; lithic scatter</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>ACI 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. 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. The predictive model for Hillsborough County indicates that the project area has a moderate to low potential for aboriginal archaeological site occurrence (Janus Research 2004). Given the results of the historic research, no historic period archaeological sites, including nineteenth century homesteads, forts, trails, roads, or Indian encampments were expected.
4.3 Historical Considerations

The background research revealed that no historic structures have been previously recorded within the project area. A review of the property appraiser’s web site indicates an absence of historic buildings on the property (Henriquez 2013). The aerial photos reveal that this parcel had no historic structures on it between 1938 and 1968 (PALMM 1938, 1957, 1968).

4.4 Field Methodology

Archaeological field methods consisted of surface reconnaissance, and systematic and judgmental subsurface shovel testing. Shovel tests were excavated at 50 m (164 ft) intervals in the higher probability areas along the wetlands. Judgmental shovel testing and 100 m (328 ft) interval testing was conducted within the low probability areas. 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 6.4 centimeter (cm) (0.25 inch [in]) mesh hardware cloth to maximize the recovery of artifacts. The locations of all shovel tests were recorded on the maps and following the recording of relevant data such as stratigraphic profile and artifact finds the shovel tests were refilled.

Historical field methodology consisted of a reconnaissance of the property to determine the location of all historic resources believed to be 50 years of age or older, and to ascertain if any such resources could be eligible for listing in the NRHP.

4.5 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 FS (Florida’s Unmarked Burial Law) would be followed. Such sites were not expected within the project area.

4.6 Laboratory Methods and Curation

No artifacts were recovered, and thus, no laboratory methods were utilized. All project-related records, including maps, field notes, and photos, will be maintained at ACI in Sarasota unless the client requests otherwise.
5.0 SURVEY RESULTS

5.1 Archaeological Survey Results

Archaeological field survey included both surface reconnaissance and the excavation of 49 shovel tests within the Carriage Pointe South property. Twenty-two tests were excavated at 50 m (164 ft) intervals, and 27 were excavated at 100 m (328 ft) intervals or judgmentally placed (Figure 5.1). As a result of these investigations, no archaeological sites were discovered.

The general stratigraphy within the Carriage Pointe South project area consisted of 0-20 cm (0-8 in) gray sand, 20-50 cm (8-20 in) light gray sand, 50-60 cm (20-24 in) dark brown hardpan, and 60-100 cm (24-40 in) light brown sand. Water was encountered in all of the shovel tests between 30 and 50 cm.

5.2 Historical/Architectural Survey Results

Background research revealed a low potential for historic resources on the tract. As a result of the historic structures survey, no historic structures were identified.

5.3 Recommendations

It is the opinion of ACI that development of the Carriage Pointe South property will have no effect on any archaeological sites or historic resources that are listed, determined eligible, or considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP, or otherwise of historical or archaeological value. No further work is recommended.
Figure 5.1. Approximate location of the shovel tests (not to scale) within the project area (ESRI 2013a - Basemap: Transportation and Imagery).
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APPENDIX A: SHPO Correspondence
Southwest Florida Water Management District
2379 Broad Street
Brooksville, FL 34604-6899

Re: DHR Project File No.: 2013-3621
    Received by DHR: July 3, 2013
    Application No.: 683621
    Applicant: Carriage Pointe Partners LLC
    Project: Carriage Pointe South Ekker Road Extension
    County: Hillsborough

August 27, 2013

To Whom It May Concern:

Our office received and reviewed the referenced project in accordance with Chapters 267 and 373, Florida Statutes, Florida’s Coastal Management Program, and implementing state regulations, for possible impact to historic properties listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register of Historic Places, or otherwise of historical, architectural, or archaeological value.

The project area has not been subjected to a systematic professional archaeological or historical investigation and contains environmental conditions consistent with those found at other archaeological sites in Hillsborough County. For these reasons, it is the recommendation of this office that the project area be subjected to a professional cultural resource survey prior to any ground disturbing activities.

The purpose of the survey will be to locate and assess any cultural resources that may be present. The resultant survey report must conform to the specification set forth in Chapter 1A-46, Florida Administrative Code, and will need to be forwarded to The Division of Historical Resources, in order to complete the reviewing process for this proposed project and its impacts. The results of the analysis will determine if significant cultural resources would be disturbed by the project activities. In addition, if significant remains are located, the data described in the report(s) and the consultant’s conclusions will assist this office in determining measures that must be taken to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse impacts to archaeological sites and historical properties listed, or eligible for listing in the NRHP, or otherwise significant.
Because this letter and its contents are a matter of public record, archaeological consultants who have knowledge of our recommendations may contact the applicant or their agent. This should in no way be interpreted as an endorsement by this agency. The Division of Historical Resources does not maintain a list of professional archaeologists who are qualified to work in the State of Florida and/or who meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for federally involved archeological projects as specified in 36 CFR 61 (see Federal Register: June 20, 1997 (Volume 62, Number 119, pages 33707-3372). However, the American Cultural Resources Association (ACRA) maintains a listing of professional consultants at www.acra-crm.org. In addition, the Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA) maintains a membership directory that may be useful in locating professional archaeologists and other professional preservation consultants in your area (www.rpanet.org).

Many qualified historic preservation professionals are not members of these organizations, and omission from the directories does not imply that someone does not meet the Secretary's Standards or that the resultant work would not be acceptable. Conversely, inclusion on the list is no guarantee that an archaeologist's work will automatically be acceptable. As with any contractor references and recent work history should be requested.

For any questions concerning our comments, please contact Sarah Liko, Historic Sites Specialist, at 850.245.6333, or by electronic mail at Sarah.Liko@dos.myflorida.com. We appreciate your continued interest in protecting Florida's historic properties.

Sincerely,

Robert F. Bendus, Director
Division of Historical Resources
and State Historic Preservation Officer

Pc: Mary Robin Thiele
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