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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A desktop analysis of the Harvest Grove property in Hillsborough County was conducted by Archaeological Consultants, Inc. (ACI) on behalf of Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. This study, conducted as due diligence, included an identification and description of all known archaeological sites and historic resources located within or adjacent to the property, as well as a discussion of potential archaeologically sensitive areas. In addition to background research, an archaeological field reconnaissance was performed. The initial research indicated that one archaeological site, 8HI11445, is located within the Harvest Grove property and a second recorded site, 8HI62, is adjacent. 8HI11445, the Fort Sullivan Site, is a nineteenth century fort with insufficient archaeological data. The Florida State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) has not evaluated this site in terms of the eligibility criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). 8HI62 is recorded as a prehistoric sand mound. It similarly has insufficient information, and was not evaluated by the SHPO. Eight other archaeological sites have been recorded within one mile of the Harvest Grove property. Based upon the results of research and field reconnaissance, selected portions of the property are considered to have a high to moderate potential for archaeological site occurrence. There is also one standing structure that is historic (50 years of age or older). A systematic professional archaeological and historical survey is therefore recommended.

INTRODUCTION

The 1008-acre Harvest Grove property is located in Sections 2, 11, and 14 of Township 28 South, Range 22 East in Plant City, Hillsborough County (USGS 1975). It is north of I-4, due south of Knights Griffin Road, east of Wilder Road, and due west of Charlie Taylor Road (Figure 1). The land is currently in agricultural use.

In general, the property is nearly level to gently sloping, with elevations ranging from approximately 100 to 140 feet (ft) above mean sea level (amsl) (USGS 1975). The local soil association is Myakka-Basinger-Holopaw, which is characterized by nearly level, poorly and very poorly drained sandy soils. Table 1 lists the specific soil types within the project area and their relief and drainage, and environmental association (USDA 1989). The majority of soils are poorly drained types associated with a native flatwoods community. The better drained soils are found within the relatively elevated lands, which, like the wetland areas, are scattered throughout the property.
Figure 1. Location of the Harvest Groves project area, Hillsborough County (ESRI 2013 - Streets).
Table 1. Soil types present within the Harvest Grove property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Type</th>
<th>Relief &amp; Drainage</th>
<th>Environmental Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamsville fine sand</td>
<td>Nearly level, somewhat poorly drained</td>
<td>Broad ridges on the flatwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basinger, Holopaw and Samsula soils, depressional</td>
<td>Nearly level, very poorly drained</td>
<td>Swamps and depressions on the flatwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Meade loamy fine sand, 0-5% slopes</td>
<td>Nearly level to gently sloping, well drained</td>
<td>Uplands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville loamy fine sand, 0-5% slopes</td>
<td>Nearly level to gently sloping, well drained</td>
<td>Uplands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesson muck, frequently flooded</td>
<td>Level, very poorly drained</td>
<td>Tidal swamps and marshes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake fine sand, 0-5% slopes</td>
<td>Nearly level to gently sloping, excessively drained</td>
<td>Uplands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malabar fine sand</td>
<td>Nearly level, poorly drained</td>
<td>Low-lying sloughs and shallow depressions on the flatwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myakka fine sand</td>
<td>Nearly level, poorly drained</td>
<td>Broad plains on the flatwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ona fine sand</td>
<td>Nearly level, poorly drained</td>
<td>Broad plains on the flatwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando fine sand, 0-5% slopes</td>
<td>Nearly level to gently sloping, well drained</td>
<td>Uplands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomello fine sand, 0-5% slopes</td>
<td>Nearly level to gently sloping, moderately well drained</td>
<td>Low ridges on the flatwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seffner fine sand</td>
<td>Nearly level, somewhat poorly drained</td>
<td>Rims of depressions and on broad, low ridges on the flatwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyrna fine sand</td>
<td>Nearly level, poorly drained</td>
<td>Broad, low-lying, convex swells on the flatwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns fine sand</td>
<td>Nearly level, poorly drained</td>
<td>Low-lying plains on the flatwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavares-Millhopper fine sands, 0-5% slopes</td>
<td>Level to gently sloping, moderately well drained</td>
<td>Low-lying areas on the uplands and on low ridges on the flatwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zolfo fine sand</td>
<td>Nearly level, somewhat poorly drained</td>
<td>Broad, low ridges on the flatwoods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

A review of pertinent archaeological and historical literature, records, and other documents and data pertaining to the general area of the Harvest Grove property was conducted. The focus of this desktop analysis was to ascertain the types of cultural resources known within and near the property, as well as the potential for the occurrence of as yet unrecorded resources. Research included a review of sites listed in the NRHP and the Florida Master Site File (FMSF; April 2014 GIS update), plus an examination of USDA soil survey information (USDA 1952, 1989), the nineteenth century federal surveyor’s plat map and field notes, tract book records, regional prehistories and site location predictive models (Austin 2001; de Montmollin 1983; Deming 1980; Janus Research 2004), and relevant historical accounts, cultural resource assessment survey reports, and manuscripts.
Recorded Archaeological Sites: A review of the FMSF indicated that one previously recorded historic period archaeological site, 8HI11445, is located within the Harvest Grove property. A second site, 8HI62, is adjacent on the east side of Charlie Taylor Road. Eight other sites have been recorded within approximately one mile (Table 2; Figure 2). Most of the recorded sites are prehistoric artifact scatters; two sites have historic period components. The local archaeological sites were recorded as a result of cultural resource assessment surveys of a segment of Interstate 4 (Janus Research/Piper Archaeology 1992), two borrow pits (Driscoll et al. 1996, 1997), and facilities owned by the Florida Gas Transmission Company (Athens and Donald 1993), among others (Table 3). Six of the total 10 sites were determined ineligible for listing in the NRHP by the SHPO; the other four were not evaluated.

Table 2. Previously recorded archaeological sites within approximately one mile of the Harvest Grove property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cultural Period</th>
<th>SHPO Eval. of NRHP Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8HI24</td>
<td>Mt. Enon</td>
<td>Prehistoric burial mound</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8HI62</td>
<td>(No name)</td>
<td>Prehistoric mound</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8HI5119</td>
<td>Helene</td>
<td>Artifact scatter-low density</td>
<td>Prehistoric lacking pottery</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8HI5120</td>
<td>Ursa Bonita</td>
<td>Artifact scatter-low density</td>
<td>Prehistoric lacking pottery</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8HI5121</td>
<td>Desiree Lynn</td>
<td>Artifact scatter-dense</td>
<td>Early Archaic; prehistoric lacking pottery</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8HI5384</td>
<td>Echepucassa</td>
<td>Seminole town; prehistoric campsite</td>
<td>American Acquisition/Territorial Development, 1821-1845; Seminole, 1716+; Archaic, 8500 BC-1000 BC</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8HI6266</td>
<td>B&amp;B Pit #23</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8HI6412</td>
<td>B&amp;B Pit #47</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8HI11445</td>
<td>Fort Sullivan</td>
<td>Historic fort</td>
<td>American Acquisition /Territorial Development, 1821-1845</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8HI12149</td>
<td>CS30-1</td>
<td>Artifact scatter-low density</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Green shading indicates sites located within or adjacent to the Harvest Grove property.*
Figure 2. Location of previously recorded archaeological sites and historic resources within one mile of the Harvest Grove property; Township 28 South, Range 22 East, Sections 2, 11, and 14; USGS Plant City East (National Geographic Society 2013 - USA Topo Maps).
Fort Sullivan (8HI11445) was recorded by Richard Estabrook of the Florida Public Archaeology Network (FPAN) in September 2008. The site file data were derived from archival research; no site visit was made and no archaeological testing was conducted. This Second Seminole War fort was established on January 20, 1839, and decommissioned less than one year later on November 5, 1839. It was one in a line of forts between Fort Brooke (Tampa) and Fort Mellon (Sanford) constructed under the direction of General Zachary Taylor to provide protection to the settlers against Indian raids. Originally known as “Fort Hickapusassa,” the installation was garrisoned by Company G of the Third Artillery under the command of Captain Hezekiah Garner. Although constructed as part of the general plan to capture or defeat the Seminoles, the men at Fort Sullivan did not engage in a single battle. After the fort was decommissioned, the troops transferred to Fort Brooke (Bruton and Bailey 1984:20; Covington 1975:2-3).

According to a sketch and description of the fort provided by Lieutenant W.A. Brown of the Third Artillery in August 1839, the fort was comprised of a “pine picketing
110 feet square with two block houses at diagonal corners [constructed of limestone] and store houses at the extremity of the other diagonal.” It was “situated in the centre of a small pine barren, encompassed with wet and dry marsh and small hammocks” (G.A.R.I. n.d.). The sketch map depicted attached stables, two large gardens, and a nearby well. The road from Fort Brooke to Fort Mellon was adjacent at the north. As recorded, 8HI11445 is located in an improved pasture in the southeast quarter of Section 2, west of Charlie Taylor Road. This location has never been verified through archaeological field survey. The NRHP eligibility of 8HI11445 has not been determined by the SHPO.

**8HI62** was recorded by William Plowden in May 1952 as a sand mound measuring 30 ft by 30 ft by 5 ft. It was located in a pasture on the edge of Wiggins Prairie on the east side of SR 17 (now Charlie Taylor Road). No other descriptive information is provided on the FMSF form, and the site location is plotted “per vague verbal description;” the exact location of the mound is unknown. The NRHP eligibility of 8HI62 has not been determined by the SHPO.

**Archaeological Predictive Model:** On the basis of regional survey data (cf., Austin 2001; de Montmollin 1983; Deming 1980; Janus Research 2004), informed expectations concerning the types of sites expected to occur within the project area, as well as their likely environmental settings, could be generated. As archaeologists have long realized, aboriginal populations did not select their habitation sites and special 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 archaeological sites are most often located near a permanent or semi-permanent source of potable water. In addition, prehistoric 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.

In general, comparative site location data for Hillsborough County 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 the pine flatwoods, sites tend to be situated on ridges and knolls near a freshwater source. Most are associated with swamp-creek hammocks. It should be noted that this settlement pattern could not be applied to sites of the Paleo-Indian and Early Archaic periods, which precede the onset of modern environmental conditions. Most of the previously recorded archaeological sites in the general vicinity of the project area can be described as artifact scatters characterized by small areal extents and variable density. These types of 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 comprises the site assemblages.

The potential for yet unrecorded historic period archaeological sites was also assessed. Deputy Surveyor A.M. Randolph’s 1845 plat map of Township 28 South, Range 22 East (Figure 3) depicts the old Fort Brooke to Fort Mellon Road crossing
Figure 3. 1845 Federal Surveyor’s Plat of Township 28 South, Range 22 East showing the location of Fort Sullivan, the Road to Fort Mellon, and the Hollingsworth homestead (Permit No. 652).
through the southern half of Section 2. Fort Sullivan and the homestead of Stephen Hollingsworth (Permit No. 652) are also depicted in the southeast quarter of Section 2. Randolph’s plat map also shows the Seminole town of Echebusassa in the center of Section 15, to the west of today’s Harvest Grove property. In his notes, Randolph wrote, “This Township contains the Indian old town of Echebusassa (many pipes) the remains of which are still distinct and numerous” (State of Florida 1843:401). Previously, W.A. Brown’s notes accompanying his 1839 sketch of Fort Sullivan stated: “the remains of two or three Indian villages, about two miles from the fort in a south-westerly direction and one close to the fort; these are supposed to have been deserted about two years since” (G.A.R.I. n.d.). Echepucsassa (8H15384) was recorded in 1993 as the result of the Seminole Heritage Survey of Seminole Sites (AHC 1993). It was recorded based upon the recovery of lithics, historic glass, European ceramics, and a bone knife handle (AHC1993:153).

Stephen Hollingsworth was granted a 160-acre homestead in Section 2 under the conditions of the Armed Occupation Act. This Act, passed by Congress in 1842, stipulated that any family or single man over 18 years of age 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 1961:48). In addition to Stephen Hollingsworth, three other homesteads were granted in Township 28 South, Range 22 East: Hollingsworth’s son John Henry Hollingsworth (Section 17), his son-in-law Samuel Rodgers (Section 10), and Rigdon Brown (Section 9) (Bruton and Bailey 1984:27). All were situated along the Fort Brooke to Fort Mellon Road. Sometime after 1850, Hollingsworth moved to Polk County, where he died in 1870 (Bruton and Bailey 1984:28).

Given the historic activity associated with the project area and vicinity, including Fort Sullivan, the Fort Mellon Road and the 19th century Hollingsworth homestead (Figure 3), and the proximity of the Seminole town of Echepucassa (1830s), on the basis of background research, the Harvest Grove property was considered to have a moderate potential for archaeological sites of the historic period.

FIELD RECONNAISSANCE

Archaeological field reconnaissance, conducted on June 19, 2014, served to ground-truth the preliminary predictive model formulated as the result of background research. As a result, selected portions of the Harvest Grove property were considered to have a high (HPZ) or moderate (MPZ) probability for prehistoric and historic site occurrence. The locations of these probability zones are shown in Figure 4; photographs of each (Photos 1 through 7) follow.
Figure 4. Location of High (HPZ-yellow) and Moderate (MPZ-purple) archaeological probability zones within the Harvest Grove property (National Geographic Society 2013 - USA Topo Maps).
Photo 1. General view of the upland area within the plotted location of Fort Sullivan, 8H111445, (“HPZ A”) looking north.

Photo 2. “HPZ B” near intersection of Midway Road and Charlie Taylor Road, looking south.
Photo 3. Small upland area immediately south of Midway Road and west of a pond ("HPZ C"), looking west.

Photo 4. Elevated land south of a large wetland ("HPZ D"), looking east.
Photo 5. Elevated area surrounded by wetlands in Section 14 (“MPZ E”), looking north.

Photo 6. Elevated area adjacent to wetlands (“MPZ F”), looking east.
Other potential probability zones were visited and found to have a generally low site location potential. These included the area due west of the recorded location of 8HI62 in Section 14 (Photo 8), and the general vicinity of the Fort Brooke to Fort Mellon Road in Section 2 (Photo 9).

Photo 7. Elevated area due west of Charlie Taylor Road (“HPZ G”), looking north.

Photo 8. Looking north at the area directly west of Charlie Taylor Road, near 8HI62.
Photo 9. Approximate location of the Fort Brooke to Fort Mellon Road in Section 2, looking west.

In addition to the identification of archaeological probability zones, field reconnaissance indicated one historic (50 years of age or older) structure within the Harvest Grove property (Photo 10).

Photo 10. Unrecorded historic structure located within the Harvest Grove property.
CONCLUSIONS

Background research indicated that one previously recorded archaeological site, Fort Sullivan (8HI11445), is located within the Harvest Grove property. A second site, 8HI62, may be adjacent. Since neither site has ever been subjected to field survey, their exact locations are unknown at this time. Archaeological field reconnaissance, conducted on June 19, 2014, served to ground-truth the preliminary predictive model formulated as the result of background research. As a result, seven areas within the Harvest Grove property were considered to have a high or moderate potential for prehistoric and historic site occurrence. The most archaeologically sensitive area lies within the southeast quarter of Section 2 where Fort Sullivan and the Stephen Hollingsworth homestead were located. Systematic archaeological field survey is recommended for all high and moderate zones, in accordance with the standards promulgated by the Florida Division of Historical Resources. A sample of the non-wetland remainder of the property should also be subjected to ground surface reconnaissance and limited subsurface testing. In addition, there is one historic structure which will require recordation and evaluation.
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