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BACKGROUND

National Register nominations prepared by Robert J. Austin for Cultural Resources Consulting have been submitted to the Bureau of Historic Preservation, Florida Department of State, representing both a Multiple Property Listing (Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula, Florida, Appendix A) and the following archaeological sites located within, and owned by, the City of St. Petersburg:

- Abercrombie Park Site Complex (Appendix B),
- Jungle Prada Site Complex (Appendix C),
- Maximo Beach (Appendix D), and
- Princess Mound (Appendix E).

According to procedures established by the National Historic Preservation Act, before a property within the jurisdiction of the Certified Local Government, such as St. Petersburg, may be considered by the State for nomination to the National Register, the local preservation commission and chief local elected official shall have the opportunity to comment. Within sixty days of the notice from the SHPO, the City shall submit a report as to whether the property meets the eligibility criteria and the recommendation of the commission and local elected official.

A Multiple Property Listing (MPL) establishes Historic Contexts, Associated Property Types, and other information on data collection and evaluation methods. Within an MPL, individual resources are then listed. The uniting theme of the Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula, Florida MPL is “Living on the Coast: From Prehistory to the Dawn of the Modern Era.”

Although the boundaries may differ slightly, Abercrombie Park Site Complex, Maximo Beach, and Princess Mound have been documented locally as “archaeological areas,” and all four sites have a classification of Archaeological Sensitivity presently in place. The additional National Register designation will provide an important aspect of recognition of the sites’ historic significance, and the nominations provide valuable information to the study of the region’s early history.

OVERVIEW OF THE PROCESS

Section 16.30.070.2.4 of the Historic and Archaeological Preservation Overlay of the Land Development Regulations (LDRs) outlines the application and approval procedure for nominations of a resource to the National Register of Historic Places. The Certified Local Government Guidelines for Florida require the Community Planning and Preservation Commission’s (CPPC) involvement in the process for nominating properties to the National Register of Historic Places. These responsibilities include rendering an opinion on the technical completeness of the proposed nomination as well as assessing the proposal’s eligibility for inclusion in the Register. Criteria for determining technical completeness include an adequate physical description of the property, historical overview of the city in which the property is located and its placement within the context of that history, demonstration that the property is significant under one of the four criteria used by the National Park Service (NPS) and evidence the property retains its integrity as specified by the standards used by the NPS.

As part of this process, the property owner, the Mayor of St. Petersburg, and the Chair of the Pinellas County Commission have the opportunity to voice support or opposition to the proposed nomination request. The CPPC shall forward to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) its action on the nomination and the recommendations of the local officials within 60 days of the mailing of the application from the SHPO.
If either the CPPC, the Mayor, or the Chair of the Pinellas County Commission, support the nomination, the SHPO will schedule the proposal for consideration by the Florida National Register Review Board at its next regular meeting. If both the CPPC and the chief local elected official recommend the property not be nominated to the National Register, then the SHPO will take no further action unless an appeal is filed with the State.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEWING NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

To be listed in the National Register of Historic Places, a resource must be significant under the National Register criteria and retain its integrity. Significance may be found in one of four aspects of American history recognized by the National Register Criteria:

- Criterion A – Association with historic events or activities,
- Criterion B – Association with important persons,
- Criterion C – Distinctive design or physical characteristics,
- Criterion D – Potential to provide important information about prehistory or history.

The Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula, Florida MPL and the four associated sites being considered herein are found to be significant under Criterion D and, in the case of the Abercrombie Park Site Complex, Jungle Prada Site Complex, and Maximo Beach, Criterion A.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Community Planning and Preservation Commission approve the attached letter of support for listing the Archeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula, Florida, Abercrombie Park Site Complex, Jungle Prada Site Complex, Maximo Beach, and Princess Mound in the National Register of Historic Places (Appendix F).
Appendix A:
National Register of Historic Places Registration Form:
Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula, Florida
United States Department of the Interior

National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form

This form is used for documenting property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form (formerly 16B). Complete each item by entering the requested information.

___X___ New Submission __________ Amended Submission

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing
Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula, Florida

B. Associated Historic Contexts
(Name each associated historic context, identifying theme, geographical area, and chronological period for each.)

Historic Contexts:
Late Archaic, 3000-500 BC
Early Manasota, 500 BC-AD 300
Late Manasota/Weeden Island, AD 300-900
Safety Harbor, AD 900-1725
First Spanish, AD 1513-1763
Second Spanish, AD 1783-1821
Pioneer, AD 1821-1888

Theme:
Living on the Coast: From Prehistory to the Dawn of the Modern Era

C. Form Prepared by:
name/title: Robert J. Austin
organization: Cultural Resources Consulting
street & number: 7224 Alafia Ridge Loop
city or town: Riverview state: FL zip code: 33569
e-mail: roc_doc@verizon.net
telephone: 813-205-9847 date: 5/13/2019
D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR 60 and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation.

__________________________________________  ___________________________________________  ________________________________
Signature of certifying official  Title  Date

__________________________________________
State or Federal Agency or Tribal government

I hereby certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

__________________________________________
Signature of the Keeper  Date of Action
United States Department of the Interior

National Park Service

Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula, Florida

Name of Multiple Property Listing

Florida

State

Table of Contents for Written Narrative

Create a Table of Contents and list the page numbers for each of these sections in the space below.

Provide narrative explanations for each of these sections on continuation sheets. In the header of each section, cite the letter, page number, and name of the multiple property listing. Refer to How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form for additional guidance.

Page Numbers

E. Statement of Historic Contexts 4

F. Associated Property Types 16

G. Geographical Data 25

H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods 26

I. Major Bibliographical References 28

J. List of Figures 37

K. List of Tables 37
E. Statement of Historic Contexts

(If more than one historic context is documented, present them in sequential order.)

1) INTRODUCTION

The City of St. Petersburg, Florida occupies the lower (southern) portion of Pinellas County, a peninsula bounded by Tampa Bay on the east and the Gulf of Mexico on the west. Within the city limits are numerous recorded archaeological sites, including four that are located within the City’s park system (Figure 1). The four sites contain components that range in age from the Late Archaic Period (ca. 3000-500 B.C.) through the region’s Pioneer Period (AD 1821-1888). All four contain dense midden deposits and shell mounds, and most have evidence of preceramic Archaic occupations underlying their middens (Table 1). One site also contains archaeological evidence of contact with Spanish explorers during the First Spanish Period (Jungle Prada), another (Maximo Beach) contains archaeological evidence of a First Spanish Period fishing rancho and a mid-nineteenth century rancho and homestead, and the fourth (Abercrombie Park) contains evidence of an early pioneer homestead.

The theme on which this multiple property listing (MPL) is based is “Living on the Coast: From Prehistory to the Dawn of the Modern Era.” The time depth represented at the four sites included in this nomination, as well as the quantity and quality of archaeological and paleoecological data classes, provides an excellent data base for the study of the environmental, social, and economic factors that influenced the development of native coastal communities in the Tampa Bay region, the impact of European contact on these communities during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and their eventual replacement by Euroamerican fishermen and pioneers in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The theme is sufficiently narrow enough to focus research on topics that are best addressed by archaeological data, and yet is broad enough to encompass a variety of research approaches. For prehistoric sites research topics related to the overall theme might include aspects of settlement pattern, resource exploitation, subsistence, seasonality, technology, or trade networks and how these influenced the development of native societies on the peninsula. For the historic periods, the effects of European contact on native peoples, including the destruction of political and cultural institutions, the abandonment of the region and eventual replacement by Spanish fishermen and Seminole Indians, and the initial pioneering efforts by white settlers are all viable research topics. For all sites and periods, the relationship between humans and their environment, particularly in a coastal setting, is a subject of interest to archaeologists, historians, and environmental scientists.

2) DESCRIPTION OF HISTORIC CONTEXTS

Current evidence indicates that the first inhabitants of Florida arrived approximately 14,500 years ago during the Paleoindian Period (Halligan et al. 2016). While artifacts dating to these periods are sometimes found along Pinellas County shorelines, in fill dredged from Tampa Bay and Boca Ciega Bay, or occasionally as surface finds or in surveys conducted prior to development, no intact sites of these periods have been documented so far within the boundaries of the sites included in this MPL. Consequently, this description of historic contexts begins with the Late Archaic Period. Before discussing these contexts, it is necessary to briefly review the paleoenvironment of Florida since changes in climate and sea levels through time have greatly affected coastal populations.
a) **Paleoenvironmental Context**

At the end of the Pleistocene glacial maximum, ~18,000 years ago, sea level was ~120 meters lower than today and the climate may have been as much as 8° to 10° cooler. The Florida peninsula was nearly twice as large, particularly on its Gulf side where the continental shelf is much shallower than on the Atlantic coast. As the glaciers began to melt, sea levels rose rapidly until about 8000 BP when the rate of rise began to slow. Pollen evidence from Florida lakes combined with data from deep sea cores (Grimm et al. 1993; Watts et al. 1996) suggest variable wet and dry conditions during this time with drought and major cooling event at about 12,500 cal BP (Dunbar 2016).

Since approximately 6500 BP sea level has risen gradually and by 4000 BP the climate, water levels, and plant communities of Florida attained essentially modern conditions, although multidecadal- and century-scale variability did occur (Mayewski et al. 2004; Poore 2008; Soto 2005). A cool, dry event between 4200 to 3800 BP followed by a period of extreme aridity between 3500 and 2500 BP has been postulated based on the global climate record. These climatic events are found in the global climate record at temporally equivalent periods, but their local effects were variable and, for Florida, not well understood (Poore 2008). However, archaeological evidence from sites along the central and southwestern Gulf coast indicate that people there were exploiting marine resources intensively during this time (Braley 1978; Marquardt 1999; Russo 1991; Williams 1979). The rate of sea-level rise also slowed and many of the barrier islands around the Gulf began to form near their present position (Davis et al. 2003; Stapor et al. 1991).

Several studies have provided evidence of fluctuating sea-level stands during the past 3000 years (summarized in Walker 2013). Karen Walker (2013) has reviewed the climatic history and sea level data in southwest Florida and developed a chronology of paleoenvironmental events that informed her and colleague William Marquardt’s interpretation of the archaeological deposits at Pineland in Lee County. Using data from the Gulf of Mexico, the Florida Straits, the Sargasso Sea, West Africa, and Chesapeake Bay, among others, she concluded that between AD 1 and AD 500 the greater North Atlantic region including southwest Florida was characterized by a warm climate and a raised sea level of perhaps as much as 1.2 to 2 meters above modern (twentieth-century) levels. During this period, both climate and sea levels varied slightly, with short-term perturbations characterized by cooler climate and lower sea levels. While noting that there are no good data on precipitation in Florida during this period, she suggests that warmer sea surface temperatures may have contributed to more frequent and/or severe storms (Walker 2013:39).

The period from AD 550-850 was characterized by cool climate and lowered sea levels (Buck Key Low) associated with the Vandal Minimum climatic event, although again fluctuations in both occurred (Walker 2013:39-41). The cooler climate may have been caused by dust and ash from frequent volcanic eruptions, several of which have been documented for the period in question. Sea levels may have reached as low as 1.2 to 2 meters below the modern mean. A return to a warm climate punctuated by short-term cooling events is believed to have characterized the period from AD 850-1200, a time span referred to as the Medieval Warm Period (Walker 2013:41-42). Sea levels rose to near modern levels, the La Costa High, and evidence of more frequent storms is present at sites in southwest Florida (Walker 2013:42). Finally, the period from AD 1200-1850 is known as the Little Ice Age due to cooler temperatures, glacial advances, and lower sea levels. In
southwest Florida, sea levels are believed to have dropped to 0.6 to 0.3 m below the modern mean beginning around AD 1450. Walker (2013:42) refers to this lowstand as the Sanibel II Low.

Around Tampa Bay and along the southwest coast, evidence of human populations abandoning or moving their settlements in response to the position of the habitable shoreline as sea level fluctuated has been documented at several archaeological sites (Austin et al. 2014; Schwadron 2002; Marquardt and Walker 2013). Figure 2 compares these climatic events with sea level fluctuations over the last 3000 radiocarbon years.

b) Late Archaic Period, 3000-500 BC

The Late Archaic period in Florida spanned a 2500-year period between approximately 5000 and 2500 BP (~3000-500 BC). The period is divided into pre-ceramic and ceramic subperiods, with the latter occurring at around 4600 BP with the development of fiber-tempered pottery (Milanich 1994:88). Referred to as Orange pottery by archaeologists, this early ceramic ware was tempered with vegetal fibers, either thin strands of palmetto or Spanish moss (Bullen 1972). Late Archaic people appear to have practiced a hunting, fishing, and gathering lifestyle with an emphasis on the exploitation of aquatic resources. The central and northern Atlantic coast and the St. Johns River were major centers of Late Archaic Orange-period populations, and fiber-tempered pottery is often found in large marine or freshwater shell middens. Elsewhere, fiber-tempered pottery, while present, is not as abundant, nor are the sites typically as large.

Ripley Bullen (1959, 1971) used the term Transitional to refer to the terminal ceramic Archaic (3200–2500 BP; 1200-500 BC), a period during which he believed Late Archaic people were abandoning fiber-tempered pottery and were beginning to adopt the regional ceramic traditions that would come to characterize the succeeding Woodland period throughout Florida. In the central Gulf Coast region, sites of the Transitional period were believed to be characterized by ceramic wares that contained sand and fiber as tempering agents (sometimes referred to as semi-fiber-tempered pottery or Norwood) as well as limestone-tempered pottery and spiculate-paste pottery with incised surface decorations (Perico Incised and St. Johns Incised) similar to those found on some earlier Orange-period vessels in northeast Florida. Three different projectile point styles -- basally notched, corner-notched, and stemmed -- all occur in relatively contemporaneous deposits. This profusion of ceramic and tool traditions suggested population movement and social interaction between culture areas. The Transitional period also was thought to have seen the first attempts at horticulture (Milanich and Fairbanks 1980:61). However, the term fell out of favor when it became clear that sand-and-fiber-tempered pottery was not the chronological marker it was once believed to be, making it difficult to distinguish a distinct Transitional component from components dating to the preceding Orange period (Milanich 1994:88). In addition, social interaction, regional exchange, and limited horticulture all have been shown to have longer histories than previously believed (Sassaman 2010).

Recently, Russo (2010:153) has suggested reinstating the Transitional designation for the period beginning around 3500 BP based on material culture differences with the preceding Late Archaic, a cessation in the construction and use of public architecture (i.e., shell rings, burial mounds), and a possible reduction in population. It has been hypothesized that a lowering of sea levels may have contributed to these changes in the coastal Southeast (Thomas 2010). Lower sea levels would also have affected the potentiometric surface of the
Floridan aquifer, reducing spring flow and water levels in lakes and river, and negatively impacting productive wetland environments.

In the Tampa Bay region, the Orange and Transitional periods are not well understood despite the fact that several sites with such components have been excavated. These include Maximo Beach (8PI31), Bay Pines (8PI64), and Canton Street (8PI55) in Pinellas County and the West Williams site (8HI509) in Hillsborough County (Austin et al. 2004; Braley 1978; Bullen et al. 1978; Williams 1979). Large, dense shell midden sites and redeposited lithic sites are found in coastal locations, with the latter sites having been dredged up from offshore locations, suggesting that major living areas of this time period were along a coastline that may now be partially inundated by higher sea levels (e.g., Goodyear 1968; Warren 1962, 1968). Sites containing basally notched and corner-notched projectile points and/or sand-and-fiber-tempered pottery also are found in the interior uplands of Pinellas, Hillsborough, and Manatee counties, these appear to consist of small, short-term, and possibly seasonal encampments where native peoples exploited deer, alligator, turtles, and freshwater fish (e.g., Austin et al. 2009). Beyond basic subsistence and technology data, however, the lifeways and societies of Late Archaic/Transitional people in the Tampa Bay region, including relationships between coastal and interior sites, remain unclear, in part, to a lack of well-dated deposits and problem-oriented excavations.

The Late Archaic/Transitional period also is noteworthy in that it appears to have been a period during which mortuary customs on Florida’s west coast were changing from interment in ponds and sloughs to interment on dry land. Burials in wetland environments was a common practice across the central peninsula beginning as early as 7000 cal BC at Windover Pond in Brevard County (Doran 2002) and was particularly common between about 5000 and 3000 BC (e.g., Beriault et al. 1981; Clausen et al. 1979; Wharton et al. 1981). Although some dry land burials are known for this long time period (e.g., Tick Island [Aten 1996] and Gauthier [Carr and Jones 1981; Sigler-Eisenberg et al. 1985]), by the end of the Transitional period the use of wetland cemeteries had all but ceased on Florida’s west coast. Burial in the ground, i.e., in sand dunes and shell middens, became the common mode of interment during the subsequent Manasota period (Austin et al. 1992:165-180, 2018; Koski et al. 2017; Luer and Almy 1982).

**c) Early Manasota Period, 500 BC-AD 300**

The Manasota culture and period were defined by Luer and Almy (1979, 1982) who suggested an inception date for this culture of about 500 BC. It was defined in part by a coastal adaptation, a technological reliance on bone and shell, the use of plain, undecorated, utilitarian ceramics, and the interment of the dead in shell middens particularly during the Early Manasota period (Luer and Almy 1982:39-49). Manasota people occupied the shoreline along the Gulf, bays, and estuaries of the coastal strand as well as off-shore barrier islands. Non-coastal sites of the Manasota culture were defined as those located within 30 km of the coastline and assigned the label “inland-from-the-shore” to differentiate them from “interior” sites of the central uplands. These “inland-from-the-shore” sites typically consist of small scatters of ceramics, lithics, and occasionally marine shell in pine flatwoods or scrub habitats near rivers, streams, and bayheads. They are presumed to be seasonal encampments used by coastal populations to exploit non-coastal resources (Luer and Almy 1982:43).
Analysis of faunal remains from controlled excavations at Manasota sites such as Catfish Creek, Old Oak, and Roberts Bay in Sarasota County (Austin and Russo 1989; Luer 1977a, 1977b), Yat Kitischee in Pinellas County (Vojnovski 1995), and the Remnant Mound and Perico Island in Manatee County (DuChemin 2018; Quitmyer 2002) shows that the Manasota subsistence economy was primarily marine oriented but was augmented by terrestrial mammals and reptiles, and plants such as pokeberry, possible cheno-ams, sugarberry, prickly pear cactus, saw palmetto, hickory nuts, and acorns (Austin et al. 2018; Ruhl 2002).

The use of marine shell and animal bone for tools and utensils was well developed. A wide variety of wood working implements, hammers, awls, cups, dippers, and beads were manufactured from gastropod shells (e.g., lightning whelk, fighting conch, crown conch, horse conch) while bivalves (e.g., quahog or hard clam, sunray venus, ponderous ark) were used for anvils, digging implements, net weights, knives, and scrapers. Mammal bone was used to make pins, awls, composite fish hooks, and net mesh gauges. Chipped stone is usually rare at Manasota sites south of Tampa Bay because of the relative absence of chert outcrops, but in the Pinellas County area chert tools are more common because of nearby exposures of knappable stone.

Early Manasota people buried their dead in village shell midden deposits or in nearby sand dunes (e.g., Austin 1992:29-32; Austin et al. 1992, 2008, 2018; Koski et al. 2017; Willey 1949:159-167). These are typically primary flexed interments although there is some evidence of the use of secondary bundle burials (Austin et al. 1992:153-156, 2018). Associated grave goods are few or nonexistent.

d) Late Manasota/Weeden Island Period, AD 300-900

Manasota people were not isolated from outside influences. Luer and Almy interpreted the use of burial mounds during the later Manasota period (i.e., post-AD 300) as representing the adoption of some of the burial customs associated with Weeden Island, a mortuary complex that began to emerge in southern Georgia, southern Alabama, and northern Florida at about this same time. The Weeden Island-related phase of Manasota is recognized in domestic sites by St. Johns Check Stamped pottery in village contexts and the inclusion of ornately decorated pottery in mortuary contexts (burial mounds). Important sites in the Tampa Bay area include Weeden Island (8PI1), Bayshore Homes (8PI41), the Safford Mound (8PI3), and the Thomas site (8HI1) (Austin et al. 2008; Bullen 1958; Bullen et al. 1970; Willey 1949:105-125).

The basic maritime way of life was fairly consistent throughout the Manasota period. The major difference between early and late Manasota is in the interment of the dead. Luer and Almy (1982:47) noted a change in burial customs with the interment of the dead in sand mounds beginning around AD 200-300. They also document an increasing use of secondary bundle burials during the late Manasota period (although recent research at the Perico Island site in Manatee County has documented secondary bundle interments in early non-mound contexts there [Austin et al. 2018]). Earlier mound burials were rarely accompanied by grave goods, but ornately decorated mortuary ceramics, some of non-local origin, began to be placed with the dead during late Manasota, a practice reflecting the influence of Weeden Island cultures farther north (e.g., Austin and Mitchem 2014:Table 5; Bullen et al. 1970; Willey 1949:110-111, 119-121).
e) Safety Harbor Period, AD 900-1725

The Safety Harbor culture developed out of the preceding Late Manasota/Weeden Island-related culture in the Central Peninsula Gulf Coast region of Florida around A.D. 900 (Mitchem 1989). Mitchem (1989) has identified four temporal phases of Safety Harbor – Englewood (AD 900-1100), Pinellas (AD 1100-1500), Tatham (1500-1567) and Bayview (1567-1725) – and five regional variants. Pinellas County falls within his Circum-Tampa Bay region, which also includes Hillsborough and southern Pasco counties as well as a small portion of Manatee County to the Manatee River. The other four regions are the Northern, Manasota, Interior, and Southern regions. The Circum-Tampa Bay region was the core area of Safety Harbor development. The type site at Safety Harbor (8PI2) is believed to be the paramount town of the Tocobaga, historic descendants of the prehistoric Safety Harbor people (Bullen 1978).

Safety Harbor sites in this region include nucleated villages usually containing a large platform mound with associated plaza, one or more burial mounds, and surrounding village middens. In addition, numerous smaller midden sites are present in outlying areas. These probably represent small “hamlets” or household clusters within a specific polity. Each polity was ruled by a cacique who lived at the town center. Caciques and their family members were buried in lineage mounds after their remains had been ritually cleaned and stored in a charnel house. Each town center probably represented a simple chiefdom, and although alliances were forged between local polities, they otherwise appear to have acted independently of one another (Milanich 1998:103-104).

There is no evidence that agriculture was practiced by Safety Harbor groups. Instead, the subsistence base of Safety Harbor people was one of fishing, gathering, and hunting, similar to their Manasota ancestors (e.g., Vojnovski 1998). Safety Harbor technology resembled that of the preceding Manasota period. Shell and bone were used extensively for tools and implements, stone was used to tip arrows and for microliths used in drilling shell. Domestic ceramics were mostly undecorated although notching of the rims is sometimes seen on individual vessels.

The nucleated villages, or town centers, containing a platform mound and plaza, ceramic jars and bottles, and decorative representations of human hands and maces on pottery are all suggestive of influences from the central and southern Mississippi Valley via intermediate groups in Alabama and north Florida (Mitchem 2012). Participation in shell trade, particularly lightning whelk and horse conch which were much sought after in the Midwest and interior Southeast for use in the manufacture of shell beads, may have been a proximate factor fostering an exchange of ideas and institutions from north to south (Mitchem 2012:181-185).

In addition to the Safety Harbor site, Safety Harbor components are present at Weeden Island (8PI1), Jungle Prada (8PI54), Maximo Point (8PI19), and Tierra Verde (8PI51) (Arthur et al. 2016; Bushnell 1962; Griffin and Bullen 1950; Simpson 1998; Sears 1958, 1967). Large platform mounds are present at Bayshore Homes (8PI41) and the Princess Mound (8PI108), but to date no firm artifactual or chronometric data are available to confirm a Safety Harbor association. The earlier presumed assumption of an exclusive association of platform mounds and plazas with late prehistoric, Mississippian societies has been shown to be invalid as this type of
mound architecture and village planning first appeared during the late Weeden Island period (Pluckhahn 2003; Pluckhahn and Thompson 2018).

Archaeological and documentary evidence indicate that several ethnic groups encountered by the Spanish around Tampa Bay, including the Tocobaga, the Pohoy, the Uzita, and the Mocoso, were the historic descendants of the prehistoric Safety Harbor people (Bullen 1978; Milanich 1995:71-77). Milanich (1994:198) has suggested that population density during the Safety Harbor period was greater than during the preceding Weeden Island period, and thus the level of political integration was probably more complex. Exactly how complex is not known precisely. Each of these groups may have represented a simple chiefdom. Although alliances were forged between local polities, they otherwise appear to have acted independently of one another (Milanich 1998:103-104). On the other hand, Escalante Fontenada’s 1575 account indicates that the Tocobaga cacique was the “head chief of that district towards the right side for the coming toward Havana” (True 1944:69 cited in Hann 2003:109). By the beginning of the seventeenth century, the Tocobaga may have been under the domain of the powerful Calusa, who were centered on Charlotte Harbor to the south (Hann 2003:120).

A group of Tocobaga are mentioned in Spanish documents living near the Wacissa River in north Florida in 1677 and Hann (2003:122) suggests that the dominance of the Calusa in Tampa Bay may have been a factor in their migration north. Although other Tampa Bay groups are mentioned in documents as late as 1738, it is unclear whether any significant number of Tocobaga remained in the area after the seventeenth century (Hann 2003:124, 132).

f) Early Spanish Period, AD 1513-1763

Spanish Contact in Tampa Bay

Juan Ponce de Leon explored Florida’s Atlantic coast in 1513, eventually rounding the southern tip of the peninsula to an area near Charlotte Harbor. Ponce de Leon returned in 1521 to the San Carlos Bay region where he intended to settle but once again found hostile natives (Gannon 1996). Although local legend and some historians contend that Pánfilo de Narváez landed in Pinellas County in 1528, and specifically in the area of the Jungle Prada (e.g., MacDougald 2018), research by Jerald Milanich and Charles Hudson (1993) suggests that he may have landed south of Tampa Bay and trekked inland and then north to the Appalachee Bay region. Hernando de Soto also landed on the west coast of Florida, in Tampa Bay near the mouth of the Little Manatee River. De Soto and some of his men left the Tampa Bay camp and headed northeast crossing the Alafia River (River of Mocoso). Archaeological sites associated with the de Soto expedition have been located in Hillsborough County (Milanich and Hudson 1993). Spanish beads recovered from the Jungle Prada site (8PI54) have been dated to the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries (Mitchem 1998) and some are probably related to the 1567 Pedro Menéndez de Avilés expedition to the native town of Tocobaga at Safety Harbor to establish a garrison and mission (Milanich 1995:157).

The source of the Narváez story lies in the narrative of Cabeza de Vaca, treasurer and high-sheriff of the Narváez expedition and one of only four survivors (Hodge and Lewis 1984:18-20). It was written in 1536 or 1537, eight years after the landing took place, and was not published until 1542. De Vaca’s description of the landing is very
brief. After sailing from Spain to explore and colonize lands north and east of Mexico around the Gulf, a storm drove Narváez’s fleet of five ships from Cuba north towards the coast of Florida.

We came in sight [of Florida] on Tuesday, the twelfth day of April, and sailed along the coast. On Holy Thursday we anchored near the shore in the mouth of a bay at the head of which we saw some houses or habitations of Indians.

On the same day [April 14, 1528] the comptroller, Alonzo Enríquez, landed on an island in the bay. He called to the Indians, who came and remained with him for some time; and in barter gave him fish and several pieces of venison. The day following, which was good Friday, the governor debarked with as many of the people as the boats he brought could contain. When we came to the buhíos, or houses that we had seen, we found them vacant and abandoned, the inhabitants having fled at night in their canoes. One of the buhíos was very large; it could hold more than three hundred persons. The others were smaller. We found a tinklet of gold among some fish nets.

The next day [April 16, 1528] the Governor raised ensigns to your Majesty, and took possession of the country in your royal name [Hodges and Lewis 1984:18-19].

The following day the Indians of the town came and spoke to us; but as we had no interpreter we could not understand what they meant. They made many signs and menaces, and appeared to say we must go away from the country. With this they left us and went off, offering no interruption.

The day following, the Governor resolved to make an incursion to explore the land, and see what it might contain...We took our way towards the north, until the hour of vespers, when we arrived at a very large bay that appeared to stretch far inland. We remained there that night, and the next day we returned to the place where were our ships and people [Hodges and Lewis 1984:20].

On the basis of this narrative, the landing site of Narváez has been interpreted to be somewhere on the Pinellas peninsula, west of Tampa Bay. However, there is little in de Vaca’s description that indicates a specific location. Several large archaeological sites are known to have existed along the southern and western shores of the Pinellas peninsula, including two at its southern tip (Princess Mound, 8PI108, and Maximo Point, 8PI19). Both of these had platform mounds that could have supported the large “house” described by de Vaca. However, only the large mound and midden complex at Jungle Prada has yielded Spanish artifacts, fueling speculation that this was the landing site. As discussed above, however, none of the Spanish artifacts recovered from the site date to the early sixteenth century. Instead, a mid-to-late sixteenth century through early seventeenth century time frame is indicated.

The most likely explanation for the presence of Spanish artifacts, particularly the beads, at Jungle Prada is the activities of Pedro Menéndez de Avilés in 1566 and 1567. Under a royal contract with King Phillip II of Spain, Menéndez set sail in June of 1565 to found a colony in Florida. Aware that the French also had an interest in Florida, and had already established a fort at the mouth of the St. Johns River in 1564, Menéndez was required by his contract to explore the Florida coast, establish two or three towns, and missionize the Indians. First, however,
he had to capture Fort Caroline, in northeast Florida near present-day St. Augustine, from the French. This he accomplished in September of 1565.

After establishing St. Augustine, Menéndez sailed to southwest Florida to establish a garrison and mission among the Calusa, first in 1566 and again in 1567. On his second trip he took with him Father Juan Rogel, a Jesuit priest, to begin the missionizing effort. On that same 1567 voyage, Menéndez sailed to the town of Tocobaga located at the present site of Safety Harbor on Old Tampa Bay, to establish a second garrison and mission (Milanich 1995:157; Hann 1991). Later that year Rogel visited Tocobaga to minister to the soldiers and Indians. The mission there lasted only six months. While there is no documentary evidence for direct contact with the 1567 expedition, contact with the mission and garrison either directly or indirectly via trade could explain the presence of the beads and European artifacts at Jungle Prada.

Another possibility for some of the Spanish artifacts is the salvaging of shipwrecked goods by local native peoples. During the sixteenth century, Spanish ships on route from Mexico to Spain were sometimes wrecked on the west coast of Florida. Native peoples living on the coast salvaged goods from the wrecked ships, which may have contributed to the power struggles between various native groups that are recorded in Spanish documents (Milanich 1995:74). Salvaging and trade were probably the two biggest contributors of European goods to the native economy.

Seminole Arrival
By the early eighteenth century, the native population of Florida was badly decimated by European diseases and inter-tribal warfare. Into this vacuum, Creek Indians from Georgia and Alabama (along with small numbers of Choctaw, Yuchi, and Shawnee) began to enter Florida, occupying the land formerly inhabited by native populations, further contributing to the disintegration of indigenous cultures. Groups of fugitive African-American slaves also immigrated to Florida with some settling in the Tampa Bay area in the 1810s (Brown 1990). The transplanted Creek Indians, along with free blacks and some survivors of native tribes, later became known collectively as the Seminoles (Weisman 1999). The Seminoles’ friendly manner toward escaped slaves angered the slave-holding border states, a factor that would eventually culminate in the Seminole Wars. While early Creek/Seminole towns were primarily in north Florida, the 1757 expedition of Don Francisco Maria Celi around Tampa Bay and the Hillsborough River encountered Indians carrying muskets who may have been Seminoles (Arsenault 1996:27).

g) Second Spanish Period, AD 1783-1821

At the conclusion of the Seven Years War between Spain and England in 1763, the British traded their recent conquest of Havana to Spain for the Florida peninsula. Britain took possession of Florida in July 1763 and held control until 1783. Several trading posts were established in an attempt to control the Seminoles who had entered Florida in the early eighteenth century, filling the void left by local native groups. During this time, runaway black slaves from the Carolina colonies fled to Florida and sought refuge. The Seminoles helped the runaways form their own settlements, and often prevented slave-catchers from recapturing them. Another major event of this period was the establishment of British plantations all along the northeastern coast of Florida. Despite this activity, there is no evidence of British occupation of the Tampa Bay region during this period.
The American colonies declared their independence from British rule in 1776. In 1783 the Treaty of Paris ended the American Revolution and returned Florida to Spain. During the Second Spanish period, Spain continued the British system of controlling the Seminoles through trade and supply. According to Covington (1993:48), Muskogee-speaking people began occupying the area around Tampa Bay on a permanent basis between 1783 and 1821. Thonotosassa, a town of about 200 people, was located near the lake of that name northeast of Tampa between 1812 and 1820 (Covington 1993:48, 53). Swanton (1922:406) lists five towns in the Tampa Bay area in 1821. One of these, Tots-ta-la-hoets-ka, or Watermelon Town, was reportedly located on the west side of Tampa Bay in what is now Pinellas County.

Eighteenth-century reports by Spanish and British coastal mapping expeditions mention encounters in the Tampa Bay area with "Spanish Indians." These may have been Seminoles who were often employed as workers in Spanish fish rancheros, hence the origin of this name in Anglo-American documents (Neil 1955; Wright 1986:218-219). However, some researchers believe that the Spanish fishermen also intermarried with the few remaining local natives (Almy 2001; Weismann 1999:80; Worth 2012).

Maranda Almy (2001) and Margaret Stack (2011) provide comprehensive reviews of Spanish Indians and the fishing ranchos of the Gulf coast, from which much of the following summary has been taken. The first mention of Spanish fish ranchos on the Gulf coast is by George Gauld, a British surveyor who in 1765 while charting Tampa Bay noted that “The Spaniards resort to the Mullet Kays for the purpose of fishing and have built huts on the principal of them where there is likewise wells of fresh water” (Gauld 1790 cited in Almy 2001:7). Bernard Romans wrote that in 1770 the “whole of the west coast of East Florida is covered with fishermen's huts and flakes; these are built by the Spanish fishermen from the Havannah, who come annually to make one or two fishing voyages on this coast, to the number of about thirty sail” (Romans 1962:185-186). A few years later, William Bartram, while visiting the Seminole town of Talahasochte in modern Levy County, wrote in his journal that “The Spaniards of Cuba likewise trade here or at St. Marks, and other sea ports on the West coast of the isthmus in small sloops; particularly at the bay of Calos, where are excellent fishing bans and grounds” (Bartram 1955:194).

The relationships between Cuban merchants and fisherman and the Indians living in Florida, as well as those between the fisherman and the Spanish in Havana, Cuba were based on the need for the Spanish to find more fertile sources of fish coupled with the desire by the Florida Indians to obtain European goods. After the Spanish settled Cuba, the waters surrounding the island quickly were overfished and the estuaries of Florida’s Gulf coast, with their bountiful fish populations, provided an excellent alternative. The Indians were well acquainted with Cuba since they had often traveled there to exchange ambergris, deer skins, and furs for iron implements, fishhooks, tobacco, rum, coffee, and sugar (Covington 1959:115-116) and Spanish vessels from Havana had been fishing the waters of the lower Gulf coast since at least the 1680s (Worth 2012:143).

Spanish traders often lived on the ranchos throughout the year, living off fresh fish and cultivated gardens. At the beginning of the new fishing season, fishermen would arrive at the ranchos, where they would first prepare their fishing gear, repair the thatched huts that served as their shelters, or build new ones, and build wooden racks to serve as curing stations for the fish they caught (Covington 1959:119). Since they did not bring women with them to the ranchos, the Spanish took Indian women as their wives and established families with them. The children of
these relationships either moved to Cuba, enjoying all the rights of Spanish citizenship, or stayed in Florida to marry Seminoles (Covington 1959:120).

Although several Gulf coast fishing ranchos are known from the historical and archaeological records, few have been extensively excavated. Palov (1999) reports on excavations at a late eighteenth-early nineteenth-century Spanish fishing rancho on Useppa Island near Charlotte Harbor. Artifacts associated with the rancho included glass beads, lead shot, glazed (Rey, El Morro, and Marine wares) and unglazed coarse earthenware, Spanish Olive Jar, pearlware and whiteware (including shell-edged and transfer-printed sherds), clay pipe stems, glass fragments, and metal (nails, tacks, a thimble). Other archaeological investigations include possible fishing ranchos on Estero Island and Fisherman’s Key in southwest Florida (Schober and Torrence 2002; Snapp and Sickman 1996), and Rocky Point on Old Tampa Bay in Hillsborough County (Neill 1968).

h) Pioneer Period, AD 1821-1888

The Pioneer Period begins in 1821 with the annexation of La Florida from Spain by the United States following the First Seminole War and the Adams-Onis Treaty of 1819. It ends locally in 1888 with the coming of the Orange Belt Railway to St. Petersburg. During this 67-year period, Florida experienced the Second and Third Seminole Wars (1835-1842 and 1855-1858, respectively), the Civil War (1861-1865), Reconstruction (1865-1877), and development spurred by the railroads (1860s-1890s). Many of the major activities associated with these historic events occurred beyond the boundaries of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula. Fort Brooke, established in 1824 in what is now the City of Tampa, was a major military installation that furnished central and south Florida with troops and supplies during both Seminole Wars. Egmont Key served as a temporary way-station for Seminole Indians prior to being dispatched to reservations in the West. In 1862, during the Civil War, a local settler, Abel Miranda, was accused of murdering a well-known Union sympathizer and his home, orange grove, and all of his livestock were destroyed by Union troops stationed at Egmont Key (Arsenault 1996:40). A small village was established on the eastern side of the peninsula on land purchased by John Williams in 1876. Williams’s partner, Peter Demens, was instrumental in bringing the Orange Belt Railway to the village in 1888 resulting in substantial growth and the eventual incorporation in 1903 as the City of St. Petersburg.

Early Settlers

Although the northern Pinellas peninsula attracted settlers, the southern peninsula remained relatively uninhabited well into the 1880s. Once Florida became a U.S. territory in 1821, white homesteaders began moving into Florida; however, Indian unrest and war prevented settlers from inhabiting the Pinellas peninsula until 1842. The earliest of these were Antonio Maximo Hernandez, John Levich, and Joseph Silva, who all obtained land grants from the government through the Armed Occupation Act of 1842.

Hernandez was a Spanish fisherman who established a homestead and fishing rancho at the southern end of the peninsula in what is now Maximo Park (Watson 1848a). Hernandez is known to have been in Florida as early as 1812 and worked with another early fisherman, William Bunce, at the latter’s rancho on the Manatee River (Almy 2001). He may have squatted on the land at what became known as Maximo Point for several years before applying in March of 1843 for a deed for the property under the Occupation Act (Fuller 1969; Grismer 1948:18-19). In addition to his commercial fishing operation, Hernandez served as a fishing guide for soldiers
stationed at Fort Brooke in Tampa (Arsenault 1996:30). The hurricane of 1848 destroyed his rancho and he is believed to have moved back to Havana where he died in 1852 (Arsenault 1996:33; Grismer 1948:19). In 1880 the land was purchased from Hernandez’s wife, Dominga, by Alfred Lechevalier, a French plume hunter for whom Frenchman’s Creek was named (Fuller 1969). He apparently stayed there for three years before leaving the area.

John Levich (also spelled Levique) was born in Louisiana ca. 1810. He came to Florida sometime after 1840 and homesteaded land along Boca Ciega Bay in what is called the Jungle area. He supported himself by fishing and catching turtles in the waters of Boca Ciega Bay and the nearby Gulf of Mexico. According to Fuller (1972:48), Levich’s first house was destroyed during the hurricane of 1848. This storm also created a pass through the barrier island directly west of Levich’s homestead, and the pass has been known ever since as John’s Pass. Following the hurricane, Levich built his second home on higher ground atop a large mound (the Anderson Mound at Jungle Prada, 8PI54). Levich died in 1873 and is reportedly buried about 10 meters northwest of the present Anderson house (Fuller 1972:45).

Joseph Silva is the third early homesteader who obtained title to property about one mile north of Levich partly within the City-owned Abercrombie Park (Watson 1848b). Very little is known about Silva. According to Fuller (1972:44), he was a turtle fisherman who filed a homestead claim under the Armed Occupation Act on May 30, 1843 at Fort Brooke along with John Levich. No other information is available regarding Silva, but he was gone from the area by the 1860s when Frank Girard began homesteading the land (Huff 1937). Girard’s son, John Francis, worked for Lechevalier, the plume hunter of Frenchman’s Creek.

Other notable early settlers on the lower peninsula included John Bethell, Williams Paul, Abel Miranda, and James Hay. Miranda settled at Big Bayou in 1857 and his brothers-in-law, John and William Bethell eventually joined him there in 1859. The small cluster of houses was referred to as Pinellas Village and the Bethell house served as the post office (Arsenault 1996:36-37).

The founder of St. Petersburg is generally considered to be John Constantine Williams who arrived on the Pinellas peninsula in 1875 from Detroit. He purchased 1600 acres and tried his hand at farming. When that failed, he decided to develop the area instead. Williams convinced Peter Demens to build his Orange Belt Railway to present-day St. Petersburg since he thought it would make a good shipping port (Young 1984:39-40). By 1888, the railroad was operating between Sanford and the Pinellas Peninsula. Demens named the small village in honor of his birthplace, St. Petersburg, Russia. With the coming of the railroad, St. Petersburg and the Pinellas Peninsula’s population began to increase (Arsenault 1996:52-75), growing from 601 people in 1890 to 2,572 in 1900. St. Petersburg was incorporate3d as a town in 1892 and reincorporated as a city in 1903.

At this time, the Pinellas Peninsula was part of Hillsborough County, but the political establishment in Tampa ignored the growing demands for services and roads on the peninsula and in 1911 voters approved the creation of a new county (Arsenault 1996:139-141). On January 1, 1912, Pinellas County was officially created from the western half of Hillsborough County with Clearwater designated the county seat (Arsenault 1996:141). Approximately 13,000 people lived on Pinellas Peninsula at the time of its creation. Two years later, Tony Jannus piloted the world’s first scheduled airline flight from St. Petersburg to Tampa.
F. Associated Property Types

(Provide description, significance, and registration requirements.)

All of the resources that are included in this multiple property nomination (or which may be included in the future) are archaeological sites. This property type includes middens, shell mounds, platform mounds, burial mounds, cemeteries, or graves, and prehistoric and historic artifact scatters. The National Register Criteria under which these property types may be considered eligible are D (has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important to history or prehistory) and, for some sites, A (association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history). These criteria reflect aspects of the overall theme.

Specific considerations under Criterion D include a site’s dating potential, potential for data related to understanding the coastal lifeways of Native American and early Euro-American inhabitants of Tampa Bay including settlement patterns, resource exploitation, subsistence, seasonality, technology, or trade networks, and how these influenced the development of prehistoric native societies on the Pinellas peninsula. For the historic periods, the effects of European contact on native peoples, including the destruction of political and cultural institutions, the abandonment of the region and eventual replacement by Spanish fishermen and Seminole Indians, the initial pioneering efforts by white settlers and the political and social contexts within which these occurred, are also viable research topics. Finally, understanding the complex relationship between humans and the natural environment is a critical component of any research aimed at understanding life along the coast. This includes the effects of long-term climate and sea level variation, as well as shorter term weather events (e.g., hurricanes). The data classes that need to be present in order for these research considerations to be addressed are discussed below.

Criterion A has been applied to two sites that have archaeological remains associated with the earliest white settlement of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula – the homesteads of Antonio Maximo Hernandez and Joseph Silva. Documentary records indicate that the homestead of the area’s third white settler, John Levich, was located on one of the archaeological sites included in this MPL nomination and may, in fact, be buried there, but to date no physical remains of the homestead or grave have been found. This site does have archaeological remains associated with early (sixteenth century) Spanish contact, however, and is therefore considered eligible under A for its association with early Spanish colonization of La Florida.

Other factors that are considered include site integrity, uniqueness, and potential for public display and interpretation. Factors contributing to a reduction of site integrity include natural factors, such as erosion and bioturbation (rodent burrowing, root growth), and disturbance factors related to development, maintenance, and vandalism or artifact collecting. Factors contributing to a determination of uniqueness include the relative occurrence of a property type in Pinellas County. Uniqueness also may be present in a property type that is considered typical if it is an especially well-preserved example of such a type, or if there are few other preserved examples locally, and its research or educational value is enhanced by its condition. In addition to all of these factors, public ownership and/or access were considered with regard to determining if a site has potential for public display and interpretation.
1) RESEARCH DOMAINS

The research domains to which sites included in this MPL can contribute include human-environment interaction, paleoenvironmental reconstruction, maritime economics, subsistence, settlement patterns and mobility, regional chronology and culture history, socio-cultural development, intra- and inter-regional interaction (trade, exchange relations, etc.), intra-site structure, and reconstruction of coastal lifeways and site histories. The following outline of research questions reflect some of the gaps in our knowledge as they relate to the various historic contexts and to the theme of this MPL – Living on the Coast. The list is not exhaustive and leaves room for future researchers to develop additional questions necessary to expand or refine archaeological and historical information as it develops.

I) Human-Environment Interaction

A) What was the environment and climate of Tampa Bay and the Pinellas peninsula like during the Late Holocene (3000 BC-AD 1888)?
   1) Is there evidence for climate or sea level variation during the period 3000 BC to AD 1888?
   2) Is there evidence for short-term weather events that may have affected local communities (e.g., hurricanes, storm surges)?
   3) What was the effect of these perturbations on local resources (plants, animals, fish, shellfish)?

B) How did coastal populations respond to these changes?
   1) Changes in subsistence patterns (e.g., species or habitats exploited)?
   2) Changes in resource acquisition strategies?
   3) Changes in settlement patterns (e.g., movement, abandonment, migration)?
   4) Changes in community organization (e.g., aggregation, dispersal)?
   5) Changes in community structure (e.g., purposeful construction and/or of higher elevations for structures)?

C) Were there social or political effects related to climate/sea level changes?
   1) Differential access to fishing/shell fishing areas by settlements or lineages?
   2) Differential access to specific species?
   3) Territorial expansion or contraction by political entities.

D) What effect did human occupation of the coast have on maritime resources?
   1) Is there evidence of overharvesting of shellfish or fish populations?
   2) Are there increases or decreases in the use of terrestrial species through time?

II) Late Archaic/Transitional Period

A) How was the Late Archaic/Transitional Period on the Pinellas Peninsula and the greater Tampa Bay region similar or different from contemporaneous cultures elsewhere on the Gulf Coast? Florida?

B) What do preceramic lithic scatters represent? Small campsites?

C) Were larger settlements situated on a shoreline now inundated?

D) How were Late Archaic/Transitional groups organized socially and politically?

E) Was there movement of populations into or out of the Tampa Bay region?

F) Is there evidence of exchange relations with non-local groups?
III) Manasota Period
   A) What was the relationship between Late Archaic/Transitional culture and subsequent Early Manasota
developments? Is there a difference other than the introduction of pottery?
   B) How does the Manasota settlement pattern in the Tampa bay region compare with the regional pattern
   posited by Luer and Almy?
   C) What influence did Weeden Island cultures to the north have on local Manasota cultures? Was it only in
   the mortuary sphere, or were other influences felt in the domestic sphere?
   D) Is there evidence for pre-Safety Harbor platform mounds? If so, what do these represent in terms of
   influences and political/social developments?
   E) Is there evidence of settlement movement or site abandonment during the Vandal Minimum?
   F) Is there evidence for status or ranking?
   G) Did individuals or lineages have differential access to elite goods or subsistence items (e.g., larger fish,
better cuts of meat)?

IV) Safety Harbor Period
   A) What does the Englewood phase of Safety Harbor (AD 900-1100) represent?
   B) What was the influence of Mississippian cultures farther north on local cultures?
   C) Were Safety Harbor societies ranked?
   D) Were individuals or groups accorded differential status? Did they have differential access to wealth
   goods (e.g., Spanish artifacts) or subsistence items (e.g., larger fish, better cuts of meat)?
   E) Is there evidence of craft specialization (e.g., shell beads).
   F) Were the several mound centers on the peninsula contemporaneous or occupied sequentially?
   G) Do Safety Harbor mound complexes represent independent polities? Or were they part of a hierarchical
   political system?
   H) If the latter, when did this hierarchical system occur and what were the factors leading to its
   development?
   I) If mound centers were politically independent and contemporaneous, how did the large number of
   mound centers on the Pinellas peninsula interact politically and socially?
   J) Was there competition for resources?
   K) If the mound centers were occupied at different times, what caused the shifts in settlement location?
   Population growth? Group fissioning? Environmental constraints?
   L) What effects did the Little Ice Age have on local coastal populations?

V) First Spanish Period
   A) Is there additional evidence for occupation of the peninsula by indigenous groups post-contact?
   B) What was the impact of European contact on indigenous societies?
   C) What did the availability of Spanish goods, either through direct contact, trade with other native people,
or shipwreck salvaging, have on indigenous technology, social relations, and politics?
   D) What material correlates equate to ethnohistorically defined political or ethnic units.
   E) When were Tampa Bay indigenous sites abandoned for good? Is there evidence for the causes of
   abandonment?

VI) Second Spanish and Pioneer Periods
   A) When was the peninsula reoccupied following the disappearance of indigenous groups?
   B) Who reoccupied these sites? Seminoles? Spanish Indians? Cuban fishermen?
C) Is there evidence of a Seminole or Spanish fishing rancho at Maximo Beach (8PI31)?
D) What evidence is there of late nineteenth-century occupation and use?
E) What was the layout and structure of a Spanish fishing camp and early pioneer homesteads?
F) What was the relationship between Spanish/Cuban fishermen and the “Spanish” Indians?
G) Who were the Spanish Indians? Seminole? Others?
H) In addition to fishing, what dietary information can be obtained?
I) What was the relationship between wild, domestic, and commercially obtained goods?
J) What was the material culture of ranchos and homesteads? Spanish Indians?
K) Were women and children present at the ranchos?
L) What was the influence of wider political events on the ranchos and homesteads?

VII) Regional Patterns
A) Were individual sites occupied seasonally or year-round?
B) Did occupation patterns and settlement organization change through time?
C) If so, what were the factors (environmental, political, social) that contributed to these changes or lack thereof?
D) What was the relationships of individual sites to other sites on the peninsula?
E) Were components of sites contemporaneous with each other (e.g., Safety harbor occupations at Maximo, Jungle Prado, and Abercrombie/Kuttler), with other sites on the peninsula (e.g., Maximo Point, Weedon Island), and in the greater Tampa Bay area (e.g., Safety Harbor, Safford Mound)?
F) If contemporaneous, what were the political relationships between mound/village complexes?
G) Is there evidence for population increase and competition for territory and resources?
H) Is there evidence of group aggregation at any sites? Evidence of non-local peoples visiting or living at the sites (e.g., different ceramic types, pastes, tempering)?
I) What were the economic and social relationships between sites on the peninsula and those in Florida and the greater Southeast?
J) Is there evidence of non-local or exotic materials suggesting trade or exchange?
K) What do Late Archaic, Manasota, and Safety Harbor villages look like? How do they differ from contemporaneous sites elsewhere in Florida and the Southeast?

2) SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Given the above research domains and data gaps, the following criteria are considered necessary to be present at any site included in this MPL.

a) Datable Materials

In order for any site to address specific research questions and contribute to the overall theme, it is necessary that archaeological and/or historical documentary evidence be available that can associate a specific site temporally with specific historic contexts. Chronometric dating techniques, principally radiocarbon dating, offer the best way to date the various occupations, construction episodes, and activity loci present at multicomponent archaeological sites such as those that are included in this MPL. A few radiocarbon dates have been obtained from three sites included in the MPL, but these are relatively limited in terms of geographic and...
temporal scope. Given the long histories and multiple occupations during several archaeological periods, additional dates are desirable from well-controlled contexts to refine site chronologies, assist in intra- and intersite analyses of subsistence practices, technology, and season of occupation, document changes in site use through time, and correlate site occupations with climate and sea-level events. Fortunately, all four sites contain the data classes necessary to obtain such dates; that is, organic materials such as charred wood, charcoal, and marine shell.

For sites where organic materials are not present, such as prehistoric artifact scatters in sandy deposits either outside the boundaries of shell midden deposits, or below these deposits, optically stimulated luminescence dating (OSL) offers a potential alternative. Briefly, OSL geochronology is based on the time-dependent dosimetric properties of silicate minerals, predominately feldspar and quartz. The technique has been used successfully to date sediments that received direct sunlight exposure prior to deposition, usually as a result of aeolian transport. After the sediment is buried and shielded from further light exposure, ionizing radiation from the decay of naturally occurring radioisotopes produces free electrons that are trapped in the silicate minerals. Excitation of minerals by light produces luminescence emissions. The intensity of the luminescence is measured and calibrated in the laboratory to yield a luminescence age that reflects the time since burial. Although used primarily on sites where organic materials are scarce or nonexistent (e.g., Rink et al. 2012), it also has been used successfully on quartz sediments contained in shell mounds (Pluckhahn et al. 2015; Thompson et al. 2007).

The second primary way to assign date ranges is the cross-dating of strata and features using temporally diagnostic artifacts. Ceramics and projectile points are the most important types of artifacts for prehistoric components, while historic components benefit from documentary evidence of the manufacturing and peak periods of use of various kinds of material culture (e.g., coins, buttons, clay pipes, ceramics, bottles). Artifacts that had a relatively brief period of manufacture and use are especially useful and may provide a more refined date range than chronometric dating methods which have inherent error factors. Consequently, sites may be judged as particularly significant if one or more of these artifact types are present in sufficient quantity for basic dating purposes.

b) Faunal and Botanical Remains

In addition to documenting prehistoric and historic dietary patterns, vertebrate and invertebrate faunal remains can provide information on resource exploitation patterns, exploited habitats, procurement methods, climate and sea-level changes, seasons of occupation, and differential access to resources resulting from status differences within a society. Botanical remains, while less commonly preserved, can, if present, provide similar types of information.

c) Site Structure

The interior structure of coastal sites in the Tampa Bay region is not well understood due to limited large-scale, block excavations. This is particularly true of the sites on the Lower Pinellas Peninsula. Nonetheless, excavations that have exposed relatively large, spatially contiguous areas have documented numerous structural
features along with hearths, storage pits, refuse pits, and cemeteries (e.g., Austin et al. 1995; 2004; 2018). Thus, it is anticipated that similar large-scale excavation would reveal similar features at the sites in this MPL. If overlapping features are present, this would suggest reuse and (perhaps) reoccupation of areas over time. If structures can be identified through the exposure and arrangement of postmolds or postholes, another set of questions arise. It might be possible to estimate structure size and thus infer population density at the site. The size of structures, and the size and numbers of posts associated with them, can provide information on the degree of architectural investment by site occupants which can then be used to infer intensity of occupation. How do these data compare with what is observed locally and regionally? What might the degree of occupation intensity mean in terms of interaction, association, or environmental adaptation? In combination with accurate dating, documenting the layout and structure of individual sites is critical to the development of site histories, understanding the origin and function of landscape features (mounds, ridges, midden areas), and the reconstruction of day-to-day life in a coastal setting. Sites that contain evidence of such features would be considered significant resources for the purposes of this MPL.

d) Stratigraphic and Spatial Integrity

For archaeological sites that may be eligible under Criterion D, stratigraphic integrity is especially important. The ability to document artifacts, features, faunal remains, and other materials in situ is integral to reconstructing past lifeways and testing hypotheses about the natural, cultural, and historical processes that create the archaeological record. The main aspects of integrity to consider are materials and association. For example, a site considered significant because of its potential to provide information on changing subsistence patterns through time needs to contain well-preserved faunal remains along with artifacts that can be related to specific archaeological cultures or periods (materials) and these need to be in stratigraphically separated components that can be excavated, analyzed, and compared to one another (association) for the site to be considered eligible.

Other considerations include: 1) What is the period of significance? 2) What are the character-defining features from the period of significance that are necessary to convey significance? 3) Have there been alterations or impacts to the resource? 4) Is the resource still able to produce information important to history or prehistory? While it is not necessary for archaeological sites to be in pristine, unaltered condition to meet these considerations, particularly when such resources are located in an urban environment, it remains necessary to demonstrate that most can still be met in order for a site to qualify for NRHP listing under Criterion D.

e) Uniqueness and Potential for Public Interpretation

None of the property types discussed below are particularly unique, except perhaps for platform mounds and fishing ranchos. However, few intact examples of most of these property types exist locally, or even regionally, due to intense development of coastal areas. Thus, their uniqueness resides primarily in their good state of preservation. In addition, all four sites are located in city parks that provide access to the public and the potential for public interpretation of the areas pre-Columbian and post-contact past. The recent Archaeological Parks Master Plan (Austin 2014, 2018) has provided the City with detailed recommendations for developing
innovative interpretive and educational materials suitable for on-site, web-site, and phone-app viewing. Many of these recommendations have been implemented and others are being actively developed.

3) PROPERTY TYPES

a) Artifact Scatters

These are scatters of ceramic sherds, shell food remains, shell tools, lithic tools and manufacturing debris, or any combination of these. They are most often found on sandy ridges or on low rises in the pine flatwoods. Often they underlie later shell midden deposits. Many times there is no surficial evidence of their presence; however, these sites often have relatively deep subsurface components. This type subsumes a number of different functional types and time periods. Most are believed to be short-term campsites related to hunting and gathering activities, however, larger sites with relatively dense amounts of artifacts may represent more permanent habitation sites.

Significance: Although these sites are fairly common, they have been poorly studied within the Pinellas peninsula. Organic preservation is usually poor, so the potential for subsistence remains and environmental data is limited. While not as spectacular as mounds or middens, these sites represent an important, and often overlooked, component of the region’s pre-Columbian history especially since they tend to represent the area’s earlier occupations (i.e., pre-500 BC). Since few sites of this type have been professionally excavated on the peninsula, understanding of precisely what they represent and how they contributed to coastal adaptations are very limited. On the other hand, where such sites have been excavated, they sometimes reveal internal site structure and features (e.g., Austin 2006; Austin et al. 2004, 2018). Therefore, if features such as post molds, hearths, or fire pits are present, then the potential information yield can be high. Potential research categories include: dating (if carbonized material or temporally diagnostic artifacts are present, OSL if they are not), intrasite activity definition, technological and settlement organization, socio-cultural reconstruction. Raw material provenance studies of lithic and ceramic artifacts can provide information on lithic and clay procurement strategies, settlement patterns, catchment areas, technological organization, group mobility, and exchange patterns. If preserved faunal remains are present then these sites should be considered very significant since this would increase the uniqueness of this property type.

b) Shell Middens

The matrix of these sites is predominately marine shell refuse mixed with sandy, organic sediments. They are usually found along the shorelines of bays and estuaries, or along creeks that drain into these water bodies. The larger sites are presumed to represent habitation areas while smaller sites may represent short-term occupations or resource extraction sites. Preservation is often very good because the calcium carbonates in the shell neutralize soil acids that typically result in organic degradation. Therefore, bone, antler, charcoal, burned wood, and occasionally botanical remains are found in shell middens, greatly increasing the potential to address environmental, dietary, and socio-economic questions. They may also contain features such as hearths, roasting pits, storage pits, post molds, and living floors. Pottery sherds, shell, bone, and stone tools and implements, shell and bone ornaments are very common and human remains may be present at some sites. Later
occupations of pre-Columbian shell midden sites were very common and historic ceramics, glass, metal, as well as faunal remains are often encountered at these sites.

**Significance:** The information potential of shell middens is usually quite high due to good organic preservation and the abundance of artifacts that usually are present. Shell middens dating as early as the Late Archaic Period are present in Pinellas County and coastal areas continued to be used intensively by indigenous peoples until shortly after Spanish Contact. They were later reoccupied by Seminole Indians, Spanish fishermen, and early Euroamerican pioneers. Their time depth in combination with the amount and variety of data classes they contain enables study of chronological variation in a variety of domains, including nearly all the research questions outlined above. Faunal and floral material can be used for studies of subsistence, seasonality, environmental change, and patterns of resource exploitation. Charcoal and shell from middens can be used for radiocarbon dating.

c) **Shell Mounds**
Shell mounds are elevated landscape features that may have been purposefully constructed for either social, political, or environmental reasons. Some may simply have been localized areas of refuse disposal. Some shell mounds were constructed using midden refuse from elsewhere. Shell mounds date as early as the Archaic period and continued to be constructed and used up through the post-contact Safety Harbor period. All of the data classes found in shell middens are usually found in shell mounds as well.

d) **Sand Mounds**
Sand mounds are purposefully constructed elevated landscape features. Most mounds are believed to have been used for the interment of the dead, although some that contain little or no skeletal material or artifacts are thought to have been used as foundations for dwellings. Borrow pits where sand for the mound was obtained are sometimes located nearby. Most sand mounds are believed to date to the post-Archaic period, although some may date as early as the Middle Archaic. They may or may not contain artifacts including ceramics, lithics, faunal material, or features, as well as human interments. Sometimes charcoal is found in features that can be used for dating purposes. Their sand matrix also makes them potential sources for OSL dating.

e) **Platform Mounds**
These are large, truncated pyramidal-shaped mounds constructed of sand, shell, or alternating layers of sand and shell. They often have ramps leading to the summit and are believed to have been used as platforms for elite dwellings or political/ceremonial structures. Platform mounds were common features of Late Weeden Island and Safety Harbor town centers. They have the potential to contain all of the data classes mentioned for shell and sand mounds including human interments. Borrow pits also may be located nearby.

**Significance:** All mounds, even those used primarily to support dwellings or for ceremonial purposes, have the potential for containing human remains and should be considered especially sensitive because of the legal requirements of Chapter 872 F.S. (see below). If archaeological testing determines that a mound does not contain human remains then the site must be evaluated in terms of its potential for contributing to regional research. Features such as post molds for structures or fire pits may be present which may contain materials suitable for radiocarbon dating. Artifacts and faunal remains (if present) can contribute to many of the research
questions identified above. In addition, their very presence may be significant in terms of understanding the physical layout of specific sites as well as larger, regional settlement patterns. Mounds may also be considered important as visible reminders of the past and may contribute to public interpretation and education regarding Native American lifeways in Florida. Potential research categories include: dating (if temporally diagnostic artifacts or charred material is present), settlement organization, socio-political organization, intra site activity recognition and site structure.

f) Mortuary/cemetery sites

This type of site includes burial mounds, dryland cemeteries, and wetland cemeteries. All mounds should be considered potential burial sites until proven otherwise. Cemeteries are more difficult to identify because there are usually no surface indications of their presence, although artifacts or middens associated with a nearby habitation area may be present. Wetland cemeteries date to the Early through the Late Archaic periods. During the Early Manasota period burials were sometimes made in shell middens and Late Archaic/Transitional and Early Manasota cemeteries may also have been placed in sandy soils that were subsequently covered by later shell midden deposits. Cemetery sites are excellent sources of information on social, cultural, religious, and ceremonial aspects of a society. They can also provide information on the physical aspects of a population including diet and health. Various types of analyses can be performed on bone, including morphometric analysis, radiocarbon dating, stable isotope analysis, and DNA, which can contribute information on the age, diet, and heritage of the remains as well as population movement, while artifacts found in association with the interments can provide indications of status or wealth.

Significance: Mortuary/cemetery sites can provide unique information not available at typical archaeological sites. Organic preservation at wetland burials is usually excellent, so their data potential is considered very high. Wetland cemeteries are also quite unique because so few of them have been discovered. If archaeological testing verifies the presence of human remains at a site, and the site is in fair or better condition, the research potential can be considered good because of the unique types of information they contain. Even if they are in poor condition, these sites should be considered sensitive because of the requirements of Chapter 872 F.S. which makes it a felony to disturb any type of cemetery. Potential research categories include: dating, settlement organization, socio-cultural reconstruction, and bio-cultural reconstruction. Excavation of burial sites requires consultation with the State Archaeologist and Native American tribes and some types of destructive analysis of the remains may be prohibited due to tribal concerns.
G. Geographical Data

1) GEOGRAPHICAL AREA COVERED BY THE MULTIPLE PROPERTY LISTING

The lower peninsula of Pinellas County encompassing the boundaries of the City of St. Petersburg, Florida (see Figure 1).

2) PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION OF GEOGRAPHIC AREA

The City of St. Petersburg occupies the lower Pinellas peninsula and consists of a total area of 137.6 square miles (356.4 km^2), of which 61.7 square miles (159.9 km^2) is land, and 75.9 square miles (196.5 km^2) of it is water. The city is bordered by Tampa Bay to the east and south and Boca Ciega Bay to the west. More than 20 barrier islands buffer the Pinellas Peninsula from the Gulf of Mexico. The following pre-urban character of the geographic area is summarized from Piper Archaeological Research, Inc. (1987) and references therein.

The dominant topographic feature is the remnant of a Pleistocene marine terrace, the Penholloway, which occupies much of the central part of the city (Figure 3). Elevations here rise to over 70 feet (21.3 meters) above sea level. The uplands are drained by Booker Creek, Bear Creek, and Joe's Creek, as well as several minor creeks and drainages. Soils around the rim of the terrace are well drained and prior to urbanization supported a vegetative complex of longleaf pine, scrub oak, and saw palmetto with occasional stands of live oak. A central interior basin is less well drained and depending on relative elevation once supported either a flatwoods (pine, palmetto) or a scrub (scrub oak, sand pine, palmetto) environment.

The broad, gently sloping Pamlico Terrace occupies the lowlands that surround the Penholloway and includes most of the lower half of the peninsula. Elevations here range from 0 to 25 feet (0 to 7.6 meters) above sea level. The soils are primarily fine marine sands which may be either well, moderately well, or poorly drained. To the north of the central uplands the terrain is relatively flat, and small ponds and streams are common. The major surface water feature is Saw Grass Lake. The major surface water feature in the southern peninsula is Lake Maggiore, which is surrounded by a series of low dunes. Although presently considered a freshwater lake, Lake Maggiore was once tidally influenced and was known as Salt Lake. Many of the small streams which drain this part of the peninsula including Salt Creek, Hart Creek, and Frenchman's Creek, are also influenced by tidal action. Scrub vegetation occupied the dunes around the lake, with pine-palmetto flatwoods elsewhere.

Fringing the peninsula is a coastal ridge system that probably formed during the Late Pleistocene or early Holocene. The ridges consist of excessively drained sands that under natural conditions support a xeric vegetation complex of sand pine, turkey oak, palmetto, and native grasses. It is on this ridge system that many of that peninsula’s post-Archaic period archaeological sites reside. Early historic accounts of the peninsula mention the presence of numerous artesian springs located along the coast particularly in the Pinellas Point and Park Street areas. The presence of freshwater springs, and the fact that elevated, well drained land was available along the shores of Tampa and Boca Ciega Bays, made for an extremely attractive habitat for early indigenous as well as modern inhabitants.
H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

(Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.)

1) SURVEY METHODS

An inventory of archaeological sites within the City of St. Petersburg was performed in 1987 by Piper Archaeological Research, Inc. The purpose of the survey was to provide base line data on the types, distribution, and potential significance of archaeological resources within the city limits. Methods included a review of existing information in the Florida Master Site File, interviews with local informants, and field survey to relocate documented sites and identify unrecorded sites on city-owned land. All documented sites were evaluated in terms of their potential for listing on the NRHP. In 2014 and 2016, the City of St. Petersburg contracted with SEARCH to conduct surveys and develop a management plan for its city parks that contain archaeological sites. These projects included a review of previous work, field survey, evaluation of NRHP eligibility, and development of recommendations for management and interpretation. Both surveys documented the four sites included in this MPL and recommended them as eligible or potentially eligible for NRHP listing.

In addition, archaeological projects have been conducted at several sites within the city, including the four city parks that are included in the MPL. These include surveys, testing, excavation, and monitoring conducted to mitigate adverse effects resulting from park improvements as well as for archaeological research. Table 2 lists the most relevant of these projects. Detailed descriptions of the scope and results of each are presented in the individual registration forms for each site.

2) HOW WERE HISTORIC CONTEXTS DETERMINED?

The historic contexts included in this MPL are essentially the cultural/temporal periods represented archaeologically in west Florida and Pinellas County (Austin and Hansen 1992; Milanich 1994) and more specifically, within the properties included in this nomination. In each period an emphasis is placed on research issues related to the overall theme of coastal living, including economic, social, and political developments.

3) ON WHAT WAS THE TYPOLOGY OF SIGNIFICANT PROPERTY TYPES BASED?

The property types were defined on the basis of physical characteristics and archaeological content. For example, the property type "artifact scatters" consists of sites that have ceramic sherds and/or lithic tools and waste flakes as their primary artifact classes and lack dense middens, faunal remains, or elevated landscape features. Similarly, historic artifact scatters may include artifact refuse related to homesteads or fishing camps. At the opposite end of the spectrum, shell mounds are elevated landscape features containing abundant marine shell, bone food refuse, artifacts, strata, and features.

There are three major reasons for using physical characteristics as the basis for this typology. First, it is not always possible to identify precisely the function of prehistoric archaeological sites without extensive excavation and analysis; therefore, the use of physical characteristics is felt to be a more objective way to classify the various types of sites. Second, while it is often easier to identify the function of a particular historic
site through documentary research, it was felt that two systems of classification - one based on physical characteristics for prehistoric sites, and another based on functional characteristics for historic sites - would be inconsistent. By using only physical characteristics to classify property types it is possible to apply the same criteria to sites of all time periods. Finally, a. typology based on physical characteristics is easily used and understood by non-professionals. The distinction between a lithic scatter and a shell midden is easily seen while the distinction between short and long-term habitation sites is much less so for someone who is not familiar with the archaeological record of an area.

4) HOW WERE THE REQUIREMENTS OF INTEGRITY DERIVED?

Archaeological resources tend to be evaluated under Criterion D with its emphasis on “important information.” Determining significance under this criterion requires that the site possesses the potential to address relevant research questions or gaps in data within a geographic region. Background research determines what research has taken place in the region and what research topics need to be addressed. Age, type of site, or number of artifacts are relevant to NRHP evaluations only as they relate to the ability of a site to address important research questions.

In an urban environment, it is rare for an archaeological site to exhibit complete integrity. Surrounding development, past looting, and, in the case of urban parks, continued maintenance and improvements for park visitors, are all potential threats and have in some cases resulted in adverse effects. Thus, the requirements of integrity were based not only on vertical and spatial considerations, but also on archaeological data needs and a knowledge of the resource base within the region. At midden sites, for example, stratigraphic integrity is necessary since the separation of occupation zones, the chronological study of artifact change, or changes in different resources through time require good stratigraphic context. At an early historic homestead, however, artifact deposition may be confined to the surface or to within 10 cm of the surface. Artifact density and content, as well as spatial segregation of different activity areas, are more important at a site of this kind, particularly if it is rare as in the case of fishing ranchos. The presence of features such as trash pits or privy pits in relatively undisturbed condition are also important since these often serve as time capsules containing artifacts representative of a brief period of time.

Some sites have been adversely affected by construction or maintenance. However, at these cases, the amount of adverse impact as a percentage of the total site area in combination with the quality of data contained in the remaining portions of a site, were important considerations when evaluating overall integrity in relation to a site’s ability to qualify for NRHP listing under Criterion D. A similar approach was taken with regard to past looting. Hardly any archaeological site, particularly those that are easily visible such as mounds and middens, has escaped the detrimental effects of destructive digging for relics. Since the sites contained in this MPL are all owned by the city and are contained in public parks, this type of looting activity has been nearly eliminated, but there is no question that looting occurred at all of the sites prior to city acquisition and development as parks. Collecting of artifacts along the shoreline does continue but has been reduced by the posting of signs indicating that no artifact collecting is allowed. This type of collecting is much less detrimental to the integrity of a site and frankly has resulted in some important information that has contributed to the significance of these sites, as discussed in the individual registration forms.
On the other hand, there are several indicators that a site probably is not eligible. These include: isolated artifacts (however, a unique artifact may have significance as a sacred object in rare cases); disturbed surface artifact scatters; sites where depositional integrity has been lost; multi-component sites where mixing due to extensive site damage or depositional processes has occurred; and recent artifact debris (less than fifty years old).
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Table 1. Archaeological sites included in the Multiple Property Listing, Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>Property Types</th>
<th>Historic Contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abercrombie Park Complex</td>
<td>8PI58, 8PI10650</td>
<td>Shell midden, shell mounds, artifact scatter</td>
<td>Late Archaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Early Manasota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Late Manasota/Weeden Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pioneer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungle Prada Site Complex</td>
<td>8PI54</td>
<td>Platform mound, shell mounds, shell midden</td>
<td>Safety Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First Spanish Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pioneer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximo Beach</td>
<td>8PI31</td>
<td>Shell mounds, shell midden, Prehistoric and historic artifact scatters</td>
<td>Late Archaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Early Manasota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Late Manasota/Weeden Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second Spanish Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pioneer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess Mound</td>
<td>8PI108</td>
<td>Platform mound, shell midden</td>
<td>Late Manasota/Weeden Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety Harbor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Archaeological projects used to identify and evaluate archaeological sites included in the MPL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary excavation at the Narváez site</td>
<td>Bushnell 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavations at the Maximo Beach site</td>
<td>Williams 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological survey of the City of St. Petersburg</td>
<td>Piper Archaeological Research, Inc. 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological monitoring and limited testing at the Maximo Beach Site</td>
<td>Austin 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test excavation at Indian Mound Park (1992)</td>
<td>Austin 2014a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological test excavations at the Narváez/Anderson site</td>
<td>Simpson 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological survey of Abercrombie Park</td>
<td>Austin 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological survey of the Bayshore Homes site (including the Kuttler Mound at Abercrombie Park)</td>
<td>Austin et al. 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological mapping of Maximo Beach site</td>
<td>Moates 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural resource survey of Maximo Park improvements</td>
<td>Burger 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological monitoring, Princess Hirrihigua Mound</td>
<td>Burger 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological survey of Jungle Prada Park and Indian Mound Park</td>
<td>Austin 2014a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master plan for City of St. Petersburg’s archaeological parks and Abercrombie Park Expansion addendum</td>
<td>Austin 2014b, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural resource survey of the Kuttler property</td>
<td>Austin and Cothran 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological monitoring of Kuttler house demolition</td>
<td>Austin 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological excavation, potable water pipeline relocation, Maximo Park</td>
<td>Austin 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Archaeological sites included in the Multiple Property Listing, Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>Property Types</th>
<th>Historic Contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Abercrombie Park Complex| 8PI58, 8PI10650 | Shell midden, shell mounds, artifact scatter    | Late Archaic  
Early Manasota  
Late Manasota/Weeden Island  
Safety Harbor  
Pioneer |
| Jungle Prada Site Complex | 8PI54         | Platform mound, shell mounds, shell midden      | Safety Harbor  
First Spanish Period  
Pioneer |
| Maximo Beach            | 8PI31        | Shell mounds, shell midden, Prehistoric and historic artifact scatters | Late Archaic  
Early Manasota  
Late Manasota/Weeden Island  
Safety Harbor  
Second Spanish Period  
Pioneer |
| Princess Mound          | 8PI108       | Platform mound, shell midden                    | Late Manasota/Weeden Island  
Safety Harbor |
Table 2. Archaeological projects used to identify and evaluate archaeological sites included in the MPL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary excavation at the Narváez site</td>
<td>Bushnell 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavations at the Maximo Beach site</td>
<td>Williams 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological survey of the City of St. Petersburg</td>
<td>Piper Archaeological Research, Inc. 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological monitoring and limited testing at the Maximo Beach Site</td>
<td>Austin 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test excavation at Indian Mound Park (1992)</td>
<td>Austin 2014a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological test excavations at the Narváez/Anderson site</td>
<td>Simpson 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological survey of Abercrombie Park</td>
<td>Austin 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological survey of the Bayshore Homes site (including the Kuttler Mound at Abercrombie Park)</td>
<td>Austin et al. 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological mapping of Maximo Beach site</td>
<td>Moates 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural resource survey of Maximo Park improvements</td>
<td>Burger 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological monitoring, Princess Hirrihigua Mound</td>
<td>Burger 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological survey of Jungle Prada Park and Indian Mound Park</td>
<td>Austin 2014a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master plan for City of St. Petersburg’s archaeological parks and Abercrombie Park Expansion addendum</td>
<td>Austin 2014b, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural resource survey of the Kuttler property</td>
<td>Austin and Cothran 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological monitoring of Kuttler house demolition</td>
<td>Austin 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological excavation, potable water pipeline relocation, Maximo Park</td>
<td>Austin 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Locations of archaeological site in St. Petersburg parks.
Figure 2. Variations in sea level and climatic events, Gulf of Mexico. 3000 BP to present.
Figure 3. Preurban landscape of Pinellas peninsula.
Appendix B:
National Register of Historic Places Registration Form:
Abercrombie Park Site Complex
United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin, How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions.

1. Name of Property
   Historic name: Abercrombie Park Site Complex
   Other names/site number: Abercrombie Park, 8P158; Kuttler Mound, 8P110650
   Name of related multiple property listing: Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula
   (Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing)

2. Location
   Street & number: Park Street North and 38th Avenue North
   City or town: St. Petersburg
   State: FL
   33709
   County: Pinellas

3. State/Federal Agency Certification
   As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended,
   I hereby certify that this ___ nomination ___ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.
   In my opinion, the property ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant at the following level(s) of significance:
   ___national ___statewide ___local
   Applicable National Register Criteria:
   ___A ___B ___C ___D

   ____________________________
   Signature of certifying official/Title: Date

   ____________________________
   State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

   ____________________________
   Signature of commenting official: Date

   Title: State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government
4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:

__ entered in the National Register
__ determined eligible for the National Register
__ determined not eligible for the National Register
__ removed from the National Register
__ other (explain: ) ________________________

Signature of the Keeper ________________________

Date of Action ________________________

5. Classification

Ownership of Property

(Check as many boxes as apply.)

Private: [ ]

Public – Local [X]

Public – State [ ]

Public – Federal [ ]

Category of Property

(Check only one box.)

Building(s) [ ]

District [ ]

Site [X]

Structure [ ]

Object [ ]
Abercrombie Park Site Complex  Pinellas County, FL
Name of Property  County and State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Resources within Property</th>
<th>(Do not include previously listed resources in the count)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contributing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Noncontributing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register  0

6. Function or Use

**Historic Functions**
(Enter categories from instructions.)
DOMESTIC/village site/midden
AGRICULTURE/SUBSISTENCE/food processing/midden
INDUSTRY/PROCESSING/EXTRACTION/fishing, shellfishing/midden

Current Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)
RECREATION & CULTURE/outdoor recreation/park

Sections 1-6 page 3
7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions.)

NA

____________________

Materials: (enter categories from instructions.)
Principal exterior materials of the property: NA

Narrative Description
(Describe the historic and current physical appearance and condition of the property. Describe contributing and noncontributing resources if applicable. Begin with a summary paragraph that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, type, style, method of construction, setting, size, and significant features. Indicate whether the property has historic integrity.)

Summary Paragraph

The Abercrombie Park Site Complex is located within the City of St. Petersburg’s Abercrombie Park at Park Street North and 38th Avenue North, Pinellas County, Florida (Township 31S, Range 15E, Section 1) (Figures 1 and 2). The park consists of approximately 14.5 acres on Long Bayou where it enters Boca Ciega Bay, an elongate coastal lagoon that is separated from the Gulf of Mexico by a series of barrier islands. The park contains two archaeological sites (see Figure 2). The Abercrombie Park site, 8PI58, covers about 8.25 acres and consists of a dense shell midden, the remnant of a small (16-18 m in diameter) shell mound, a lithic, ceramic, and shell scatter, and a small historic artifact scatter. The Kuttler Mound, 8PI10650, is a large shell mound located in the northern portion of the park. The mound was recorded separately in 1999 when the property was privately owned. The city purchased the land containing the mound and an extension of 8PI58 in 2015 and incorporated it into the existing park.

Although no radiocarbon dates have been obtained from 8PI58, diagnostic ceramics indicate occupation during the Late Archaic (3000-500 BC), Manasota (500 BC-AD 900), and Safety Harbor (AD 900-1500) periods. Nineteenth-century historic artifacts possibly related to the 1843 homestead of Joseph Silva and/or the late nineteenth-century homestead of John F. Girard also are present. Ceramics and three radiocarbon dates from 8PI10650 indicate that this mound accumulated entirely during the Late Manasota/Weeden Island and Safety Harbor periods. Both sites are part of the much larger Bayshore Homes site complex (8PI41), most of which is located on private lands to the north of the park.

In general, the integrity of both sites is good. Impacts to 8PI58 include shoreline erosion, the removal of shell from the small mound for road fill in the early twentieth century, and park...
maintenance. However, subsurface shovel testing indicates intact shell midden and artifact deposits elsewhere extending from the surface to a depth of at least 90 cm below surface (cmbs). Approximately one-quarter of the 8PI10650 was impacted by the construction of a house on the mound in 1939 and subsequent improvements. The house was demolished in 2015 and a swimming pool and basement/garage were filled with clean fill dirt and recontoured to approximate the mound’s original configuration. Archaeological test excavation in an undisturbed portion of the mound encountered over two meters of dense, well-preserved shell midden deposits. In addition, the City of St. Petersburg recently commissioned and implemented a management plan for the park which is used to ensure that park improvements and maintenance activities avoid or minimize negative impacts to the significant archaeological resources (Austin 2014).

**Narrative Description**

**A) SETTING**

Archaeological sites 8PI58 and 8PI10650 are located within the City of St. Petersburg’s Abercrombie Park which consists of approximately 14.5 acres on Long Bayou where it enters Boca Ciega Bay, an elongate coastal lagoon that is separated from the Gulf of Mexico by a series of barrier islands (see Figure 1). The surrounding area is primarily residential in character and the park experiences moderate, low-impact public use.

Archaeological remains associated with 8PI58 include a dense shell midden, the remains of a small (16-18 m in diameter) shell mound, a lithic and ceramic artifact scatter, and a small historic artifact scatter (Figure 3). The midden extends over much of the western portion of the park while the small remnant shell mound is situated adjacent to the park’s southern boundary about 145 m from the shoreline. Midden depth varies from 70 to 90 cmbs. The artifact scatter underlies the midden to the west and extends to non-midden areas in the east. Maximum depth of artifacts associated with the scatter is approximately 90 cmbs. The historic artifact scatter is located in the southwest corner along the bayshore. The Kuttler Mound (8PI10650) is located in northern portion of the park (see Figure 3). It measures about 55 x 42 m and is oriented northwest-southeast. Maximum elevation is approximately 4.5 m or about 2 m above the surrounding land surface.

Abercrombie Park is situated on the western edge of a coastal ridge system that borders Boca Ciega Bay. Several low-lying areas are present on the property that retain water during the rainy season. The largest of these is in the western portion of the park (see Figure 3). A stream winds its way through this low area and empties into Long Bayou. A second, smaller wet area is located just east of the central ridge system. It is connected by a ditch to a man-made pond near 39th Avenue North. Spoil from the excavated pond, which receives runoff from a culvert, is located to the southeast.

The vegetation of the park has been altered and no longer completely reflects natural conditions. Understory vegetation has been replaced by non-native grass that is maintained by park
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personnel. Trees consist primarily of slash pine, large oaks, cedar, cabbage palms, saw palmetto, and isolated areas of native shrubs. The low, wet areas described above contain sabal palms, wax myrtle, saw palmetto, and a number of shrubs and ferns. Figures 4-8 show current views of the property.

Since the property is a City park, several improvements have been made to accommodate visitors. A parking lot is situated along Park Street and a paved walkway connects the lot to the shoreline. A boardwalk has been constructed in the larger wetland to allow visitors access to this area. Water lines and electrical power lines have been installed, primarily in the eastern one-third of the property and along the paved walkway. The water lines provide irrigation and drainage, while the power lines provide electricity for overhead lamps along the walkway. A pump house for the water lines has been constructed just north of the parking lot. Several concrete picnic tables and benches have been constructed within the park, and most of these are in the western third, near the shoreline.

The Kuttler Mound and surrounding land once contained a two-story residence and outbuildings, now removed, and associated utility lines. The main part of the house was built in 1939 and is recorded in the FMSF as 8PI12810. A swimming pool on the mound’s west side and a walk-in basement and garage on the north side had partially removed portions of the mound (Figure 9). The residence was recommended as ineligible for listing on the NRHP in 2017 (Austin and Cothran 2017). The City’s Historic Preservation Division agreed with this assessment and the house was subsequently demolished in early 2017.

During demolition, which was monitored by a professional archaeologist, all elements of the house superstructure were removed, but concrete footers as well as the interior walls and concrete slabs for the basement and garage were left intact to minimize damage to the undisturbed portions of the mound and surrounding midden and, in the case of the walls, to prevent slumping of the loose shell that comprised much of mound. The swimming pool was filled with clean sand and the former basement and garage were filled with fill dirt and recontoured to approximate the mound’s original configuration (see Figure 6).

B) BOUNDARIES

The Abercrombie Park site complex comprises nearly all of the park’s 14.5 acres. The site boundaries are shown in Figures 1 and 2. The western boundary is Long Bayou and the southern boundary is marked by the property line that separates the park from adjacent residential homes. The northern and eastern boundaries are a combination of arbitrary property lines and boundaries determined by subsurface shovel testing.

C) ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS

The archaeological sites in Abercrombie Park are part of the larger Bayshore Homes Complex (Figure 10) (Austin et al. 2008), which has been known about by local residents and archaeologists since at least the late nineteenth century. Early investigators include S. T. Walker
The park also is the location of the mid-nineteenth-century homestead of Joseph Silva. The original Government Land Office Survey plat map of T31S, R15E (Watson 1848a) shows the location of the Silva plot on the boundary between Sections 1 and 12, adjacent to Long Bayou (Figure 11). According to local historian Walter Fuller (1972:44), Joseph Silva was a turtle fisherman who filed a homestead claim under the Armed Occupation Act on May 30, 1843 at Fort Brooke (in what is now downtown Tampa) along with another turtle fisherman, John Levich. This would make Silva, along with Levich and Maximo Hernandez, one of the earliest documented white settlers on the Pinellas Peninsula. When George Watson, Jr. surveyed the area for the government in 1848, he assigned Silva the fractional lots that encompass the S1/2 of the SW1/4 of Section 1 and the N1/2 of the NW1/4 of Section 12. In his field notes, Watson (1848b) describes the land near the center of what is now Abercrombie Park as “scrub hammock.”

Watson made no mention of the midden near Silva’s homestead nor is it described specifically in early archaeological investigations or pioneer accounts of the Pinellas Peninsula. However, C. B. Moore (1900) did visit the mounds that make up the Bayshore Homes site (8PI41) located immediately to the north in the late nineteenth century. Moore (1900:352-353) refers to that site as Four Mile Bayou and describes it as consisting of a shell ridge along the bayshore, two large mounds of sand and shell located in woods away from the shore, and a small “domiciliary” mound. This last feature was four feet in height and 58 feet (17.7 m) in diameter, very similar to the remnant mound in the park. “Central excavation and lateral trenching” revealed shell and black loam to 1.5 feet underlain by 1 foot of sand and then another 1.4 feet of shell and loam. Apparently, no burials or elaborate artifacts were recovered.

According to Moore (1900:352) this small mound was located about 300 yards (277 m) south of a large, 18-foot tall mound. Another large mound was located to the north-northwest of the latter mound and was being cut away on its northeastern slope by a small stream. These two mounds correspond with Mounds B and A, respectively, at Bayshore Homes (Austin et al. 2008; Sears 1960) (see Figure 10). A small burial mound, Mound C, is located west of both of these mounds, near the bayshore and shell ridge, not south as indicated by Moore for the “domiciliary” mound. A straight-line measurement from Mound B to the remnant mound in Abercrombie Park is approximately 350 meters, or about 383 yards. The size of the remnant mound (16-18 m in diameter), and its distance and direction from Bayshore Homes’ Mound B, are similar to Moore’s descriptions for the “domiciliary” mound and it is believed that the two mounds one and the same.
In addition, the “domiciliary mound” was reportedly on property owned by J. F. Girard, who Moore says was “living near by,” while the larger mounds and shell ridge were on the property of George T. Chamberlain (Moore 1900:352). J. F. Girard was very likely John Francis Girard, whose family homesteaded land along Boca Ciega Bay between The Jungle area and Seminole Bridge beginning in the 1860s (Huff 1937). This area includes present-day Abercrombie Park. John F. Girard is listed in the 1925 St. Petersburg City Directory as living on Tangerine Avenue South (R. L. Polk and Company 1900a, 1925); however, no Girard is listed in the 1900 directory. This suggests that he had not yet moved from Boca Ciega Bay to the city when Moore visited the area. The Tampa City Directory for 1900 lists a George T. Chamberlain as secretary and treasurer of the Ybor City Land and Improvement Company as well as secretary of the Ybor City Banking and Loan Association (R. L. Polk and Company 1900b).

What happened to the small mound in the park is not entirely certain. Arsenault (1996:29) shows a photograph of a small sign that reportedly once existed in the park. The sign, which was in the possession of a local resident until 2016 when it was donated to the Alliance for Weedon Island Archaeological Research and Education, Inc., states that a “ceremonial shell mound” was used in the construction of a road around 1925. The mound was certainly gone in 1939 when local resident, David A. Watt, approached the City with an offer to donate 11 acres of land in his possession for a park (Watt 1939a). One of the conditions of the land transfer was for the City to preserve the “remains” of the shell mound (Watt 1939b). The park was to be named in honor of John B. Abercrombie, an early settler of the peninsula and the City’s first medical doctor (Grismer 1948:126-127); he also was Watt’s father-in-law. The City acquired the property free simple in 1941 and it was opened to the public in July, 1942.

Abercrombie Park Site, 8PI58

The Abercrombie Park site (8PI58) was originally recorded on the Florida Master Site File (FMSF) in 1962 by avocational archaeologist Frank Bushnell. Information on his site file form focuses primarily on the shell mound, which is described as “almost completely excavated, only a rim remaining.” According to Bushnell, artifacts from the mound area included “200 sherds Weedon Island Plain and Wakulla Check Stamped (not personally dug), 6 sherds from woods near mound of Pinellas Plain – 2 sandstone hammerstones, 16 flint chips, 12 fragments of human bone badly decayed” (F. Bushnell 1962). The ceramic assemblage, particularly the Wakulla Check Stamped sherds, suggests a post-AD 800, Late Manasota/Weeden Island-related time frame for the mound. The presence of human remains also is noteworthy, although Bushnell gives no indication on the form that the sand and shell mound was intentionally constructed as a burial mound.

In 1970, members of the Suncoast Archaeological Society visited the site and submitted an updated site file form to the State (Feder 1970). Unfortunately, except for some historical background on the City’s acquisition of the land from “a descendent of an early county settler,” and some speculation that the site was the landing place of Spanish explorer Pánfilo de Narváez, no additional archaeological data are provided.
In a 1974 report on archaeological sites located within the area encompassed by the Oldsmar and Pass-a-Grille Beach quadrangle maps, J. Raymond Williams describes 8PI58 as consisting of a “low shell midden” (1974:II-9). He indicates that the site had been tested by an amateur at some point in the past, but that the results had not been published. Possibly he was referring to Frank Bushnell. Williams speculated that the site dated late and may have been contemporaneous with 8PI54, the Narvaez/Anderson mound at Jungle Prada, located about one mile farther south on Boca Ciega Bay. While the site seemed to be in good condition, he did note evidence of erosion along the shoreline.

The site was visited again during a 1986 survey of archaeological sites for the City of St. Petersburg’s Planning Department. The final survey report recommended the Abercrombie Park site for City Landmark status, although it erroneously indicated that a “sand burial mound” was once present (Piper Archaeological Research, Inc. 1987:43). In 1999 Janus Research conducted a monitoring project related to the removal of a cement slab and construction of footers for the building of two 9 x 4-foot platforms for the creation of benches (Hughes 1999). Both new slabs were placed within the shell midden portion of the site near the beach. The monitoring resulted in the recovery of several prehistoric artifacts that were present in the upper 4 inches of the midden. These included 26 ceramic sherds (16 sand-tempered plain, 2 Pinellas Plain, 1 Weeden Island Plain, 2 St. Johns Plain, 1 St. Johns Check Stamped, 1 Pasco Plain, and 3 sand-tempered plain check-stamped), a lightning whelk Type A cutting-edge tool, 1 lightning whelk celt, 1 columella awl, 1 shell net weight, 1 pear whelk with a “kill” hole, 1 utilized lithic waste flake, and 4 unidentified faunal fragments.

In 2001 a systematic shovel-test survey of the (then) 11-acre park was conducted by members of the Central Gulf Coast Archaeological Society under the direction of archaeologist Robert Austin (Austin 2001). The survey was performed as part of a long-term research project to investigate and study the Bayshore Homes site complex (Austin et al. 2008). A total of 76 subsurface shovel tests was excavated during the park survey, of which 25 contained cultural material (Figure 12). All of the shovel test locations, the remnant mound, and various landscape features were recorded with GPS.

The survey found that intact shell midden extends from the shoreline eastward for a distance of about 100 m. The midden extends to a maximum depth of about 70 centimeters below surface (cmbs), with the thickest deposits located closest to the shore. Farther east, the midden extends to varying depths ranging from 20-45 cmbs. The midden contains dense deposits of marine shell, animal bone, ceramic sherds, shell tools, shell beads, and lithic waste flakes in a dark, organic-stained sand matrix. Shell species include those typically found at coastal middens in Pinellas County: scallop, quahog clam, sunray venus, oyster, pear whelk, lightning whelk, crown conch, fighting conch, and cockle. Animal species represented by the bone material include deer, turtle, gopher tortoise, crab, and a variety of fish.

Table 1 lists the various ceramic types recovered from the midden and elsewhere within the site. The ceramic assemblage from the shell midden includes a variety of types. Sand-tempered plain
is most common, followed by Pinellas Plain, St. Johns Plain, and St. Johns Check Stamped. Minority wares include grog-tempered plain, Biscayne Cord Marked, West Florida Cord Marked, and a grit-tempered ware with check stamping, possibly Wakulla Check Stamped. This assemblage suggests a late Manasota/Weeden Island-related or possibly early Safety Harbor association. Of interest is a single rim sherd of Pinellas Plain with rim-ticking. This decorative treatment is diagnostic of the Safety Harbor period (Mitchem 1989).

The remains of the previously recorded shell mound are located along the south boundary of the park, about 145 m from the shoreline (see Figure 3). All that remains from prior excavation for road fill is an outer ring of shell, about 50-60 cm (20-24 in) high, that surrounds a central depression (see Figure 7). The north side of this shell ring is breached by what was possibly an access point for trucks or other equipment that may have carried away the shell. The diameter of the remnant mound, as measured from the top of the “ring,” is about 16-18 m (52-59 ft). Two shovel tests excavated just off-mound to the south and in the north edge of the remnant ring, respectively, both recovered fairly dense midden material, including marine shell, bone, and ceramics. A third test was arbitrarily excavated near the center of the mound to determine if any remaining midden is present in this area. This test indicated a high degree of disturbance in the upper 25 cm, with midden shell and bone mixed with rubble and modern artifacts. Below this is the natural tan sand of the ridge system. Only lithic waste flakes were found in this sand stratum. It appears, based on this single test, that the interior of the shell mound is destroyed or completely disturbed. However, some intact midden appears to be present in the remnant ring and in subsurface deposits outside the ring. Artifacts from the shell mound and near vicinity include sand-tempered plain, Pinellas Plain, St. Johns Plain, and limestone-tempered plain ceramics, one shell bead, the outer whorl of a large, notched lightning whelk, and 27 waste flakes from below the mound base.

To the east of the dense shell midden, extending up the west side of the central ridge for a distance of about 60 m, is a scatter of ceramics, shell, and lithic waste flakes (see Figure 3). The shell, ceramics, and some waste flakes were typically found in the upper 60 cm of sandy soil. The undecorated ceramics are similar to those recovered from the midden deposit; however, no check-stamped or other decorated wares were recovered from this part of the site. This suggests that this area may date slightly earlier, prior to the introduction of check-stamped ceramics at around A.D. 800.

Farther east, on the crest of the ridge and in a narrow strip to the east of a man-made pond, a sparse scatter of ceramics and lithic waste flakes is present. Artifacts were recovered from 10 cm to as deep as 90 cmbs. However, most artifacts were recovered from depths below 50 cmbs. Lithic waste flakes predominate in this area. The only ceramics are a few small sherds of sand-tempered plain, Pinellas Plain, and grog-tempered plain. Also recovered from this area is a small sherd of fiber-tempered plain. Fiber-tempered pottery is the first pottery manufactured in Florida and dates to the Late Archaic period, or ca. 2600-500 B.C.

A potentially important area in the extreme southwest corner of the park property along the shoreline was identified where artifacts dateable to the nineteenth and early twentieth-centuries
were recovered on the surface (see Figure 3). These include 7 sherds of blue transfer-printed whiteware, 1 blue-edged whiteware sherd, 2 possible “flow-blue” whiteware sherds, 1 sherd of hand-painted and embossed porcelain, 1 sherd of blue transfer-printed Japanese porcelain, and a fragment of manganese bottle glass. The area where these artifacts were found is the location of Joseph Silva’s 1843 homestead, as recorded on Watson’s 1848 survey plat of the area. Whether this deposit represents a refuse area associated with Silva’s homestead, a later homestead or fishing camp associated with John F. Girard, or a mix of both requires additional excavation to determine. Other artifacts include a lead fishing weight, plain whiteware and ironstone sherds, iron fragments, nails, and modern glass fragments. These were found in the upper 10 cm of shovel tests excavated in the shell midden area. While it is possible that some of these artifacts may be related to early homesteads, they may also represent later fishing activities during the early-mid twentieth century.

The most recent investigation of 8PI58 occurred in 2016 when a cultural resource assessment survey of the recently acquired Kuttler property was performed to provide the city with information on the nature and extent of archaeological materials on the property (Austin and Cothran 2017). In addition to the previously recorded 8PI10650 (Kuttler Mound), systematic shovel testing indicated subsurface midden deposits extending over most of the recently purchased property down to a depth of approximately 70 cmbs (see Figure 9). Ceramic sherds, lithic artifacts, and abundant vertebrate and invertebrate faunal remains were recovered. Table 2 lists the ceramic types recovered during this survey which indicate occupation during the Late Manasota/Weeden Island through Safety Harbor periods, ca. AD 800-1500. Figure 13 shows a sample of artifacts. The midden was recorded in the FMSF as an extension of the previously recorded Abercrombie Park site, 8PI58.

Finally, the shoreline of the park has been the focus of artifact collecting for many years. The collections of two local residents were documented as part of the Bayshore Homes research project. Artifacts in the collections were similar to those recovered during the 2001 and 2016 surveys and include sherds of sand-tempered plain, Pinellas Plain, Weeden Island Plain, Wakulla Check Stamped, Swift Creek Complicated Stamped, St. Johns Plain, and St. Johns Check Stamped, Weast Florida Cord Marked, Carrabelle Incised, lithic waste flakes, biface fragments, a Pinellas projectile point, shell beads, a perforated ceramic disk, a fragment of a polished bone pin, a variety of shell tools and tool fragments, and historic artifacts. Figures 14 and 15 show examples of some of these artifacts.

**Kuttler Mound, 8PI10650**

Between 1956 and 1958, William Sears of the Florida State Museum (now the Florida Museum of Natural History) conducted excavations at Bayshore Homes (8PI41), so named for Richard Key’s Bayshore Homes Development Company (Sears 1960). Key was getting ready to begin construction on what would become the Parque Narváez subdivision located immediately north of Abercrombie Park (see Figure 10). Sears focused his excavation on the large burial mound near Park Street (Mound B), also known as the Lighthouse Mound, and on the southern portion of a large shoreline midden ridge that is located immediately to the north of the Kuttler Mound.
The only mention of the Kuttler Mound by Sears was a brief remark on the presence of midden materials to the south of Bayshore Homes. He apparently looked at artifacts from these middens, indicating that “with the exception of one currently inaccessible large midden, artifacts in these other middens were scarce” (Sears 1960:1). The large midden was probably the Kuttler Mound which contained a residence built in 1939 (see discussion above).

No professional excavation occurred at 8PI10650 until 1999 when Robert Austin and volunteers from the Central Gulf Coast Archaeological Society (CGCAS) began a long-term research project focusing on the Bayshore Homes site complex, beginning with the excavation of a 1-x-2-m test unit in the Kuttler Mound just south of the Kuttler house. The excavation extended to a depth of 240 cmbs, encountering numerous shell strata, lenses, deposits, and possible pit features (Figure 16). Artifacts included nearly 1600 ceramic sherds (Table 3), 126 shell artifacts including 72 shell beads and bead blanks, 227 stone artifacts and unmodified pieces of stone, 2 bone pins, and a large number of vertebrate and invertebrate faunal remains, including 22 species of fish, shark, ray, deer, rabbit, opossum, ducks, loon, snake, gopher tortoise, mud/musk turtle, oysters, scallops, clams, whelks, conchs, tulip, sunray venus, ponderous ark, moon snail, and murex. Figures 17-21 show representative examples of the artifacts. Three radiocarbon dates indicate the mound accumulated between cal AD 890 and 1390, or during the very late Manasota/Weedeon Island and early Safety Harbor periods (Austin and Mitchem 2014).

The 3.5-acre Kuttler property was purchased by the City of St. Petersburg in 2015 and incorporated into Abercrombie Park. In early 2017, archeological monitoring was conducted of the demolition of the Kuttler house (Austin 2017). During demolition a small section of midden separating two concrete walls had to be removed to allow heavy machinery access to the superstructure. This material was sifted and artifacts were collected. These included a variety of ceramic sherds similar to those recovered during the 1999 testing project (Table 4), as well as shell beads, lithic artifacts, and faunal remains.

D) ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXTS

Late Archaic (3000-500 BC)
Early Manasota (500 BC-AD 300)
Late Manasota/Weeden Island (AD 300-900)
Safety Harbor (AD 900-1500)
Pioneer Period (AD 1821-1888)

Diagnostic ceramics indicate that 8PI58 was occupied as early as the Late Archaic (3000-500 BC) with occupational intensity increasing during the subsequent Manasota (500 BC-AD 900) and Safety Harbor (AD 900-1500) periods. Ceramics and three radiocarbon dates from 8PI10650 (cal AD 890-1390) indicate that this mound accumulated entirely during the Late Manasota/Weeded Island and Safety Harbor periods. Nineteenth-century historic artifacts possibly related to the 1843 homestead of Joseph Silva and/or the late nineteenth-century homestead of John F. Girard are present in the southwestern portion of Abercrombie Park near the bayshore.
8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

- [x] A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- [ ] B. Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- [ ] C. Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- [x] D. Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations
(Mark “x” in all the boxes that apply.)

- [ ] A. Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes
- [ ] B. Removed from its original location
- [ ] C. A birthplace or grave
- [ ] D. A cemetery
- [ ] E. A reconstructed building, object, or structure
- [ ] F. A commemorative property
- [ ] G. Less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years
Abercrombie Park Site Complex
Pinellas County, FL

Name of Property
County and State

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)
ARCHAEOLOGY/prehistoric
ARCHAEOLOGY/historic/non-aboriginal
EXPLORATION/SETTLEMENT

Period of Significance
3000 BC-AD 1500
AD 1821-1888

Significant Dates
3000 BC-AD 1500
1843-1900

Significant Person
(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)
NA

Cultural Affiliation
Late Archaic
Early Manasota
Late Manasota/Weeden Island
Safety Harbor
Euro-American

Architect/Builder
NA

Sections 9-end page 14
Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph (Provide a summary paragraph that includes level of significance, applicable criteria, justification for the period of significance, and any applicable criteria considerations.)

The Abercrombie Park Site Complex, consisting of 8PI58 and 8PI10650, is significant at the local level under Criteria A and D. It is significant under Criterion A as it contains archaeological materials associated with early white settlement of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula. Archaeological materials dating to the period during which Joseph Silva is known to have occupied the site for his homestead (1843-1860s) have been recovered. Silva was one of three white settlers who first occupied the Lower Pinellas Peninsula. Subsequent occupation by the Girard family may also be present extending the pioneer period presence up to the twentieth century. The site is significant under Criterion D as it has contributed important information on the Manasota through Safety Harbor periods (500 BC-AD 1500), and has the potential to contribute additional important information on these periods as well as the Late Archaic (3000-500 BC) and early Pioneer periods (AD 1821-1888) of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula.

Narrative Statement of Significance (Provide at least one paragraph for each area of significance.)

The Abercrombie Park Site Complex is considered eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and D. It contributes to the Multiple Property Listing, Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula, as a well-preserved example of three of the six property types described in Section F(3) of the Multiple Property Documentation Form: shell midden, shell mounds, and prehistoric and historic artifact scatters. The integrity of all of these property types is generally good and all of the significance criteria described in Section F(2) are present including dense deposits of vertebrate and invertebrate fauna, abundant ceramic, shell, bone, and stone artifacts, dateable materials, and landscape features (mounds, middens) in well-preserved contexts. The archaeological deposits provide a record of coastal occupation and resource exploitation from ~3000 BC to AD 1900. Thus, the data classes necessary to address nearly all of the research domains outlined in Section F(1) are present.

The site is considered eligible under Criterion D because it is considered to have contributed or be likely to contribute information related to 1) human-environment interaction during the late Holocene (500 BC-AD 1900); 2) effects of climatic and sea-level variation on coastal settlements during the Late Holocene; 3) the development of the Manasota culture in the Tampa Bay region; 4) how, why, and to what degree local cultures adopted Weeden Island cultural and mortuary patterns; 5) the factors that led to the emergence of the Safety harbor culture; 6) the timing and influence of Mississippian cultural and political developments on local cultures; 7) the role of coastal and maritime economies in the development of settled communities and social complexity; 8) comparing coastal adaptations during the prehistoric and historic periods and understanding the factors influencing them; 9) reconstruction of the social and economic spheres during the prehistoric and historic periods; 10) documenting early pioneer settlement in Pinellas

Sections 9-end page 15
In addition, evidence from excavations at the Bayshore Homes site (8PI41), of which 8PI58 and 8PI10650 are both a part, suggests site abandonment between AD 600 and AD 900, perhaps as a result of lower sea-levels during the Vandal Minimum climatic episode (Austin and Mitchem 2014; Austin et al. 2014). The site was subsequently reoccupied, expanded, and then apparently abandoned again around AD 1400, based in part on data from the Kuttler Mound. This was during the climatic event known as the Little Ice Age. The sites in Abercrombie Park have the potential to address in greater detail the effects of the climatic and sea-level events on local settlement, community organization, and maritime economics.

The site is eligible under Criterion A as it is the documented location of one of the peninsula’s earliest white settlers, Joseph Silva. Silva was one of three white settlers who were granted title to land on the Pinellas Peninsula under the Armed Occupation Act of 1842. The homesteads of the other two settlers, Antonio Maximo Hernandez and John LeVich, also are contained within archaeological sites included in the MPL (Maximo Beach and Jungle Prada). These are the earliest documented land holdings of white settlers on the peninsula. The Silva homestead is shown on the US Government plat map of T31S, R15E, in the southwestern portion of the Abercrombie Park Complex. He may actually have lived on the land prior to 1843. Although the hurricane of September 1848 destroyed his homestead and he rebuilt and continued to live there until the 1860s when John F. Girard acquired the land. Girard and his family lived there until at least 1900. Mid-to-late nineteenth century ceramics have been recovered in the general location of Silva’s documented homestead along with early glass fragments and lead fishing weights.

Table 5 summarizes the specific research questions that can be addressed by the archaeological resources at the Abercrombie Park Complex. See Section F, Multiple Property Documentation form (Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula), for more detailed discussions of areas of significance.
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10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property ~8.25

Use either the UTM system or latitude/longitude coordinates

**Latitude/Longitude Coordinates (decimal degrees)**
Datum if other than WGS84:__________
(enter coordinates to 6 decimal places)
1. Latitude: __________ Longitude: __________
2. Latitude: __________ Longitude: __________
3. Latitude: __________ Longitude: __________
4. Latitude: __________ Longitude: __________

**Or**

**UTM References**
Datum (indicated on USGS map):

[ ] NAD 1927 or [x] NAD 1983

2. Zone: 17 Easting: 326970 Northing: 3077115
3. Zone: 17 Easting: 326935 Northing: 3077055
4. Zone: 17 Easting: 337140 Northing: 3077070
5. Zone: 17 Easting: 327080 Northing: 3077000
7. Zone: 17 Easting: 326845 Northing: 3076975

**Verbal Boundary Description** (Describe the boundaries of the property.)

The boundaries of the Abercrombie Park site complex are Long Bayou on the west, the southern property line between the park and adjacent residential homes, and a combination of property lines and boundaries determined by subsurface shovel testing to the north and east. The boundaries are further defined by the UTM coordinates above and as shown on Figure 1.
**Boundary Justification** (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)

The archaeological site boundaries have been established through archaeological investigations including subsurface shovel testing, visual observation, and excavation, as described in Section C of the Narrative Description.
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name/title: Robert J. Austin
organization: Cultural Resources Consulting
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date: 5/13/2019

**Additional Documentation**

Submit the following items with the completed form:

- **Maps:** A USGS map or equivalent (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.

- **Sketch map** for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources. Key all photographs to this map.

- **Additional items:** (Check with the SHPO, TPO, or FPO for any additional items.)

**Photographs**

Submit clear and descriptive photographs. The size of each image must be 1600x1200 pixels (minimum), 3000x2000 preferred, at 300 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger. Key all photographs to the sketch map. Each photograph must be numbered and that number must correspond to the photograph number on the photo log. For simplicity, the name of the photographer, photo date, etc. may be listed once on the photograph log and doesn’t need to be labeled on every photograph.
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**Photo Log** (See Figure 22 for sketch map with photo locations).

Name of Property: Abercrombie Park Site Complex  
City or Vicinity: St. Petersburg  
County: Pinellas  
State: FL 33709  
Photographer: Robert Austin  
Date Photographed: 2018

Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera: 8PI58 shell midden along shoreline of Long Bayou, view to the north_6170325a.jpg.  
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Name of Property: Abercrombie Park Site Complex  
City or Vicinity: St. Petersburg  
County: Pinellas  
State: FL 33709  
Photographer: Robert Austin  
Date Photographed: 2017

Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera: 8PI58 midden area within the Kuttler property expansion, view to the north_003.jpg.  
2 of 5.

Name of Property: Abercrombie Park Site Complex  
City or Vicinity: St. Petersburg  
County: Pinellas  
State: FL 33709  
Photographer: Robert Austin  
Date Photographed: 2018

Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera: Kuttler Mound, 8PI10650, view to the southeast_DSCN00014.jpg.  
3 of 5.

Name of Property: Abercrombie Park Site Complex  
City or Vicinity: St. Petersburg  
County: Pinellas  
State: FL 33709  
Photographer: Robert Austin  
Date Photographed: 2018

Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera: 8PI58 shell mound remnant, view to the northwest_DSCN0005.jpg.  
4 of 5.

Name of Property: Abercrombie Park Site Complex  
City or Vicinity: St. Petersburg  
County: Pinellas  
State: FL 33709  
Photographer: Robert Austin  
Date Photographed: 2018
Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera: 8PI58 artifact scatter area, view to the east_DSCN0013.jpg.
5 of 5.

Additional Items

Figure Captions
Figure 1. Location of Abercrombie Park, and sites 8PI58 and 8PI10650, in St. Petersburg, Pinellas County, Florida.
Figure 2. Google Earth (2018) aerial showing site locations in Abercrombie Park and surrounding landscape.
Figure 3. Site features within Abercrombie Park (Google Earth 2018).
Figure 4. View to the north along the shore of Long Bayou showing exposed shell midden.
Figure 5. View to the north of midden area with cabbage palms. Kuttler Mound, 8PI10650, is to the right outside of picture.
Figure 6. View to the east of the recontoured Kuttler Mound.
Figure 7. View to the northwest of shell mound remnant.
Figure 8. View to the northeast of artifact scatter area.
Figure 9. Locations of shovel tests excavated during the 2016 survey of the Kuttler property addition to Abercrombie Park. The dark oval area in the center of the property is the Kuttler Mound, 8PI10650, and locations of the Kuttler house, pool, and outbuildings also are shown. Reproduced from Austin and Cothran (2016).
Figure 10. Map of the Bayshore Homes Site Complex including the Abercrombie Park (8PI58) and Kuttler Mound (8PI10650) sites.
Figure 11. General Land Office (GLO) survey plat map (1848) of T31S, R15E showing the Joseph Silva homestead on the boundary between Sections 1 and 12. The north half of the homestead lies within Abercrombie Park.
Figure 12. Locations of shovel tests excavated during 2001 survey of Abercrombie Park. Reproduced from Austin (2001).
Figure 13. Examples of artifacts recovered from 8PI58 midden during the 2016 survey.
Figure 14. Sample of shell, stone, and ceramic artifacts from 8PI58 midden.
Figure 15. Sample of ceramic sherds from 8PI58 midden.
Figure 16. North wall profile of 1-x-2-m test unit in 8PI10650 showing dense shell midden on top of white sand. Reproduced from Austin et al. (2008).
Figure 17. Sample of decorated ceramic sherds, Kuttler Mound, 8PI10650.
Figure 18. Examples of shell disk beads from the Kuttler Mound, 8PI10650.
Figure 19. Examples of shell tools (top) and a sinker/plummet (left), Kuttler Mound, 8PI10650.
Figure 20. Bone pins from the Kuttler Mound, 8PI10650.
Figure 21. Chert microliths, Kuttler Mound, 8PI10650.
Figure 22. Sketch map showing locations of photographs.
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Figure 1. Location of Abercrombie Park, sites 8PI58 and 8PI10650, St. Petersburg, Pinellas County, Florida.
SOURCE: USGS Seminole, FL quadrangle
Scale: 1:24,000
Figure 2. Site locations in relation to surrounding landscape.
SOURCE: Google Earth 2018
Figure 3. Site features in Abercrombie Park.
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Figure 9. 2016 shovel test survey, Kuttler property addition to Abercrombie Park, showing locations of house, pool, and outbuildings.

Source: Austin and Cothran (2016).
Figure 10. Bayshore Homes Site Complex including 8PI58 and 8PI10650. SOURCE: Austin et al. 2008
Figure 11. General Land Office survey plat map (1848), T31S, R15E, showing Joseph Silva’s homestead. The north half of the homestead lies within Abercrombie Park.

SOURCE:
Figure 12. 2001 shovel test survey, Abercrombie Park.

SOURCE: Austin 2001
Figure 13. Examples of artifacts recovered from 8P158 midden, 2016 survey.
Figure 14. Sample of shell, stone, and ceramic artifacts from 8PI58 midden.
Figure 15. Sample of ceramic sherds from 8P158 midden. SOURCE: Scanned image, 2016.
STRATA DESCRIPTIONS

A1 = very dark brown, crumbly humic soil with small amount of shell fragments
A2 = dark gray, fine to medium, humic sand with some shell fragments
B = compact, fine-grained, dark grayish brown sand with some shell
C1 = compact, gray, dry, fine sand and some shell
C2 = semi-compact gray fine sand with shell
D = compact, dark grayish-brown fine sand, very dry with some shell
E = loose whole and fragmented shell with very little sand
F1 = crushed shell and some whole shell mixed with dark-grayish brown fine-grained, silty sand
F2 = crushed shell and dark grayish-brown silty sand at base with more whole shell near the top of the stratum
G = very dry, dark gray fine sand mixed with whole and fragmented shell
H = dark grayish-brown silt with abundant shell
I = abundant shell mixed with dark grayish-brown fine sand
J = yellowish to reddish-brown stained shell
K = very dark brown silt with some shell fragments
L = whole and fragmented shell mixed with small amount of grayish-brown fine sand
M = gray sand with crushed shell
N1 = dark gray, compact, fine to medium sand
N2 = gray, compact, damp, fine to medium sand
N3 = grayish-tan, compact, damp, fine to medium sand

Figure 16. North wall profile, 1-x-2-m test unit, Kuttler Mound, 8PI10650.
SOURCE: Austin et al. 2008
Figure 17. Sample of decorated ceramic sherds, Kuttler Mound, 8PI10650.
Figure 18. Examples of shell disk beads, Kuttler Mound, 8PI10650. 
Figure 19. Examples of shell tools (top) and a sinker/plummet (left), Kuttler Mound, 8PI10650.
Figure 20. Bone pins, Kuttler Mound, 8PI1060.
Figure 21. Chert microliths, Kuttler Mound, 8P110650. Illustration by Robert Austin, 2008.
Figure 22. Sketch map showing locations of photographs.
Table 1. Ceramic data from 2001 survey of Abercrombie Park (from Austin 2001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST#</th>
<th>Site Area</th>
<th>Ceramic Types</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Sherd Frags.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STP</td>
<td>STPLAM</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Shell Midden</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Shell Midden</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Shell Midden</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Shell Midden</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Shell Midden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Shell Midden</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Shell Midden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Shell Midden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Shell &amp; Artifact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Shell Midden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Wetland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Shell &amp; Artifact Scatter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Shell &amp; Artifact Scatter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Shell Mound, North Edge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Shell &amp; Artifact Scatter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Ceramic &amp; Lithic Scatter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Ceramic &amp; Lithic Scatter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td>Ceramic &amp; Lithic Scatter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5</td>
<td>Ceramic &amp; Lithic Scatter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J6</td>
<td>Ceramic &amp; Lithic Scatter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mound Center</td>
<td>Shell Mound</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percents</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.88</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>14.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Small ceramic fragments that are too small to make a positive identification.
b Grit-tempered with an eroded check-stamp. Both sherds cross-mend.
c Rim sherd with tick marks on exterior edge.
d Paste contains common tan and reddish-brown earthy inclusions.

KEY: ST# = shovel test number; STP = sand-tempered plain; STPLAM = sand-tempered plain with laminated paste; PP = Pinellas Plain; GROGPL = grog-tempered plain; LSTPL = limestone-tempered plain; STJPL = St. Johns Plain; STJCHST = St. Johns Check Stamped; BISCDMK = Biscayne Cord Marked; WAKCHST = Wakulla Check Stamped; WFLCDMK = West Florida Cord Marked; RUSDEST = Ruskin Dentate Stamped; FIBTPL = fiber-tempered plain; MISC = Miscellaneous
Table 2. Ceramic types recovered from 2016 survey of Kuttler property expansion to Abercrombie Park (from Austin and Cothran 2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST#</th>
<th>Sand-tempered Plain</th>
<th>Pinellas Plain</th>
<th>Sand-and-grog-tempered Plain</th>
<th>Limestone-tempered Plain</th>
<th>St. Johns Plain</th>
<th>St. Johns Check Marked</th>
<th>Biscayne Cord Marked</th>
<th>Gulf Check Stamped?</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Crumbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>51.13</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>17.29</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Summary of ceramic types from 1999 test unit excavation of Kuttler Mound, 8PI10650 (from Austin et al. 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Types</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pct.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shell-tempered Plain</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas Plain</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>29.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand-tempered Plain</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>54.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeden Island Plain</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Red</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand-tempered Plain/Burnished</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakulla Check Stamped</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Shell Stamped</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruskin Dentate Stamped</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Florida Cord Marked?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeden Island Incised</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand-tempered Incised?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrabelle Punctated?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swift Creek Complicated Stamped</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Glade Plain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paps Bayou Plain?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns Plain</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns Check Stamped</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns Cord Marked</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco Plain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perico Plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone-tempered Plain</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone-tempered Check Stamped</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone &amp; sand-tempered Incised</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog-tempered Plain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog &amp; sand-tempered plain</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog, grit, &amp; sand-tempered plain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grit-tempered plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Punctated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Cord Marked</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Check Stamped</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Ceramic types recovered from Kuttler Mound (8PI10650) and Abercrombie Midden (8PI58) during 2017 house demolition (from Austin 2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Types</th>
<th>Mound Spoil</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mound Surface</th>
<th></th>
<th>Midden Spoil</th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sand-tempered plain</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>62.59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>61.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas Plain</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone-tempered plain</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeden Island Plain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Glade Plain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns Plain</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns Check Stamped</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns Incised?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns Cord Marked?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco Check Stamped</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakulla Check Stamped</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand-tempered check-stamped</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perico? Punctated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Incised</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker Ridge Pinched</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified incised (micaceous paste)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified impressed (Pinellas paste)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual sherds\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals w/o residuals</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Less than 1.5 cm in diameter.
Table 5. Research questions by archaeological site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Domains/Questions</th>
<th>Maximo Beach</th>
<th>Abercrombie Park Complex</th>
<th>Jungle Prada</th>
<th>Princess Mound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I) Human-Environment Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) What was the environment and climate of Tampa Bay and the Pinellas peninsula like during the Late Holocene (3000 BC-AD 1888)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Is there evidence for climate or sea level variation during the period 3000 BC to AD 1888?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Is there evidence for short-term weather events that may have affected local communities (e.g., hurricanes, storm surges)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) What was the effect of these perturbations on local resources (plants, animals, fish, shellfish)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) How did coastal populations respond to these changes?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Changes in subsistence patterns (e.g., species or habitats exploited)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Changes in resource acquisition strategies?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Changes in settlement patterns (e.g., movement, abandonment, migration)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Changes in community organization (e.g., aggregation, dispersal)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Changes in community structure (e.g., purposeful construction and/or of higher elevations for structures)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Were there social or political effects related to climate/sea level changes?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Differential access to fishing/shell fishing areas by settlements or lineages?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Differential access to specific species?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Territorial expansion or contraction by political entities.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) What effect did human occupation of the coast have on maritime resources?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Is there evidence of overharvesting of shellfish or fish populations?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Are there increases or decreases in the use of terrestrial species through time?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II) Late Archaic/Transitional Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) How was the Late Archaic/Transitional Period on the Pinellas Peninsula and the greater Tampa Bay region similar or different from contemporaneous cultures elsewhere on the Gulf Coast? Florida?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) What do preceramic lithic scatters represent? Small campsites?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Were larger settlements situated on a shoreline now inundated?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) How were Late Archaic/Transitional groups organized socially and politically?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Was there movement of populations into or out of the Tampa Bay region?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Is there evidence of exchange relations with non-local groups?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III) Manasota/Weeden Island Periods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) What was the relationship between Late Archaic/Transitional culture and subsequent Early Manasota developments? Is there a difference other than the introduction of pottery?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) How does the Manasota settlement pattern in the Tampa Bay region compare with the regional pattern posited by Luer and Almy?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) What influence did Weeden Island cultures to the north have on local Manasota cultures? Was it only in the mortuary sphere, or were other influences felt in the domestic sphere?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Is there evidence for pre-Safety Harbor platform mounds? If so, what do these represent in terms of influences and political/social developments?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) When was the Princess Mound constructed and used?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I) Was it constructed in stages? Rapidly or over an extended period of time?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Did it support structures?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Is there evidence of settlement movement or site abandonment during the Vandal Minimum?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) Is there evidence for status or ranking?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) Did individuals or lineages have differential access to elite goods or subsistence items (e.g., larger fish, better cuts of meat)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV) Safety Harbor Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) What does the Englewood phase of Safety Harbor (AD 900-1100) represent?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) What was the influence of Mississippian cultures farther north on local cultures? Was there population movement into the Tampa Bay region?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Were Safety Harbor societies ranked?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Were individuals or groups accorded differential status? Did they have differential access to wealth goods (e.g., Spanish artifacts) or subsistence items (e.g., larger fish, better cuts of meat)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Is there evidence of craft specialization (e.g., shell beads, mortuary ceramics)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Domains/Questions</td>
<td>Maximo Beach</td>
<td>Abercrombie Park Complex</td>
<td>Jungle Prado</td>
<td>Princess Mound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Were the several mound centers on the peninsula contemporaneous or occupied sequentially?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) Do Safety Harbor mound complexes represent independent polities? Or were they part of a hierarchical political system?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) If the latter, when did this hierarchical system occur and what were the factors leading to its development?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I) If mound centers were politically independent and contemporaneous, how did the large number of mound centers on the Pinellas peninsula interact politically and socially?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J) Was there competition for resources?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K) If the mound centers were occupied at different times, what caused the shifts in settlement location? Population growth? Group fissioning? Environmental constraints?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L) What effects did the Little Ice Age have on local coastal populations?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V) First Spanish Period

| A) Is there additional evidence for occupation of the peninsula by indigenous groups post-contact? | X |
| B) What was the impact of European contact on indigenous societies? | X |
| C) What did the availability of Spanish goods, either through direct contact, trade with other native people, or shipwreck salvaging, have on indigenous technology, social relations, and politics? | X |
| D) What material correlates equate to ethnohistorically defined political or ethnic units. | X |
| E) When were Tampa Bay indigenous sites abandoned for good? Is there evidence for the causes of abandonment? | X | X | X | X |

VI) Second Spanish and Pioneer Periods

| A) When was the peninsula reoccupied following the disappearance of indigenous groups? | X |
| C) Is there evidence of a Seminole or Spanish fishing rancho at Maximo Beach (8PI31)? | X |
| D) What evidence is there of late nineteenth-century occupation and use? | X | X | X |
| E) What was the layout and structure of a Spanish fishing camp and early pioneer homesteads? | X | X | X |
| F) What was the relationship between Spanish/Cuban fishermen and the “Spanish” Indians? | X |
| G) Who were the Spanish Indians? Seminole? Others? | X |
| H) In addition to fishing, what dietary information can be obtained? | X | X | X |
| I) What was the relationship between wild, domestic, and commercially obtained goods? | X | X | X |
| J) What was the material culture of ranchos and homesteads? Spanish Indians? | X | X | X |
| K) Were women and children present at the ranchos? | X |
| L) What was the influence of wider political events on the ranchos and homesteads? | X | X | X |

VII) Regional Patterns

| A) Were individual sites occupied seasonally or year-round? | X | X | X | X |
| B) Did occupation patterns and settlement organization change through time? | X | X | X |
| C) If so, what were the factors (environmental, political, social) that contributed to these changes or lack thereof? | X | X | X |
| D) What was the relationship of individual sites to other sites on the peninsula? | X | X | X | X |
| E) Were components of sites contemporaneous with each other (e.g., Safety harbor occupations at Maximo, Jungle Prado, and Abercrombie/Kuttler), with other sites on the peninsula (e.g., Maximo Point, Weeden Island), and in the greater Tampa Bay area (e.g., Safety Harbor, Safford Mound)? | X | X | X | X |
| F) If contemporaneous, what were the political relationships between mound/village complexes? | X | X | X | X |
| G) Is there evidence for population increase and competition for territory and resources? | X | X | X |
| H) Is there evidence of group aggregation at any sites? Evidence of non-local peoples visiting or living at the sites (e.g., different ceramic types, pastes, tempering)? | X | X | X |
| I) What were the economic and social relationships between sites on the peninsula and those in Florida and the greater Southeast? | X | X | X | X |
| J) Is there evidence of non-local or exotic materials suggesting trade or exchange? | X | X | X | X |
| K) What do Late Archaic, Manasota, and Safety Harbor villages look like? How do they differ from contemporaneous sites elsewhere in Florida and the Southeast? | X | X | X |
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INTRODUCTION

The Jungle Prada Site Complex was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 2003 under Criterion D for having contributed important information on, and having the potential to contribute further information on, the Safety Harbor (AD 1000-1725) and First Spanish (AD 1513-1763) periods in the Tampa Bay region of Florida. Specifically, the site is considered to have contributed or be likely to contribute information related to Safety Harbor chronology, settlement reconstruction, economic reconstruction, social and political reconstruction, environmental reconstruction, and seasonality (Austin and Mattick 2002).

Since a portion of this site is located on parkland owned and managed by the City of St. Petersburg, the Jungle Prada Site Complex is one of the four city-owned archaeological sites included in the Multiple Property Listing, “Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula.” Information on setting, previous archaeological investigations up to 2002, archaeological and historical contexts, and statement of significance is contained in the original NRHP Registration Form (Austin and Mattick 2002). This registration form contains new information obtained in 2014 on the city-owned park property which adds to the overall significance of the complex. In addition, it recommends that the entire Jungle Prada Site Complex also be considered eligible for listing on the NRHP under Criterion A as it contains material remains associated with Spanish exploration and colonial settlement of Florida in the mid-sixteenth through early eighteenth centuries.

7. Narrative Description

A) SETTING

Jungle Prada Park, also known as de Narváez Park, contains midden mounds that are the northerly extension of the large mound and midden on private property adjacent to the south (Figures 1 and 2). This portion of St. Petersburg has long been known as The Jungle because of its coastal hammock (live oak, sabal palm) character, which is retained in the park’s eastern half. The western half contains a shell parking lot, a dock, and a boat ramp, providing boaters with access to Boca Ciega Bay and the Intracoastal Waterway. This portion of the park consists of dredged fill that was deposited during the 1960s. The integrity of the park’s archaeological deposits is very good. The only impacts are from the installation irrigation pipes in the flat-lying areas, a few picnic tables in the wooded and grassed eastern portion of the park, and a park sign near Park Street. Figures 3-6 show various views of the park.

B) PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS

Prior to 2014, investigations in Jungle Prada Park had been limited to surface collections and illicit digging. The site was first listed in the University of Florida’s Archeological Site Survey in 1962 by Frank Bushnell. The Jungle Mound, as it was called, was assigned site number Pi54. The form indicates that the site included both the Anderson property and the adjacent park, and that sherds of Pinellas Plain, Pinellas projectile points, and plummets had been recovered from the “very rich midden” (Bushnell 1962). A small collection of artifacts collected by a local resident from the from the park in the 1960s, curated at the Alliance for Weedon Island Archaeological Research and Education, Inc. in St.
Petersburg, includes pottery sherds (113 Pinellas Plain, 9 sand-tempered plain, 1 unidentified plain, 1 St. Johns Plain, 1 possible Safety Harbor Incised, 1 Tampa Complicated Stamped), shell and stone implements (1 Busycon cutting edge tool, 1 ark shell net weight, 2 grooved sandstone abraders), and miscellaneous unmodified shell and stone.

In his 1974 survey of the areas included within the Pass-a-Grille Beach and Oldsmar quadrangle maps, Williams pointed out that the site had been recorded under several site numbers since 1962 and that 8PI54, 100, and 125 were all the same site. A few years later, a fourth site number (8PI731) was assigned to the Jungle Prada site complex in order to commemorate the presumed landing of Pánfilio de Narváez in 1528 (Davis 1978).

In addition to the artifacts described above, two interesting artifacts reportedly recovered from the park have been published in The Florida Anthropologist. One of these is a piece of mammal long bone with an incised design (Figure 7a) that was interpreted as representing a stylized arm and clenched fist (Gamble and Warren 1966); however, Wheeler and Coleman (1996:51) believe it represents a tail-feather motif. The rectilinear design is typical of what they term the Peninsular Geometric style which is commonly found at late prehistoric sites from the St. Johns River south to the Everglades (Wheeler and Coleman 1996:49-50). The second is a small tablet made of black slate, medially waisted with a single perforation above the midline (Figure 7b). This is a stylized version of an artifact that is commonly found in late prehistoric contexts on the southwest Florida coast, around Lake Okeechobee, and up the Kissimmee River (Allerton et al. 1984). Many are made of metal, usually silver, copper, or brass, and often found in burial mounds. The designs have been interpreted variously as representing a spider, a duck, an alligator, a tree of life, and an Olmec were-jaguar (Allerton et al. 1984:10-16). Certain repeated motifs, such as circles, crosses, and crescents, have precedents in Mississippian iconography in other parts of the Southeast, but their combination with a zoomorphic design is unique to Florida (Allerton et al. 1984:22). The function of these tablets also has been variously interpreted. The occurrence in burial mounds has caused some to suggest a religious function (Allerton et al. 1984:15), although others believe that they represent a position of rank or authority (Austin 1987:297; Goggin and Sturtevant 1964:189, 199; Sears 1982:200).

In 2014, Southeastern Archaeological Research, Inc. (SEARCH) performed a survey of Jungle Prada Park for the City of St. Petersburg in order to determine the extent of the midden within the park’s boundaries (Austin 2014). Fourteen shovel tests were excavated in off-mound locations and eleven of these contained dense midden deposits (Figure 8). All of the negative tests were located in the southwest corner of the survey area near the shell parking area. The mound and midden area are an extension of the large mound located on the Anderson property to the south. The portion of the site within Jungle Prada Park encompasses the entire wooded and grassed area, and measures about 120 m from northeast to southwest, and about 90 m from northwest to southeast.

Three different stratigraphic profiles were observed in the shovel tests. Shovel tests excavated closest to the midden mound contained very dark brown to black organic-stained soil mixed with abundant marine shell, animal bone, and artifacts from near the surface (between 0 and 10 cmbs) to 100+ cmbs. To the west and northwest, the midden tended to be overlain by 30–40 cm of gray sand and shell fill. Finally, in the southwest corner, nearest the shell parking lot, shovel tests encountered approximately 40 cm of
medium gray sand and shell fill overlying dark gray to very dark gray sand and shell to 75+ cmbs, at which point the water table was reached. The shells in these last STs were small beach shells, not the typical shells from food sources that are found in the midden.

The artifacts and shell samples recovered from the STs are listed in Table 1. The prehistoric ceramics are dominated by Pinellas Plain, with 56 of the 81 sherds assigned to this type. Sand-tempered plain accounts for only 13 sherds, while St. Johns Check Stamped and shell-and-grit-tempered plain are represented by one sherd each. St. Johns Check Stamped was made and used locally beginning around AD 800 (Luer and Almy 1980). The shell-tempered pottery is probably an import from the panhandle region where it is common in archaeological assemblages dating after about AD 1000 (Harris 2012). The large amount of Pinellas Plain plus the presence of these two diagnostic markers suggest a primary occupation sometime after AD 1000, which is in keeping with data from the Anderson Mound (Mitchem 1998).

Lithic artifacts include a small Pinellas point (Figure 9), two utilized flakes, two chert waste flakes, and a ferrous concretion. The Pinellas point was likely used to tip an arrow and dates from about AD 700 to the time of Spanish Contact.

The shell sample contained quahog clam (Mercenaria sp.), oyster (Crassostrea virginica), bay scallop (Aequipecten irradians), lightning whelk (Busycon sinistrum), and fighting conch (Strombus alatus). Several shells display evidence of use, including three lightning whelk spoons or cups (Figure 10), a net weight made from an ark shell (Noetia ponderosa), and several pieces of shell debitage (Busycon sinistrum and Pleurolopa gigantea) from the manufacture of tools or implements. Bone was abundant and included a variety of fish, sharks and rays, mammals, and turtles. These faunal materials are similar to those identified by Vojnovski (1998) in her analysis of column samples from the Anderson Mound.

8. Statement of Significance

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)
  _ARCHAEOLOGY/prehistoric_
  _ARCHAEOLOGY/historic, aboriginal_
  _ARCHAEOLOGY/historic, non-aboriginal_
  _EXPLORATION/SETTLEMENT_

Period of Significance
  _AD 900-1725_
  _AD 1513-1763_

Significant Dates
  _AD 900-1725_
  _AD 1566-1725_
Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph

The Jungle Prada Site Complex previously had been determined significant at the local level under Criterion D as it has contributed important information on the Safety Harbor and First Spanish periods (AD 900-1725), and has the potential to contribute additional important information on these periods. Although not originally recommended for eligibility under Criterion A, it is recommended that it be so recognized as a documented site associated with early Spanish attempts to explore and colonize La Florida in the mid-sixteenth through early eighteenth centuries. The site also is the documented location of one of the Pinellas Peninsula’s earliest white settlers, John Levich; however, no archaeological remains for Levich’s homestead have been recovered to date.

Narrative Statement of Significance

The Jungle Prada Site Complex has been determined significant at the local level under Criterion D. It contributes to the Multiple Property Listing, Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula, as a well-preserved example of three of the six property types described in Section F(3) of the Multiple Property Documentation Form: shell midden, shell mounds, and platform mound. It may represent one of several “town centers” believed to have been present in the Circum Tampa Bay area at the time of Spanish contact in the early sixteenth century (Milanich 1994:397-398). Temporally diagnostic artifacts and radiocarbon dates from the platform mound indicate that the principal occupation of the site occurred during the 14th through 17th centuries A.D., with a lesser occupation perhaps occurring at around A.D. 1000. Spanish trade beads from the mound indicate possible contact with one of the early Spanish expeditions to the Florida Gulf Coast, probably the Menéndez expedition of 1567 (Mitchem 1998). Preceramic submidden deposits are undated, but are believed to predate 1000-500 B.C.

Recent investigations at the portion of the complex located within Jungle Prada Park have verified the presence of intact non-mound midden deposits containing artifacts assignable to the Safety Harbor period as well as abundant faunal remains. The carved bone artifact and black slate tablet recovered from the park’s midden in the 1960s are consistent with the site’s presumed function as the residence of a local cacique or political leader. The integrity of the archaeological deposits in the park are very good.

In addition to the issues identified in the 2002 NRHP nomination, Jungle Prada also has potential to provide information related to 1) human-environment interaction during the late Holocene; 2) effects of climatic and sea-level variation on coastal settlements during the Little Ice Age; 3) the factors that led to the emergence of the Safety Harbor culture; 4) the timing and influence of Mississippian cultural and political developments on local cultures; 5) the role of coastal and maritime economies in the development of settled communities and social complexity; 6) comparing coastal adaptations during the prehistoric and historic periods and understanding the factors influencing them; 7) reconstruction of the social and economic spheres during the prehistoric and historic periods; and 8) the effects of early contact between Spanish and Native Americans in the New World.
Table 2 summarizes the specific research questions that can be addressed by the archaeological resources at Jungle Prada. See Section F, Multiple Property Documentation form (Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula), for more detailed discussions of areas of significance.

The recommendation to include the site as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A is based on the documented archaeological evidence of either direct or indirect contact with the Spanish during the mid-sixteenth century. Although several historians have asserted that the Jungle Prada Site Complex was the 1528 landing site of Spanish explorer Pánfilio de Narváez (e.g., Fuller 1972; MacDougald 2018), no archaeological evidence has been found at the site that would verify this. The Spanish artifacts that have been found Spanish appear to indicate a mid-late sixteenth through early eighteenth-century time frame. These include glass beads and ceramics recovered during excavations at the Anderson Mound, located immediately north of Jungle Prada Park, between 1994 and 1997 (Simpson 1998). Of the 17 glass beads, three beads, a Seven Oaks gilded bead, a gooseberry bead, and a “pony” size Carnaline d’Aleppo bead, are commonly found at sites dating to the seventeenth century (Mitchem 1998:62). The others are temporally diagnostic but many resemble beads recovered from late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century sites in Alabama and Florida. Mitchem (1998:63) concluded that the beads may have originated with the expeditions of Pedro Menéndez de Avilés in 1566 and 1567. Hoffman (1998) identified 17 historic ceramics including unglazed Olive Jar (n=8), Olive jar with interior lead glaze (n=2), unglazed coarse earthenware (n=4), white, tin-glazed coarse earthenware (n=2), and one sherd with an unglazed exterior and lead-glazed interior identified as El Morro ware. The chronological range of El Morro spans the seventeenth century. Based on vessel wall thickness, the Olive Jar sherds appear to be of the “early style” defined by Goggin (1960) which would date them to sometime between 1490 and 1570 (Hoffman 1998). A radiocarbon date from these excavations indicates occupation of the large platform mound as late as AD 1434-1660 (2 sigma range) (Tykot 1998). Thus, artifacts and radiocarbon dates indicate direct or indirect contact with the Spanish possibly as early as the second half of the sixteenth century and potentially as late as the early eighteenth century.

Although the Jungle Prada Site Complex is the documented location of John Levich, one the peninsula’s earliest white settlers, no artifacts that can be definitively associated with his occupation have been recovered to date. Levich, who was born in Louisiana in 1910, obtained title to the land in 1843 under the Armed Occupation Act of 1842. His homestead is indicated on an 1848 US government plat map of T31S, R15E (Watson 1848). According to Fuller (1972:48), Levich’s first house was destroyed during the hurricane of 1848. This storm also created a pass through the barrier island directly west of Levich’s homestead, and the pass was thereafter referred to as John’s Pass. Following the hurricane, Levich built his second home on higher ground atop the site’s mound. Levich died in 1873 and is reportedly buried about 10 meters northwest of the present Anderson house (Fuller 1972:45).

A detailed discussion of the history and archaeology of Jungle Prada is presented in the original 2002 nomination (Austin and Mattick 2002).
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**Figure Captions**

Figure 1. Location of Jungle Prada Site Complex, 8PI54, in St. Petersburg, Pinellas County, Florida.
Figure 2. Google Earth image (2018) showing location of Jungle Prada Park within the NRHP boundaries of 8PI54.
Figure 3. View to the east of midden mounds in Jungle Prada Park.
Figure 4. View to the east of open grassy area in Jungle Prada Park.
Figure 5. View to the north of shell parking within Jungle Prada Park with midden area to the right.
Figure 6. View to the south towards the Anderson property showing midden area.
Figure 7. Artifacts from the midden in Jungle Prada Park: a) fragment of an incised bone pin; b) black slate tablet. Illustrations reproduced from Wheeler and Coleman (1996:Figure 2) and Allerton et al. (1984:Figure 15).
Figure 8. Locations of 2014 shovel tests excavated within Jungle Prada Park.
Figure 9. Pinellas point recovered from ST 21, 30-50 cmbs, Jungle Prada Park.
Figure 10. Shell scoop (A) and spoon (B) made of lightning whelk (Busycon sinistrum) shells from Jungle Prada Park.

Figure 11. Sketch map of Jungle Prada Site Complex and Jungle Prada Park showing photograph locations.
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Table 1. Artifacts and fauna from 2014 shovel tests at Jungle Prada Park. Reproduced from Austin (2014).
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Figure 9. Pinellas projectile point, Jungle Prada Park.
Figure 10. Shell scoop (A) and spoon (B), Jungle Prada Park.
Figure 11. Sketch map, Jungle Prada Park, showing locations of photographs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifacts and Fauna</th>
<th>ST20</th>
<th>ST21</th>
<th>ST26</th>
<th>ST27</th>
<th>ST38</th>
<th>ST39</th>
<th>ST40</th>
<th>ST41</th>
<th>ST42</th>
<th>ST43</th>
<th>ST44</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand-tempered Plain</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas Plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns Check Stamped</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell &amp; grit-tempered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crumbs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projectile point (Pinellas)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilized flake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flakes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concretion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Shell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Busycon sinistrum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoon/Scoop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointed Columella</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debitage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pleuroplaca gigantea</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debitage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Noetia panderosa</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perforated, poss. net wt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unworked Shell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mercenaria sp.</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Crassostrea virginica</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Macrocystis nimbosa</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. <em>Dinocardium</em> sp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aequipecten irradians</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Noetia panderosa</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Busycon sinistrum</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Busycotypus canaliculatus</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Melongena corona</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Strombus alatus</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pleuroplaca gigantea</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fasciolaria</em> sp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ficus communis</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Neverita</em> sp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oliva reticularis</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chicoreus pomum</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermetidae</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Polygyra</em> sp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID Bivalvia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID Gastropoda</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID Shell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shark/Ray</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Menippe mercenaria</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Artifacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Domains/Questions</td>
<td>Maximo Beach</td>
<td>Abercrombie Park Complex</td>
<td>Jungle Prada</td>
<td>Princess Mound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I) Human-Environment Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) What was the environment and climate of Tampa Bay and the Pinellas peninsula like during the Late Holocene (3000 BC-AD 1888)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Is there evidence for climate or sea level variation during the period 3000 BC to AD 1888?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Is there evidence for short-term weather events that may have affected local communities (e.g., hurricanes, storm surges)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) What was the effect of these perturbations on local resources (plants, animals, fish, shellfish)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) How did coastal populations respond to these changes?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Changes in subsistence patterns (e.g., species or habitats exploited)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Changes in resource acquisition strategies?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Changes in settlement patterns (e.g., movement, abandonment, migration)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Changes in community organization (e.g., aggregation, dispersal)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Changes in community structure (e.g., purposeful construction and/or of higher elevations for structures)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Were there social or political effects related to climate/sea level changes?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Differential access to fishing/shell fishing areas by settlements or lineages?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Differential access to specific species?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Territorial expansion or contraction by political entities.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) What effect did human occupation of the coast have on maritime resources?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Is there evidence of overharvesting of shellfish or fish populations?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Are there increases or decreases in the use of terrestrial species through time?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II) Late Archaic/Transitional Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) How was the Late Archaic/Transitional Period on the Pinellas Peninsula and the greater Tampa Bay region similar or different from contemporaneous cultures elsewhere on the Gulf Coast? Florida?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) What do preceramic lithic scatters represent? Small campsites?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Were larger settlements situated on a shoreline now inundated?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) How were Late Archaic/Transitional groups organized socially and politically?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Was there movement of populations into or out of the Tampa Bay region?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Is there evidence of exchange relations with non-local groups?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III) Manasota/Weeden Island Periods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) What was the relationship between Late Archaic/Transitional culture and subsequent Early Manasota developments? Is there a difference other than the introduction of pottery?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) How does the Manasota settlement pattern in the Tampa Bay region compare with the regional pattern posited by Luer and Almy?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) What influence did Weeden Island cultures to the north have on local Manasota cultures?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Was it only in the mortuary sphere, or were other influences felt in the domestic sphere?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Is there evidence for pre-Safety Harbor platform mounds? If so, what do these represent in terms of influences and political/social developments?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) When was the Princess Mound constructed and used?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) Is there evidence of exchange relations with non-local groups?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) Did individuals or lineages have differential access to goods and subsistence items (e.g., larger fish, better cuts of meat)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV) Safety Harbor Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) What does the Englewood phase of Safety Harbor (AD 900-1100) represent?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) What was the influence of Mississippian cultures farther north on local cultures? Was there population movement into the Tampa Bay region?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Were Safety Harbor societies ranked?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Were individuals or groups accorded differential status? Did they have differential access to wealth goods (e.g., Spanish artifacts) or subsistence items (e.g., larger fish, better cuts of meat)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Domains/Questions</td>
<td>Maximo Beach</td>
<td>Abercrombie Park Complex</td>
<td>Jungle Prada</td>
<td>Princess Mound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Is there evidence of craft specialization (e.g., shell beads, mortuary ceramics)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Were the several mound centers on the peninsula contemporaneous or occupied sequentially?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) Do Safety Harbor mound complexes represent independent polities? Or were they part of a hierarchical political system?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) If the latter, when did this hierarchical system occur and what were the factors leading to its development?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I) If mound centers were politically independent and contemporaneous, how did the large number of mound centers on the Pinellas peninsula interact politically and socially?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J) Was there competition for resources?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K) If the mound centers were occupied at different times, what caused the shifts in settlement location? Population growth? Group fissioning? Environmental constraints?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L) What effects did the Little Ice Age have on local coastal populations?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VI) First Spanish Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Domains/Questions</th>
<th>Maximo Beach</th>
<th>Abercrombie Park Complex</th>
<th>Jungle Prada</th>
<th>Princess Mound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Is there additional evidence for occupation of the peninsula by indigenous groups post-contact?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) What was the impact of European contact on indigenous societies?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) What did the availability of Spanish goods, either through direct contact, trade with other native people, or shipwreck salvaging, have on indigenous technology, social relations, and politics?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) What material correlates equate to ethnohistorically defined political or ethnic units.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) When were Tampa Bay indigenous sites abandoned for good? Is there evidence for the causes of abandonment?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VI) Second Spanish and Pioneer Periods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Domains/Questions</th>
<th>Maximo Beach</th>
<th>Abercrombie Park Complex</th>
<th>Jungle Prada</th>
<th>Princess Mound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) When was the peninsula reoccupied following the disappearance of indigenous groups?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Is there evidence of a Seminole or Spanish fishing rancho at Maximo Beach (8PI31)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) What evidence is there of late nineteenth-century occupation and use?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) What was the layout and structure of a Spanish fishing camp and early pioneer homesteads?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) What was the relationship between Spanish/Cuban fishermen and the “Spanish” Indians?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) Who were the Spanish Indians? Seminole? Others?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) In addition to fishing, what dietary information can be obtained?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I) What was the relationship between wild, domestic, and commercially obtained goods?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J) What was the material culture of ranchos and homesteads? Spanish Indians?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K) Were women and children present at the ranchos?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L) What was the influence of wider political events on the ranchos and homesteads?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VII) Regional Patterns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Domains/Questions</th>
<th>Maximo Beach</th>
<th>Abercrombie Park Complex</th>
<th>Jungle Prada</th>
<th>Princess Mound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Were individual sites occupied seasonally or year-round?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Did occupation patterns and settlement organization change through time?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) If so, what were the factors (environmental, political, social) that contributed to these changes or lack thereof?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) What was the relationships of individual sites to other sites on the peninsula?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Were components of sites contemporaneous with each other (e.g., Safety harbor occupations at Maximo, Jungle Prado, and Abercrombie/Kuttler), with other sites on the peninsula (e.g., Maximo Point, Weeden Island), and in the greater Tampa Bay area (e.g., Safety Harbor, Safford Mound)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) If contemporaneous, what were the political relationships between mound/village complexes?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) Is there evidence for population increase and competition for territory and resources?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) Is there evidence of group aggregation at any sites? Evidence of non-local peoples visiting or living at the sites (e.g., different ceramic types, pastes, tempering)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I) What were the economic and social relationships between sites on the peninsula and those in Florida and the greater Southeast?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J) Is there evidence of non-local or exotic materials suggesting trade or exchange?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K) What do Late Archaic, Manasota, and Safety Harbor villages look like? How do they differ from contemporaneous sites elsewhere in Florida and the Southeast?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D:
National Register of Historic Places Registration Form:
Maximo Beach
**National Register of Historic Places Registration Form**

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin, *How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form*. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions.

1. **Name of Property**
   - Historic name: Maximo Beach
   - Other names/site number: 8PI31
   - Name of related multiple property listing: Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula (Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing)

2. **Location**
   - Street & number: Sunshine Skyway Lane South and Pinellas Point Drive South
   - City or town: St. Petersburg
   - State: FL
   - County: Pinellas
   - Not For Publication: [ ]
   - Vicinity: [ ]

3. **State/Federal Agency Certification**
   - As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended,
   - I hereby certify that this ___ nomination ___ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.
   - In my opinion, the property ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant at the following level(s) of significance:
     - ___ national
     - ___ statewide
     - ___ local
   - Applicable National Register Criteria:
     - ___A
     - ___B
     - ___C
     - ___D

______________________________
Signature of certifying official/Title: Date

______________________________
State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

______________________________
Signature of commenting official: Date

Title: State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government
4. **National Park Service Certification**

I hereby certify that this property is:

- [ ] entered in the National Register
- [ ] determined eligible for the National Register
- [ ] determined not eligible for the National Register
- [ ] removed from the National Register
- [ ] other (explain): ______________________________

5. **Classification**

**Ownership of Property**

(Check as many boxes as apply.)

- Private: [ ]
- Public – Local [ ]
- Public – State [ ]
- Public – Federal [ ]

**Category of Property**

(Check only one box.)

- Building(s) [ ]
- District [ ]
- Site [ ]
- Structure [ ]
- Object [ ]
Maximo Beach
Name of Property

Pinellas County, FL
County and State

Number of Resources within Property
(Do not include previously listed resources in the count)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register 0

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)
DOMESTIC/village site/midden
AGRICULTURE/SUBSISTENCE/food processing/midden
INDUSTRY/PROCESSING/EXTRACTION/fishing, shellfishing/midden

Current Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)
RECREATION & CULTURE/outdoor recreation/park
7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions.)
NA

Materials: (enter categories from instructions.)
Principal exterior materials of the property: NA

Narrative Description
(Describe the historic and current physical appearance and condition of the property. Describe contributing and noncontributing resources if applicable. Begin with a summary paragraph that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, type, style, method of construction, setting, size, and significant features. Indicate whether the property has historic integrity.)

Summary Paragraph

The Maximo Beach site (8PI31) is located within the City of St. Petersburg’s Maximo Park at Sunshine Skyway Lane South and Pinellas Point Drive South, Pinellas County, Florida (T32S, R16E, Section 10) (Figures 1 and 2). The site consists of extensive shell midden deposits, two shell mounds, and prehistoric and historic artifact scatters which together make up approximately 40 of the park’s 70 acres. Archaeological survey and excavation indicate the site was occupied by Native Americans beginning during the Late Archaic period (ca. 2800 BC) and continuing through the Early Manasota (500 BC-AD 300), Late Manasota/Weeden Island (AD 300-900), and Safety Harbor periods (AD 900-1500). The midden areas contain dense accumulations of pottery, shell, bone, and stone tools, vertebrate and invertebrate food remains, and charred wood. Tantalizing evidence of a “Spanish Indian” or Seminole occupation also is present and may be related to an early fishing rancho occupied during the Second Spanish Period (AD 1783-1821). During the region’s Pioneer Period (AD 1821-1888) the site was inhabited by one of Pinellas County’s earliest white settlers, Antonio Maximo Hernandez, for whom Maximo Point was named, and later by French plume hunter Alfred Lechevalier, for whom Frenchman’s Creek was named. All of these components together comprise a single archaeological site and are the nomination’s single contributing resource.
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In addition to the archaeological deposits the property also contains a non-historic building (restroom facility) and 19 non-historic structures (16 picnic shelters, two observation decks, an artificial interpretive mound) as well as playground areas and parking lots. Despite these developments large areas of the park remain as open space and many areas contain natural coastal hammock as well as upland pine and palmetto vegetation. Survey and excavation have demonstrated that the significant archaeological deposits retain subsurface integrity. In addition, the City of St. Petersburg recently commissioned and implemented a management plan for the park which is used to ensure that park improvements and maintenance activities avoid or minimize negative impacts to the significant archaeological resources (Austin 2014). The Maximo Beach site was determined to be eligible for listing in the NRHP by the Florida SHPO in 2012.

Narrative Description

A) SETTING

1) Location and Environment

Located at the southern tip of the Pinellas Peninsula where Boca Ciega Bay joins Tampa Bay, Maximo Park is bounded by Frenchman’s Creek to the north, a privately operated marina to the south, and I-275/US19 to the east (Figure 2). The surrounding area is dominated by commercial and residential development and the park experiences heavy and varied public uses. Amenities include a beach, covered and uncovered playgrounds, picnic shelters, boat ramps, shoreline fishing, a disc golf course, observation decks, walking trails, and restroom facilities. A non-archaeological mound was constructed on the western portion of the property in 2012 for interpretive purposes. Despite these improvements, large areas remain in open space and intact archaeological deposits associated with the Maximo Beach site are present in well-preserved contexts as demonstrated by several archaeological investigations (described in detail below).

Based on early maps, surveyor’s notes, and soil surveys (Jones and Morrison 1915; Watson 1848a, 1848b), the property originally supported a pine flatwoods community characterized by the presence of longleaf pine, scrub oak, palmetto, gallberry, myrtle, oak-runner, and wire grass. The county’s earliest soil survey shows the southern extremity of the property containing a soil type (Leon fine sand) which typically supports "scrub" vegetation on slightly elevated land along the waterfront (Jones and Morrison 1915:321). Scrub live oak, pine, saw palmetto, and rosemary are typical plant species in scrub environments.

Today all of the natural soils in the park have been reassigned to the Immokalee series of flatwoods soils (USDA 1972). Unfortunately, this has obscured the distinction between those soils in the park which are nearly level and poorly drained and those that occupy slightly elevated areas and exhibit better drainage characteristics. It is on these better drained soils that most of the archaeological deposits are situated.
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At present, thick hammock vegetation consisting of live oak, cabbage palm, pine, and saw palmetto covers much of the eastern portion of the park. The hammock represents a climax vegetation where historically scrub vegetation dominated. Along the shoreline are cabbage palms and the southeastern mound area is open grassland. To the north the park contains pine interspersed with occasional palm trees and stands of saw palmetto. The northwestern portion is sparsely vegetated and contains fill material, including the large artificial “mound.” Figures 3-9 show various views of the archaeological features and park landscape.

2) Archaeological Resources

The Maximo Beach archaeological site consists of several relatively discrete spatial components (see Figure 2). These include a large elliptical midden/mound near the center of the site which is separated from the shoreline midden by a shallow swale (Figure 3); a shell midden that runs parallel to the bayshore and extends to the northeast towards I-275/US19 (Figures 4 and 5); a large, low shell mound that is located along the southeastern shoreline and is separated from the elliptical mound by a salt marsh (Figure 6); several areas of diffuse to moderately dense scatters of prehistoric lithics, ceramics, and shell, as well as nineteenth-century artifacts (Figures 7 and 8).

Most archaeologists consider 8PI31 to be an extension of the large mound and shellworks complex known as Maximo Point (8PI19), which was located to the east of I-275/US19. This portion of the site was visited by Walker (1880a), Moore (1900:353-355), and Wainright (1916:142) and portions were excavated by Sears (1958), Bushnell (1962), and Boyle et al. (1986). All but the extreme western portion of this site was destroyed by construction of the Carlton Arms apartments in the late 1960s (Bothwell 1969).

B) BOUNDARIES

The ~40 acres that comprise the Maximo Beach archaeological site are wholly contained within the City’s Maximo Park. The site boundaries are shown in Figures 1 and 2. The northern boundary is Frenchman’s Creek. Boca Ciega Bay forms the western boundary. To the east is a parcel owned by the Florida Department of Transportation and the I-275/US19 highway. The southern boundary is marked by a private marina. The archaeological site boundaries have been established through archaeological investigations including subsurface shovel testing, visual observation, surface collection, and excavation (see discussion below).

C) ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS

Early archaeological investigations of the lower Pinellas Peninsula tended to focus their attentions on the area’s larger sand and shell mounds, with only scant mention made of shell middens. Walker (1880a), Moore (1900:353-355), and Wainright (1916:142) describe the large mound and shellworks at Maximo Point (8PI19), which was located to the east of I-275/US19, but not the middens west of the point. In his depiction of the mounds at Maximo Point, John
Bethell, an early resident of the peninsula, mentions in passing that “West of Maximo Point is a less striking continuation of the shell works for a good many yards” (1914:53).

William Plowden first recorded the Maximo Beach site in the University of Florida's Archeological Site Survey in 1952 (Plowden 1952). The original site file form referred to the site as Pinellas III and assigned it site number Pi19A, presumably considering it to be an extension of the larger Maximo Point site to the east which was recorded as Pi19. Plowden’s information was typed onto a new form at an unknown date with the current site number Pi31 and a new name, Maximo Point A.

The first professional excavation at Maximo Beach occurred in 1973 as part of an archaeological field school supervised by University of South Florida (USF) anthropology professor J. Raymond Williams (1979). The excavation focused on an 11.7-acre area in the southeastern part of the site that was going to be used as an interchange for I-275 (Figure 10). Williams (1979:4, 6) considered Maximo Beach to be a western extension of the larger Maximo Point site, and indeed referred to both as 8P119. His field school excavated 36 2-x-2-m squares in five subareas.

On the basis of seven radiocarbon dates obtained from charcoal and shell, Williams (1979:60-63) concluded that this portion of Maximo Beach was occupied primarily during the late Archaic period, or between 4148 and 3822 14C years BP, although two later ages also were obtained (Table 1). However, there is no indication that isotopic fractionation of the seven shell samples was considered, which would make the samples appear to be younger than they actually are. When the 13C/12C ratio is incorporated, the corrected 14C ages range between 4351 and 4025 14C years BP, or cal 2833-1947 BC. The two charcoal dates (2130 ± 105 BP and 976 ± 70 BP) did not require this correction and have been calibrated to 303 BC-AD 50 and AD 899-1215 in Table 1. These dates are in the time frame of the Early Manasota and Late Manasota/Weeden Island through early Safety Harbor periods, respectively.

Although a few ceramic sherds were recovered from upper levels of the midden, Williams (1979:28) felt that these were present in disturbed contexts and did not represent a significant post-Archaic occupation. He concluded that the entire western component of the larger Maximo Point complex (i.e., all of Maximo Beach) dated primarily to the late Archaic period (Williams 1979:1).

Most of the artifacts recovered from the USF excavation were made of shell, primarily the shell of Busycn sinistrum. These include hammers, columella hammers, adzes, possible awls, and beads (Table 2). Bone artifacts included perforated shark teeth, a bone pendant, and several beads. The lithic artifacts included a stemmed projectile point, which was identified as an Archaic-period Alachua point, utilized flakes, waste flakes from the manufacture and repair of tools, and miscellaneous unmodified stone. Only 12 ceramic sherds were found and all were recovered from the upper four levels. This small assemblage includes three sherds of Hillsborough Shell Stamped and nine sherds of plain, undecorated sand-tempered pottery. The
decorated sherds are consistent with either a Late Manasota/Weeden Island or Early Safety Harbor (Englewood Phase) component (Austin et al. 2014).

In addition to artifacts, unworked shell and a sample of vertebrate remains were analyzed. No quantitative data are presented for the shell, but the list of species includes oyster, quahog or hard clam, sunray venus, marsh clam, scallop, cockle, transverse ark, lightning whelk, pear whelk, banded tulip, true tulip, crown conch, horse conch, fighting conch, as well as many other species, most of which are commensals. Vertebrate species include deer, rabbit, opossum, raccoon, squirrel, dog, shark, rays, catfish, red snapper, black drum, red drum, spotted sea trout, blue croaker, mullet, flounder, mud turtle, diamondback terrapin, gopher tortoise, common loon, coot, blue and stone crabs.

In his 1974 inventory of archaeological sites within the area encompassed by the Pass-a-Grille and Oldsmar quadrangle maps, Williams (1974:II-6) indicated that much of the site had been destroyed by construction of the I-275 interchange; however, after much public protest related to destruction of this portion of the park, the Florida Department of Transportation reconfigured the interchange to avoid the park and 8PI31 (Albright 1976).

James D. Knight was a resident of St. Petersburg who collected artifacts from the beach at Maximo Park. Among these was a large number of microlithic tools, similar in form to tools recovered from the Late Archaic-period Poverty Point site in Louisiana (Figure 11). Knight published an article on these microliths in *The Florida Anthropologist* (Knight 1976). The largest of these tools measured only 14.8 mm long and most were made on small blade fragments. Knight believed the microliths were used primarily as drills based on rounding of the tips and crushing on alternate margins suggestive of a rotary motion.

A 1987 survey of archaeological sites in the City of St. Petersburg by Piper Archaeological Research, Inc. (PAR) discussed the significance of 8PI31 and recommended the site for City Landmarking (PAR 1987:42). Although no excavation work was conducted for this study, a visual examination of the shoreline, as well as an examination of collections made by several individuals, identified sherds of sand-tempered plan, St. Johns Plain, St. Johns Check Stamped, and Pinellas Plain. These ceramic types confirmed that a significant post-Archaic component was present as well as the Late Archaic component identified by Williams. The ceramics were consistent with a Late Manasota/Weeden Island and/or Safety Harbor component. The shoreline in the southwest portion of the park was observed to be eroding badly as a result of waves caused by boats entering O’Neill’s Marina as well as seasonal storms.

The following year, PAR conducted limited testing and archaeological monitoring associated with park improvements (Austin 1988). The testing included excavation of 50-cm-in-diameter shovel tests in judgmental locations (primarily non-midden areas to the north of the picnic area), and a single 1x2-m test unit (EU-1) in the location of a proposed picnic shelter (Figure 12). Monitoring was conducted of the removal of existing picnic shelters and preparation of grade for
construction; the excavation of auger holes for pilings to support picnic shelters; and the preparation of grade for the construction of concrete sidewalks and bike paths.

Artifacts recovered during the project are listed in Table 3. The stratigraphic profile in the 1x2-m test unit revealed numerous lenses and strata containing variable amounts of shell and bone extending from the ground surface to a depth of 130 cm below surface (cmbs). Pinellas Plain and sand-tempered plain pottery was recovered in almost equal amounts, but the former was restricted to the upper 45 cm while the latter continued to be recovered down to 100 cm. Sherd of St. Johns Check Stamped were recovered from the 15-25 cm level indicating that the upper levels of the test unit were deposited sometime after ca. AD 800, which is when this pottery type was first manufactured (Luer and Almy 1980). One sherd of Pinellas Incised, diagnostic of the Safety Harbor period, was recovered from the surface near the large elliptical mound, supporting the presence of a Safety Harbor component at the site. A single sherd of Hillsborough Shell Stamped was recovered from the 1x2-m test unit between 55 and 65 cm and a small sherd with an unidentified punctuated design was recovered from between 75 and 100 cm. The former is a firm Weeden Island marker and the punctuated sherd is likely Weeden Island-related also. No ceramics were recovered below 100 cm, suggesting that these levels date to the pre-ceramic Late Archaic period. Also of note is the recovery of a single sand-and-fiber-tempered sherd that had eroded out onto the beach. Fiber-tempered pottery is the earliest pottery manufactured by native peoples in Florida, dating to about 4500-4000 years BP (Sassaman 2003) and its presence supports the notion that a Late Archaic component similar to that identified by Williams farther south also is present along the shoreline.

In addition to the ceramics, a few bifacial tools, some waste flakes, and several shell and bone implements were recovered. No detailed analysis of the vertebrate fauna was performed, although the bones of fish, deer, and turtle were all present. Invertebrate species included oyster (Crassostrea virginica), quahog clam (Mercenaria sp.), bay scallop (Aequipecten irradians), sunray venus (Macrocystis nimbosa), moon snail (Polinices duplicatus), lightning whelk (Busycon sinistrum), pear whelk (Busycon spiratum), horse conch (Pleuroloca gigantea), fighting conch (Strombus alatus), and crown conch (Melongena corona). The stratigraphic profile in the test unit indicated variation in the density of vertebrate and invertebrate fauna with depth.

PAR also prepared an archaeological sensitivity map for use by the City in managing the archaeological resources within the park boundaries. The map identified the location of all midden deposits along the shoreline as well as non-midden areas that contained scattered artifacts and faunal material.

No further archaeological work was conducted at the site until 2009 when archaeologists with the Florida Public Archaeology Network (FPAN) conducted a reconnaissance-level survey of the park (Moates 2009). This study identified the southwestern shoreline as an area of active erosion that was damaging the archaeological site. Consequently, a plan was developed to erect an erosion control structure in this location, which extends from the existing observation tower
southeast to O’Neill’s Marina. In order to mitigate any adverse effects to this portion of 8PI31 that might occur as a result of construction, FPAN, along with volunteers from the Central Gulf Coast Archaeological Society (CGCAS), cleaned and profiled the midden in this area (Figure 13). In addition to drawing the stratigraphic profile, volunteers screened the excavated midden materials and collected samples of artifacts. Ceramics recovered included Pinellas Plain and sand-tempered plain (Jeff Moates, personal communication, 2010). Profiling did not extend beneath the existing shoreline although probing indicated that midden is present to an unknown depth. An erosion control device consisting of rip-rap and planted mangroves (Figure 14) was installed in early 2010 and installation was monitored by archaeologist Bill Burger (2010a).

Burger also conducted an archaeological assessment survey of proposed improvements to existing boat ramps adjacent to Frenchman’s Creek (Burger 2010b). Burger dug 92 shovel tests within the project area. In addition to documenting the northern extent of the shoreline midden associated with 8PI31, Burger also identified a possible historic pit feature buried under 25 cm of recent fill. The pit consisted of 5-10 cm of marine shell (oyster, quahog clam, fighting conch) capping about 30-35 cm of dark gray sand. Two pieces of a stoneware vessel and two pieces of cow bone were recovered from the shell. No artifacts or fauna were found within the gray sand. Burger (2010b:17) speculated that this feature could be related to the nineteenth-century homestead of Maximo Hernandez.

A second area of prehistoric and historic artifacts was identified along Frenchman’s Creek and included two concentrations of lithic waste debris, three concentrations of shell midden, and a historic feature. On the basis of negative findings in intervening shovel tests, Burger considered this cluster of deposits to be separate from 8PI31 and so he assigned it a separate FMSF number, 8PI11968. (This site has since been combined with the larger 8PI31 [V. Birdsong, personal communication with Robert Austin, 10/8/2018]). The lithic concentrations are labeled “Northeast Scatter” and “Southwest Scatter” on Figure 2. The northeast scatter consisted of a low-density concentration of lithic flake debris that was encountered between 40 and 80 cmbs. The southwest scatter also was relatively sparse in terms of artifact content with artifacts concentrated vertically between 50 and 90 cmbs. Burger (2010b:18) described a modified flake from this concentration as similar to the microliths collected by Knight from the beach adjacent to 8PI31.

Burger labeled the midden deposits A, B, and C (Figure 15). Middens A and B are similar in that they are relatively small and thin. Midden A measured 40 x 15 m in size and 30 cm thick while Midden B measured 30x15 m and was 30-45 cm thick. Both are covered by spoil and natural sand deposits. Midden C was estimated to be only 15 m in diameter but was apparently quite dense since excavation had to be terminated due to the difficulty of penetrating the deposit (Burger 2010b:19). It was buried by 70 cm of spoil and sand. No ceramics were recovered from any of the midden deposits, although one sherd of limestone-tempered pottery was recovered from the natural sand stratum 15-20 cm above Midden B. The absence of ceramics in the shell midden deposits suggests that all three may be preceramic Archaic in age. In addition to
abundant shell and bone food refuse, several worked pieces of *Busycon* shell were recovered including cups or dippers, awls, hammers, and a mallet/pounder,

The historic locus consisted of sand bricks lying flat on a former ground surface that had become buried by about 50 cm of fill. The brick area measured about 20 m in diameter. No other historic artifacts were recovered, but immediately beneath the brick, embedded in the original ground surface, was a small projectile point which Burger identified as an Ichetucknee point, dateable to about AD 700 and later. He considered the brick to be related to a former structure.

In addition to professional investigations, local residents have collected artifacts from the beach for decades. Artifacts recovered from the site range in age from the Paleoindian through historic times (PAR 1987) and include Suwannee, Bolen and various Archaic Stemmed projectile points, prehistoric ceramic sherds (primarily sand-tempered plain, Pinellas Plain, St. Johns Plain, St. Johns Check Stamped, Wakulla Check Stamped), shell tools and implements, and historic artifacts (coarse unglazed earthenware, stoneware, whiteware, transferware, musket balls, gunflints, coins). Figures 16 and 17 show examples of some of the prehistoric artifacts from the shoreline midden.

Of the historic artifacts, the most significant are two Kaskaskia projectile points made of rolled sheet brass (Figure 18), which date to the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and are associated with Seminole Indians (Dunbar 1981). Other possible Seminole-related or Spanish artifacts are two 1788 Spanish reals (Figure 19). “Black” (actually very dark green) bottle glass, unglazed earthenware sherds with turning wheel marks on their interior surfaces, a script I infantry button, and the gunflints and musket balls could be related to a Seminole/Spanish fishing rancho and/or to the Maximo Hernandez occupation. Although none of these artifacts have been recovered from intact contexts, interviews with the individuals who have collected them indicate that most were recovered from the beach and/or from eroded midden at the southern end of the park near the recorded location of Maximo’s homestead and commercial fishing operation. These include ten gunflints (Figure 20) and five musket balls that were found together. One of the gunflints is a form typically used by the US military during the Second Seminole War (Austin 2011) while the other nine gunflints are of a form and technology typical of Spanish manufacture (Ballin 2013; Biagi et al. 2016). Other historic artifacts from the site span the temporal range from approximately 1870 to the 1940s.

Recently, a small salvage project was conducted where a water pipeline was being relocated (Austin 2019). The relocation occurred within the area where eighteenth and nineteenth-century artifacts had been recovered near the south of the site. Excavation was undertaken in two locations and documented an intact stratum containing nineteenth-century artifacts including salt-glazed stoneware, a clay pipe-stem, and melted lead. Several small pieces of unglazed earthenware also were recovered.
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D) ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXTS

Late Archaic (3000-500 BC)
Early Manasota (500 BC-AD 300)
Late Manasota/Weeden Island (AD 300-900)
Safety Harbor (AD 900-1500)
Second Spanish (AD 1783-1821)
Pioneer Period (AD 1842-1888)

Firm evidence of occupation during the Late Archaic (3000-500 BC), Early Manasota (500 BC-AD 300), Late Manasota/Weeden Island (AD 300-900), and Safety Harbor periods has been documented by surveys and excavations at 8PI31 (Austin 1988; Burger 2010b; Moates 2009; Williams 1979). Discussions of these contexts are presented in the MPL documentation form. In addition, surface collections from the beach have recovered artifacts associated with the Paleoindian, Early and Middle Archaic, and historic periods, particularly at the south end where erosion continually exposed artifacts prior to stabilization. It is unclear if the early prehistoric components are present in the upland portion of the site as no temporally diagnostic artifacts from these periods have been found in context. It is possible, however, that some of the lithic scatter material identified by Burger and Austin may date from at least the Middle Archaic period (ca. 5000-3000 BC). Moreover, midden material at the park does extend into Boca Ciega Bay and early artifacts have been collected from several other locations along the southern Pinellas peninsula (e.g., Goodyear 1968) indicating a possible offshore site.

Some of the historic artifacts recovered from the beach, by Burger’s testing in 2010, and by the recent salvage work by Austin in 2019, date to the eighteenth through the nineteenth centuries. More specifically, two Kaskaskia projectile points and two eighteenth-century Spanish reals may indicate the presence of so-called Spanish Indians or Seminoles at the site, perhaps working at one of the early Spanish fishing ranchos that are known to have been plentiful along the Gulf coast during the 1700s and early 1800s (Neill 1955; Stack 2011). Neill (1968:110) suggests the association between Miccosukee and Spaniards began as early 1769 and fishing ranchos were well established around Tampa Bay by 1788 (Dodd 1947). At DeLeon Spring in Volusia County a Kaskaskia point was recovered from a site occupied by Seminoles from 1789-1836 (Dunbar 1981:167). The reals, gunflints, musket balls, and unglazed earthenware sherds could also be related to a Seminole and/or Spanish presence during the Second Spanish Period (AD 1783-1821) or they could be related to one of the city’s earliest white settlers, Antonio Maximo Hernandez.

In 1843 Hernandez was awarded a fractional quarter section within Section 10, T32S, R16E under the Armed Occupation Act of 1842 (Fuller 1969:45; Grismer 1948:18-19). This would have included all of Maximo Park as well as land on both sides of Frenchman’s Creek. The original Government Land Office Survey plat map of T32S, R16E (Watson 1848a) shows the location of the Hernandez homestead plot in the southeast quarter of Section 10 on the bayshore near where O’Neill’s Marina exists today (Figure 21).
In his land grant documentation, Hernandez indicates he had been a resident of Florida since 1814 and he is believed to have worked on fishing ranchos along the Gulf coast until he established his own rancho at Pinellas Point, or Punta Pinal as it was known then (Stack 2011:41-42). He served in the Second Seminole War and received a commendation which may have led to his being awarded the land grant (Arsenault 1996:30). Hernandez also indicated on his application that the land was the site of “an old fishery” (Fuller 1972:43); whether this was meant to indicate a former Spanish fishing rancho or the prehistoric shell midden is not known.

While operating his rancho, Hernandez served as a fishing guide for soldiers stationed at Fort Brooke across Tampa Bay in what is now the city of Tampa (Arsenault 1996:30) and, like many other fishing ranchos in Florida, he had commercial ties with Cuba. By all accounts his operation was successful but that success came crashing down in September of 1848 when a massive storm surge from a hurricane completely destroyed his rancho. Demoralized, Hernandez moved to Havana, where he died in 1852 (Arsenault 1996:33; Grismer 1948:19).

Hernandez never received a permit for his land grant and he claimed he was a widower on his land grant documentation, but an alleged wife, Dominga, acquired the permit and title to the land in 1852 following Hernandez’s death (Fuller 1969:50). In 1880 the land was purchased from Dominga by Alfred Lechevalier, a Frenchman for whom Frenchman’s Creek was named (Fuller 1969). According to Bethel (1914:57-58), Lechevalier (or Chevalier as he is referred to by Bethell) established a camp “just west of Point Maximo” for the purpose of killing birds for plumes, feathers, and skins. He apparently stayed there for three years before leaving the area. Lechevalier’s camp also is shown on Walker’s (1880a) “Sketch of Mounds on Point Pinelos” (Figure 22). Lechevalier’s reputation as a “notorious” dealer in bird plumes was widespread (Barron 1998:114-115) and he is featured in Peter Matthiessen’s historical fiction about southwest Florida, Killing Mr. Watson (1990).
8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

B. Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

C. Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.

D. Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations
(Mark “x” in all the boxes that apply.)

A. Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes

B. Removed from its original location

C. A birthplace or grave

D. A cemetery

E. A reconstructed building, object, or structure

F. A commemorative property

G. Less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years
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Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)
ARCHAEOLOGY/prehistoric
ARCHAEOLOGY/ historic, aboriginal
ARCHAEOLOGY/ historic, non-aboriginal
EXPLORATION/SETTLEMENT

Period of Significance
2800 BC-AD 1500
1783-1821
1821-1888

Significant Dates
2800 BC-AD 1500
1783-1821
1843-1848

Significant Person
(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)

Cultural Affiliation
Late Archaic
Manasota (Early)
Manasota (Late; aka Weedon Island)
Safety Harbor
Seminole
Euro-American

Architect/Builder
NA

Pinellas
County, FL
County and State
The Maximo Beach site, 8PI31, is significant at the local level under Criteria A and D. It is significant under Criterion A as it contains archaeological materials associated with early white settlement of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula. Archaeological materials dating to the period during which Antonio Maximo Hernandez is known to have occupied the site for a fishing rancho (1843-1848) have been recovered. Maximo Point and Maximo Park were named after him. The site is significant under Criterion D as it has contributed important information on the Late Archaic through Safety Harbor periods (2800 BC-AD 1500), and has the potential to contribute additional important information on these periods as well as on fishing ranchos occupied by Seminole/Spanish Indians and Spanish/Cuban fishermen during the Second Spanish (1783-1821) and historic Pioneer (1821-1888) periods.

The Maximo Beach site is considered eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and D. It contributes to the Multiple Property Listing, Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula, as a well-preserved example of three of the six property types described in Section F(3) of the Multiple Property Documentation Form: shell midden, shell mounds, and prehistoric and historic artifact scatters. The integrity of all of these property types is good and all of the significance criteria described in Section F(2) are present including dense deposits of vertebrate and invertebrate fauna, abundant ceramic, shell, bone, and stone artifacts, dateable materials, and landscape features (mounds, middens) in well-preserved contexts. The archaeological deposits provide an almost continuous record of coastal occupation and resource exploitation from ~3000 BC to AD 1888. Thus, the data classes necessary to address nearly all of the research domains outlined in Section F(1) are present.

The Maximo Beach site is eligible under Criterion D because it is considered to have contributed or be likely to contribute information related to 1) human-environment interaction during the late Holocene (3000 BC-AD 1888); 2) effects of climatic and sea-level variation on coastal settlements during the Late Holocene; 3) cultural developments during the Late Archaic/ Transitional Period and the factors leading to the emergence of the Manasota cultural pattern in the Tampa Bay region; 4) how, why, and to what degree local cultures adopted Weeden Island cultural and mortuary patterns; 5) the factors that led to the emergence of the Safety harbor culture; 6) the timing and influence of Mississippian cultural and political developments on local cultures; 7) the role of coastal and maritime economies in the development of settled communities and social complexity; 8) comparing coastal adaptations
during the prehistoric and historic periods and understanding the factors influencing them; 9) reconstruction of the social and economic spheres during the prehistoric and historic periods; 10) examining the history, social and economic spheres, and cultural interaction between “Spanish Indians”/Seminoles and Spaniards at a eighteenth to nineteenth-century fishing rancho; 11) documenting early pioneer settlement in Pinellas County; and 11) documenting the daily life of a specific settler, Antonio Maximo Hernandez.

The site is eligible under Criterion A as it is the documented location of one of the peninsula’s earliest white settlers, Antonio Maximo Hernandez, and may also have been the locus of a Spanish and Indian fishing rancho. Hernandez was one of three white settlers who were granted title to land on the Pinellas peninsula under the Armed Occupation Act of 1842. The homesteads of the other two settlers, John LeVich and Joseph Silva, also are contained within archaeological sites included in the MPL (Jungle Prada and Abercrombie Park). These are the earliest documented land holdings of white settlers on the peninsula. The Hernandez homestead is shown on the US Government plat map of T32S, R16E, in the southern portion of the Maximo Beach site. He may actually have lived on the land prior to 1843. The hurricane of September 1848 destroyed his fishing operation and he subsequently returned to Cuba where he died in 1852. Maximo Point and Maximo Park were named in his honor. Archaeological materials associated with his homestead include nineteenth-century ceramics, “black” glass, hand-made nails, musket balls, and a clay pipe stem.

Artifacts associated with the possible late eighteenth or early nineteenth-century fishing rancho include two 1780 Spanish reals, two brass Kaskaskia points, and nine Spanish gunflints. No archaeological sites associated with this important period of Gulf Coast history have been documented in Pinellas County and only a few fishing ranchos in west Florida have been excavated. Finally, the site served in the early 1880s as the base of operation for Alfred Lechevalier, a Frenchman for whom Frenchman’s Creek was named. Lechevalier was a notorious dealer in bird plumes who is alleged to have virtually wiped out the bird population of Boca Ciega Bay before moving on to more productive rookeries in south Florida.

Table 4 summarizes the specific research questions that can be addressed by the archaeological resources at Maximo Beach. See Section F, Multiple Property Documentation form (Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula), for more detailed discussions of areas of significance.
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10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property ~40

Use either the UTM system or latitude/longitude coordinates

Latitude/Longitude Coordinates (decimal degrees)
Datum if other than WGS84:__________
(enter coordinates to 6 decimal places)
1. Latitude: _______ Longitude: _______
2. Latitude: _______ Longitude: _______
3. Latitude: _______ Longitude: _______
4. Latitude: _______ Longitude: _______

Or
UTM References
Datum (indicated on USGS map):

☐ NAD 1927 or ☒ NAD 1983

1. Zone: 17 Easting: 334015 Northing: 3066415
2. Zone: 17 Easting: 334160 Northing: 3066555
3. Zone: 17 Easting: 334220 Northing: 3066585
4. Zone: 17 Easting: 334230 Northing: 3066380
5. Zone: 17 Easting: 334375 Northing: 3066380
7. Zone: 17 Easting: 334300 Northing: 3066030
8. Zone: 17 Easting: 334235 Northing: 3066005
11. Zone: 17 Easting: 333890 Northing: 3066340

Verbal Boundary Description (Describe the boundaries of the property.)

The northern boundary is Frenchman’s Creek. Boca Ciega Bay forms the western boundary. To the east is a parcel owned by the Florida Department of Transportation and the I-275/US19 highway. The southern boundary is marked by a private marina. The boundaries are further defined by the UTM coordinates above and shown on Figure 1.
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**Boundary Justification** (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)

The archaeological site boundaries have been established through archaeological investigations including subsurface shovel testing, surface collection, visual observation, and excavation (see Section C, Narrative Description).

---
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---

**Additional Documentation**

Submit the following items with the completed form:

- **Maps:** A USGS map or equivalent (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.

- **Sketch map** for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources. Key all photographs to this map.

- **Additional items:** (Check with the SHPO, TPO, or FPO for any additional items.)

**Photographs**

Submit clear and descriptive photographs. The size of each image must be 1600x1200 pixels (minimum), 3000x2000 preferred, at 300 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger. Key all photographs to the sketch map. Each photograph must be numbered and that number must correspond to the photograph number on the photo log. For simplicity, the name of the photographer, photo date, etc. may be listed once on the photograph log and doesn’t need to be labeled on every photograph.
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Name of Property: Maximo Beach, 8PI31
City or Vicinity: S. Petersburg
County: Pinellas State: FL
Photographer: Robert Austin
Date Photographed: 2019

Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera:
Elliptical mound facing northeast_ IMG1624.jpg.
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Name of Property: Maximo Beach, 8PI31
City or Vicinity: S. Petersburg
County: Pinellas State: FL
Photographer: Robert Austin
Date Photographed: May, 2014

Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera:
Shell midden along shoreline, facing southeast_ ARCG1.jpg.
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Name of Property: Maximo Beach, 8PI31
City or Vicinity: S. Petersburg
County: Pinellas State: FL
Photographer: Robert Austin
Date Photographed: 2019

Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera:
Shell midden ridge along shoreline, facing northwest_ IMG1630.jpg.
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Name of Property: Maximo Beach, 8PI31
City or Vicinity: S. Petersburg
County: Pinellas State: FL
Photographer: Robert Austin
Date Photographed: 2019

Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera:
Low mound, facing southeast_ IMG1625.jpg.
4 of 9.
Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera: Lithic and shell artifact scatter, northwest corner of park, facing northwest_IMG1632.jpg.
5 of 9.

Name of Property: Maximo Beach, 8PI31
City or Vicinity: S. Petersburg
County: Pinellas State: FL
Photographer: Robert Austin
Date Photographed: 2019
Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera: Picnic shelter, historic artifact scatter area, elliptical mound in background, facing northeast_IMG1628.jpg.
6 of 9.

Name of Property: Maximo Beach, 8PI31
City or Vicinity: S. Petersburg
County: Pinellas State: FL
Photographer: Robert Austin
Date Photographed: 2014
Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera: Interpretive mound, facing northwest_ARCG1.jpg.
7 of 9.

Name of Property: Maximo Beach, 8PI31
City or Vicinity: S. Petersburg
County: Pinellas State: FL
Photographer: Rebecca O'Sullivan
Date Photographed: 2009
Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera: Profiling of low mound, view to the southeast_IMG_0781.
8 of 9.

Name of Property: Maximo Beach, 8PI31
City or Vicinity: S. Petersburg
County: Pinellas State: FL
Photographer: Robert Austin
Date Photographed: 2014
Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera: View to the southeast, rip-rap and planted mangroves to prevent erosion of low mound_DSCN034.
9 of 9.
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Additional Items

Figure Captions

Figure 1. USGS Pass-a-grille Beach, FL 7.5’ quadrangle map showing the boundaries of Maximo Beach, 8PI31, in Pinellas County, Florida.
Figure 2. Aerial photograph (Google Earth 2018) showing Maximo Beach, 8PI31, boundaries and site features within City of St. Petersburg’s Maximo Park.
Figure 3. View to the northeast of the elliptical mound at 8PI31.
Figure 4. View to the southeast of shell midden along the shoreline of Boca Ciega Bay.
Figure 5. View to the northwest of shell midden ridge paralleling the shoreline.
Figure 6. View to the southeast of low mound at southern end of 8PI31.
Figure 7. View to the northwest of northern portion of 8PI31 where lithic artifacts and shell have been recovered.
Figure 8. View to the northeast of picnic shelter, area of early historic artifacts. The elliptical mound is in background.
Figure 9. View to the northwest of the interpretive mound.
Figure 10. Location of 1973 USF excavation north of O’Neill’s Marina. Reproduced from Williams (1979).
Figure 11. Microlithic tools collected from the beach at Maximo Park. Reproduced from Knight (1976:Figure 4).
Figure 12. Location of 1988 test unit (EU-1) in shoreline midden. Reproduced from Austin (1988:Figure 2).
Figure 13. View to the southeast of volunteers drawing a stratigraphic profile of the low mound midden prior to the installation of an erosion control structure.
Figure 14. Rip-rap and planted mangroves installed along the beach in front of the low mound to prevent erosion. View is to the southeast.
Figure 15. Burger’s 2010 shovel test map showing the addition to 8PI31 and the boundaries of 8PI1698 within Maximo Park.
Figure 16. Prehistoric ceramic sherds from shoreline of 8PI31.
Figure 17. Sample of shell artifacts collected from shoreline of 8PI31.
Figure 18. Seminole rolled brass Kaskaskia projectile points from Maximo Beach.
Figure 19. Obverse and reverse views of Spanish reals recovered near Maximo Hernandez’s homestead and fishing camp.
Figure 20. Spanish and French (lower left) gunflints recovered near the recorded location of Maximo Hernandez’s homestead and fishing camp.
Figure 21. Nineteenth-century (1848) General Land Office (GLO) map of T32S, R16E showing the location of Antonio Maximo Hernandez’s homestead in the southeast quarter of Section 10.
Figure 22. S. T. Walker’s map of Pinellas peninsula showing the location of Alfred Lechevalier’s (“Chevalier”) camp within the land that became Maximo Park. Reproduced from Walker (1880a:406).
Figure 23. Sketch map showing locations of photographs.
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List of Tables

Table 1. Radiocarbon dates from 1973 excavation at Maximo Park. Original data from Williams (1979:61).

Table 2. Artifacts recovered from during 1973 excavation at Maximo Beach, 8PI31. Data from Williams (1979).

Table 3. Artifacts and faunal material recovered during 1988 survey, testing, and monitoring at Maximo Park. Data from Austin (1988).
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Figure 1. Maximo Beach site boundaries and UTM locations. USGS Pass-a-grille, FL quadrangle map 1:24,000
Figure 2. Maximo Beach site boundaries and features within Maximo Park. Google Earth aerial 2018
Figure 3.
1. Maximo Beach, 8P131
2. Pinellas County, FL
3. Robert Austin
4. 2019
5. Elliptical mound facing northeast.
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Figure 4.
1. Maximo Beach, 8PI31
2. Pinellas County, FL
3. Robert Austin
4. 2014
5. Shell midden along shoreline, facing southeast.
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Figure 5.
1. Maximo Beach, 8PI31
2. Pinellas County, FL
3. Robert Austin
4. 2019
5. Shell midden along shoreline, facing northwest.
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Figure 6.
1. Maximo Beach, 8PI31
2. Pinellas County, FL
3. Robert Austin
4. 2019
5. Low mound, facing southeast.
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Figure 7.
1. Maximo Beach, 8PI31
2. Pinellas County, FL
3. Robert Austin
4. 2019
5. Lithic and shell scatter area, facing northwest.
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Figure 8.
1. Maximo Beach, 8PI31
2. Pinellas County, FL
3. Robert Austin
4. 2019
5. Picnic shelter, historic artifact scatter area, elliptical mound in background, facing northeast.
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Figure 9.
1. Maximo Beach, 8PI31
2. Pinellas County, FL
3. Robert Austin
4. May, 2014
5. Interpretive mound, facing northwest.
6. Photo 7 of 9
Figure 10. Maximo Beach, location of 1973 USF excavations.  
Figure 11. Maximo Beach, microlithic tools collected from the beach.
SOURCE: Knight 1976.
Figure 12. Maximo Beach, location of 1988 test unit (EU-1).
Figure 13.
1. Maximo Beach, 8PI31
2. Pinellas County, FL
3. Rebecca O’Sullivan
4. 2009
5. Profiling of low mound midden, view to the southeast.
6. Photo 8 of 9.
Figure 14.
1. Maximo Beach, 8PI31
2. Pinellas County, FL
3. Robert Austin
4. 2014
5. View to the southeast, rip-rap and planted mangroves to prevent erosion of low mound.
Figure 1. Maximo Beach, midden areas A, B, and C.

SOURCE: Burger 2010b.
Figure 16. Maximo Beach, 8PI31, examples of prehistoric ceramic sherds collected from shoreline.
SOURCE: Scanned image, 2019
Figure 17. Maximo Beach, 8P131, examples of shell artifacts collected from shoreline. SOURCE: Scanned image, 2019.
Figure 18. Maximo Beach, 8P131, Seminole Indian Kaskaskia points.
Figure 19. Maximo Beach, 8PI31, 1788 Spanish reals, obverse and reverse views. Scanned images, 2019.
Figure 20. Maximo Beach, 8P131, Spanish and British (lower left) gunflints. Scanned images, 2019.
Figure 21. General Land Office map (1848), T32S, R16E, showing the location of Antonio Maximo Hernandez’s homestead in the southeast quarter of Section 10.
Figure 22. S. T. Walker’s map of Pinellas peninsula showing the location of Alfred Lechevalier’s (“Chevalier”) camp within the land that became Maximo Park. SOURCE: Walker 1880a.
Figure 23. Sketch map of photograph locations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample No.</th>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Measured $^{14}$C Age</th>
<th>$^{13}$C/$^{12}$C$\alpha$</th>
<th>Conventional $^{14}$C Age</th>
<th>Calibrated Years BP 2$\sigma$</th>
<th>Calibrated Calendrical Years 2$\sigma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UM-143</td>
<td>992N 1994E, 72 cm</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>976±70</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>976±70</td>
<td>1051-735</td>
<td>AD 899-1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM-144</td>
<td>1934N 2004E, 75-80 cm</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>3977±118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4180±120</td>
<td>4575-3896</td>
<td>2626-1947 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM-145</td>
<td>1934N 2004E, 75-80 cm</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>3875±90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4078±93</td>
<td>4386-3859</td>
<td>2437-1910 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM-146</td>
<td>1936N 2002E, 105 cm</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>3827±80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4030±84</td>
<td>4309-3813</td>
<td>2630-1864 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM-147</td>
<td>1934N 2004E, 80 cm</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>3822±100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4025±103</td>
<td>4355-3757</td>
<td>2406-1808 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM-148</td>
<td>1934N 2004E, 100 cm</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>3822±80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4025±84</td>
<td>4304-3806</td>
<td>2355-1857 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM-149</td>
<td>2002N 1998E, 115-120 cm</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>4022±122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4225±124</td>
<td>4680-3956</td>
<td>2731-2007 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM-150</td>
<td>2002N 1998E, 105-110 cm</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>4148±90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4351±93</td>
<td>4782-4234</td>
<td>2833-2285 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM-151</td>
<td>fire pit, concretion, 2003N 1998E, 110 cm</td>
<td>Calcareous concretion with charcoal</td>
<td>2130±105</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>2130±105</td>
<td>2342-1891</td>
<td>393 BC-AD 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Calibrations performed using CALIB 7.04 with INTCAL13 and MARINE13 calibration curves.
Table 2. Artifacts recovered from during 1973 excavation at Maximo Beach, 8PI31. Data from Williams (1979).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics(^a)</td>
<td>1  5  4  2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projectile point-Alachua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biface fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cores</td>
<td>2 4 1 1 1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilized flakes</td>
<td>4 1 2 1 2 2 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste flakes</td>
<td>1 2 8 8 4 3 1 4 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmodified limestone</td>
<td>4 2 1 1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossilized shell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral fragments</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 4 1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. unmodified stone</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Busycon</em> hammers</td>
<td>5 10 20 11 8 4 4 1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Busycon</em>, perforated</td>
<td>3 7 5 6 3 1 2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pleuroloca</em>, perforated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aequipecten</em>, perforated</td>
<td>2 1 1 2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Busycon</em> adze</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Busycon</em> columnella awls(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible <em>Busycon</em> ladles(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible <em>Mercenaria</em> tools(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Busycon</em> pendant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shark teeth, perforated</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beads, disc</td>
<td>3 2 3 4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beads, tubular</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatulate pin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous pins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer antler tine, socketed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>27 59 62 59 54 31 19 7 9 553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Ceramics include 3 Hillsborough Shell Stamped and 9 sand-tempered plain. Proveniences for specific types are not provided in the original report.

\(^b\) No specific provenience information provided for these artifacts.
Table 3. Artifacts and faunal material recovered during 1988 survey, testing, and monitoring at Maximo Park. Data from Austin (1988).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Materials</th>
<th>Surface Shovel Tests &amp; Auger Holes</th>
<th>1x2-m Test Unit Levels</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-5 cm</td>
<td>5-15 cm</td>
<td>15-25 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas Plain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas Incised</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Shell Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified punctated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand-tempered laminated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand-tempered plain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand-&amp;-grit-tempered plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns Plain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns Check Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone-tempered Plain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand-&amp;-fiber-tempered plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bifaces</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste flakes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithics, unmodified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell, modified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrapers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercenaria sp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busycon sp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercenaria sp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melongena corona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columnella hammers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busycon sp.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleuroloca gigantea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified gastropod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cultural Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Materials</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Shovel Tests &amp; Auger Holes</th>
<th>1x2-m Test Unit Levels</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-5 cm</td>
<td>5-15 cm</td>
<td>15-25 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columnella plane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columnella, undetermined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Busycon spiratum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pleuroplaca gigantea</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perforated <em>Strombus alatus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladies, <em>Busycon</em> ssp,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell, unmodified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mercenaria</em> sp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aequipecten irradians</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Macrocallista nimbosa</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Polinices duplicatus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Busycon</em> sp.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pleuroplaca gigantea</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Melongena corona</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified shell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone, modified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone, unmodified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Research questions by archaeological site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Domains/Questions</th>
<th>Maximo Beach</th>
<th>Abercrombie Park Complex</th>
<th>Jungle Prada</th>
<th>Princess Mound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I) Human-Environment Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) What was the environment and climate of Tampa Bay and the Pinellas peninsula like during the Late Holocene (3000 BC-AD 1888)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Is there evidence for climate or sea level variation during the period 3000 BC to AD 1888?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Is there evidence for short-term weather events that may have affected local communities (e.g., hurricanes, storm surges)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) What was the effect of these perturbations on local resources (plants, animals, fish, shellfish)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) How did coastal populations respond to these changes?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Changes in subsistence patterns (e.g., species or habitats exploited)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Changes in resource acquisition strategies?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Changes in settlement patterns (e.g., movement, abandonment, migration)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Changes in community organization (e.g., aggregation, dispersal)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Changes in community structure (e.g., purposeful construction and/or of higher elevations for structures)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Were there social or political effects related to climate/sea level changes?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Differential access to fishing/shell fishing areas by settlements or lineages?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Differential access to specific species?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Territorial expansion or contraction by political entities.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) What effect did human occupation of the coast have on maritime resources?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Is there evidence of overharvesting of shellfish or fish populations?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Are there increases or decreases in the use of terrestrial species through time?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II) Late Archaic/Transitional Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) How was the Late Archaic/Transitional Period on the Pinellas Peninsula and the greater Tampa Bay region similar or different from contemporaneous cultures elsewhere on the Gulf Coast? Florida?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) What do preceramic lithic scatters represent? Small campsites?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Were larger settlements situated on a shoreline now inundated?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) How were Late Archaic/Transitional groups organized socially and politically?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Was there movement of populations into or out of the Tampa Bay region?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Is there evidence of exchange relations with non-local groups?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III) Manasota/Weeden Island Periods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) What was the relationship between Late Archaic/Transitional culture and subsequent Early Manasota developments? Is there a difference other than the introduction of pottery?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) How does the Manasota settlement pattern in the Tampa Bay region compare with the regional pattern posited by Luer and Almy?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) What influence did Weeden Island cultures to the north have on local Manasota cultures? Was it only in the mortuary sphere, or were other influences felt in the domestic sphere?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Is there evidence for pre-Safety Harbor platform mounds? If so, what do these represent in terms of influences and political/social developments?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) When was the Princess Mound constructed and used?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Was it constructed in stages? Rapidly or over an extended period of time?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Did it support structures?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Is there evidence of settlement movement or site abandonment during the Vandal Minimum?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) Is there evidence for status or ranking?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) Did individuals or lineages have differential access to elite goods or subsistence items (e.g., larger fish, better cuts of meat)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV) Safety Harbor Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) What does the Englewood phase of Safety Harbor (AD 900-1100) represent?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) What was the influence of Mississippian cultures farther north on local cultures? Was there population movement into the Tampa Bay region?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Were Safety Harbor societies ranked?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Were individuals or groups accorded differential status? Did they have differential access to wealth goods (e.g., Spanish artifacts) or subsistence items (e.g., larger fish, better cuts of meat)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Is there evidence of craft specialization (e.g., shell beads, mortuary ceramics)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Domains/Questions</td>
<td>Maximo Beach</td>
<td>Abercrombie Park Complex</td>
<td>Jungle Prada</td>
<td>Princess Mound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Were the several mound centers on the peninsula contemporaneous or occupied sequentially?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) Do Safety Harbor mound complexes represent independent polities? Or were they part of a hierarchical political system?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) If the latter, when did this hierarchical system occur and what were the factors leading to its development?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I) If mound centers were politically independent and contemporaneous, how did the large number of mound centers on the Pinellas peninsula interact politically and socially?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J) Was there competition for resources?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K) If the mound centers were occupied at different times, what caused the shifts in settlement location? Population growth? Group fissioning? Environmental constraints?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L) What effects did the Little Ice Age have on local coastal populations?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V) First Spanish Period

| A) Is there additional evidence for occupation of the peninsula by indigenous groups post-contact? | X            |
| B) What was the impact of European contact on indigenous societies?                           | X            |
| C) What did the availability of Spanish goods, either through direct contact, trade with other native people, or shipwreck salvaging, have on indigenous technology, social relations, and polities? | X            |
| D) What material correlates equate to ethnohistorically defined political or ethnic units. | X            |
| E) When were Tampa Bay indigenous sites abandoned for good? Is there evidence for the causes of abandonment? | X            | X                        | X            | X              |

VI) Second Spanish and Pioneer Periods

| A) When was the peninsula reoccupied following the disappearance of indigenous groups?        | X            |
| C) Is there evidence of a Seminole or Spanish fishing rancho at Maximo Beach (8PI31)?       | X            |
| D) What evidence is there of late nineteenth-century occupation and use?                     | X            | X                        | X            | X              |
| E) What was the layout and structure of a Spanish fishing camp and early pioneer homesteads? | X            | X                        | X            | X              |
| F) What was the relationship between Spanish/Cuban fishermen and the “Spanish” Indians?     | X            |
| G) Who were the Spanish Indians? Seminole? Others?                                          | X            |
| H) In addition to fishing, what dietary information can be obtained?                         | X            | X                        | X            | X              |
| I) What was the relationship between wild, domestic, and commercially obtained goods?      | X            | X                        | X            | X              |
| J) What was the material culture of ranchos and homesteads? Spanish Indians?                | X            | X                        | X            | X              |
| K) Were women and children present at the ranchos?                                          | X            |
| L) What was the influence of wider political events on the ranchos and homesteads?          | X            | X                        | X            | X              |

VII) Regional Patterns

| A) Were individual sites occupied seasonally or year-round?                                  | X            | X                        | X            | X              |
| B) Did occupation patterns and settlement organization change through time?                 | X            | X                        | X            | X              |
| C) If so, what were the factors (environmental, political, social) that contributed to these changes or lack thereof? | X            | X                        | X            | X              |
| D) What was the relationships of individual sites to other sites on the peninsula?          | X            | X                        | X            | X              |
| E) Were components of sites contemporaneous with each other (e.g., Safety harbor occupations at Maximo, Jungle Prado, and Abercrombie/Kuttler), with other sites on the peninsula (e.g., Maximo Point, Weeden Island), and in the greater Tampa Bay area (e.g., Safety Harbor, Safford Mound)? | X            | X                        | X            | X              |
| F) If contemporaneous, what were the political relationships between mound/village complexes? | X            | X                        | X            | X              |
| G) Is there evidence for population increase and competition for territory and resources?  | X            | X                        | X            | X              |
| H) Is there evidence of group aggregation at any sites? Evidence of non-local peoples visiting or living at the sites (e.g., different ceramic types, pastes, tempering)? | X            | X                        | X            | X              |
| I) What were the economic and social relationships between sites on the peninsula and those in Florida and the greater Southeast? | X            | X                        | X            | X              |
| J) Is there evidence of non-local or exotic materials suggesting trade or exchange?         | X            | X                        | X            | X              |
| K) What do Late Archaic, Manasota, and Safety Harbor villages look like? How do they differ from contemporaneous sites elsewhere in Florida and the Southeast? | X            | X                        | X            | X              |
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Historic name: Princess Mound

Other names/site number: 8PI1108; Pinellas Point Mound; Hirrihigua Mound
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Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula
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As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended,
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**Number of Resources within Property**
(Do not include previously listed resources in the count)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register 0

---

6. **Function or Use**

**Historic Functions**
(Enter categories from instructions.)

SOCIAL/civic/platform mound
GOVERNMENT/public works/platform mound
RELIGION/religious facility/platform mound
AGRICULTURE/SUBSISTENCE/food processing/midden
INDUSTRY/PROCESSING/EXTRACTION/fishing, shellfishing/midden

---
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(Enter categories from instructions.)

RECREATION & CULTURE/outdoor recreation/park
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7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions.)

NA

Materials: (enter categories from instructions.)
Principal exterior materials of the property: NA

Narrative Description
(Describe the historic and current physical appearance and condition of the property. Describe contributing and noncontributing resources if applicable. Begin with a summary paragraph that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, type, style, method of construction, setting, size, and significant features. Indicate whether the property has historic integrity.)

Summary Paragraph

The Princess Mound (8PI108) is located within the City of St. Petersburg’s Indian Mound Park at Mound Place South and Bethel Way South, Pinellas County, Florida (T32S, R16E, Section 13) (Figures 1 and 2). The Princess Mound is a large rectangular platform mound with a ramp extending from its southern side and a second possible ramp on its northern side (Figure 3). The mound was truncated on its western edge by the construction of a house in 1929 but retains approximately 85 percent of its estimated original length of 155 ft (47 meters). A shell midden surrounds the mound and covers all but the extreme northern and southeastern parts of the park (see Figure 2). Shell deposits extend to approximately 40-50 centimeters below surface (cmbs) and contain ceramic sherds, modified shell, and occasional lithic artifacts.

Archaeological survey and test excavation indicate that the midden dates to the Manasota period (ca. 500 BC-AD. 900) but few artifacts have been recovered from the platform mound. Those that have been recovered suggest a pre-Safety Harbor, Late Manasota/Weeden Island period for the fill used to construct the mound. The southern ramp is believed to have once extended farther south via a shell causeway to connect with a small sand mound that is located within a City road right-of-way and is outside of Indian Mound Park. Shell middens also once extended
for several hundred meters along the bayshore and are assumed to have been part of a village area associated with the Princess Mound; however, much of the area was developed as a residential area in the early twentieth century and very little professional archeological investigation of the area has been conducted.

The integrity of the existing mound is very good while the surrounding midden appears to have suffered some disturbance during the twentieth century. Thus, only the mound is considered a contributing resource to this nomination. Indian Mound Park was designated a Local Historic Landmark by the City of St. Petersburg in 2002. In addition, the City of St. Petersburg recently commissioned and implemented a management plan for the park which is used to ensure that park improvements and maintenance activities avoid or minimize negative impacts to the significant archaeological resources (Austin 2014a).

**Narrative Description**

**A) SETTING**

Indian Mound Park is located at the southern end of the Pinellas Peninsula in an area known locally as Pinellas Point. It consists of .73 acres and is bounded by Mound Place South to the south, a fence line ~12 meters south of Pinellas Point Drive to the north, and residential houses to the east and west (Figure 2). Tampa Bay is located about 300 meters to the south. The Princess Mound archaeological site encompasses ~0.63 acres. The prehistoric mound occupies most of this area and is surrounded by a fringe of shell midden. Except for the mound, the land surface is relatively flat with a gradual slope to the south. Elevations along Pinellas Point Drive are about 14 feet NGVD (4.3 m) and those along Mound Place South are about 10 feet (3 m). The highest point on the property is the crest of the mound at 29 feet NGVD (8.8 m) (City of St. Petersburg 2009). The surrounding area is dominated by residential homes and the park experiences moderate, low-impact public use.

The Princess Mound is a large rectangular platform mound with a ramp extending from its southern side and a second possible ramp on its northern side (Figure 3). The mound was truncated on its western edge by the construction of a house in 1929 but originally it may have been as wide as 155 ft (47 m) (Moore 1900:356). Current mound measurements are approximately 40 m (131 ft) long by 17 m (56 ft) wide (not including ramps) with a height of about 4.5 m (14.8 ft). The flat summit measures about 23 m (75.5 ft) long and 11 m (36 ft) wide. If Moore’s length is accurate, then approximately 7 meters of mound were removed when the house was constructed. According to early investigators, the mound was constructed of alternating layers of sand and shell and at least one burial was reportedly recovered from near its top (Moore 1900; Walker 1880a).

The shell midden surrounding the mound measures about 60 meters in diameter and includes all but the extreme northern part of the park near Pinellas Point Drive (see Figure 2). Shell deposits extend to approximately 40-50 cmbs and contain prehistoric ceramic sherds, modified shell, and
occasional lithic artifacts as well as modern artifacts (Austin 2014). It is suspected that some of these deposits have eroded from the mound.

The mound is vegetated with live oaks, cabbage palms, and native understory. Large banyan trees are present on the east side of the park while the northern park area is open and grassy. Several interpretive signs are located just north of the mound and a wooden stairway ascends the mound on its north side. Early maps, aerial photographs, and soils maps indicate that the area originally contained scrub oak, pines, palmetto, and rosemary (Jones and Morrison 1915). Figures 4-9 show historic and current views of the site.

The Princess Mound is one of what was at one time several large shell mounds, smaller sand mounds, and a near continuous shell midden that stretched from the eastern end of the peninsula west to Maximo Point and then north to at least as far as Frenchman’s Creek along Boca Ciega Bay (Goodyear 1968; Walker 1880a, 1880b; Williams 1974). Most of these sites were destroyed by development during the early twentieth century. Although interpretive signs at the park indicate that the mound is from the Safety Harbor period (AD 900-1500), recent field work suggests that it may date slightly earlier, to the Late Manasota/Weeden Island Period, ca. AD 400-900 (see discussion below).

B) BOUNDARIES

The Princess Mound archaeological site comprises ~0.63 acres, or nearly all of the park’s 0.73 acres. The mound proper is ~0.34 acres. The site boundaries are shown in Figure 2. The boundary of the mound was determined by topographic mapping. The northern boundary of the site is an irregular line located about 18 meters south of the park boundary and about 30 meters south of Pinellas Point Drive, and was determined by systematic subsurface shovel testing. The western and northeastern boundaries are arbitrarily set at the boundaries between the park and adjacent private properties. The southern and southeastern boundaries are defined by Mound Place South and an irregular line determined by shovel testing. At its maximum, this irregular line is located about 18 meters from the park’s southeastern property corner.

C) ARCHACOEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS

The earliest documented investigation of the Princess Mound was in 1872 when, according to early Pinellas pioneer John Bethel, a Dr. Van Bibber and Professor Agassiz (probably Louis Agassiz, a renowned biologist and geologist) visited the peninsula (Bethel 1914:51-52). Bethel took them to the large mound into which they apparently made an excavation revealing that the mound was constructed in layers of earth and shell (Bethel 1914:52). He provides one of the earliest and best descriptions of what the mound looked like originally:

There are three or more circular excavations like sinkholes or pond bottoms, from which the earth [for the mound] was taken. The present county road [Pinellas Point Drive] along the section line skirts the largest of the holes, beyond which to the south and but a stone’s throw from the road stands the mound.
As the mound stands on the high timbered land about a quarter of a mile from the present beach line, the transportation of shell thither is a problem. The remains of a causeway reaching the top of the mound and gently sloping toward the south may have assisted in making the deposit of shell. The mound is elongated in an almost east and west line. The slope of the sides is abrupt, except on the south, as mentioned. The top at the south end had once been leveled off for fifteen or twenty feet and terraced over.

It must have been in existence many years, perhaps ages, from the fact that when I first saw it, in 1849, it had pine trees growing on it equally large as any in the neighborhood. I did not see the mound again until 1859, and it was then in a good state of preservation. But since the Civil War vandal hands have preyed upon it so often that now there is scarcely a vestige of the terrace to be seen (Bethel 1914:52).

The mound appears on an 1879 Coastal Survey map, which shows it located at the edge of scrub vegetation with pine forest to the north (Figure 10). Also, in that year, the mound was investigated by S. T. Walker (Walker 1880a). It was one of several mounds visited by him on the Pinellas peninsula (Figure 11). A description that seems to fit the Princess Mound indicates that it was one mile south of Maximo Point and one-quarter mile inland from the beach; this is labeled “13. Mound at Bethel’s Camp” (Walker 1880a:405), although the mound is labeled #10 on his map of site (see Figure 11). The mound is described as measuring 200 feet along the top and 20 feet high with an “inclined roadway” on its western side. His Plate VI, Figures 3 and 4, illustrate a ramped platform mound that closely resembles the Princess Mound (Figure 12). Contrary to his written description, the map indicates the ramp or “roadway” extending from the southern side of the mound, not the western as he described it. A south-facing ramp would be consistent with the Princess Mound. A linear excavation “that was made many years ago” was visible as was a pine tree with the year 1840 engraved in the trunk (Walker 1880a:405). A second pit is shown from which a skeleton and an “Indian pipe” had reportedly been taken. Walker expanded this pit “in all directions, but found nothing excepting a few pieces of pottery” (Walker 1880a:405, 407).

Clarence B. Moore visited the mound in 1900. Moore and his excavation crew are probably the “employees [sic] of the Philadelphia Acadamey [sic] of Natural Sciences” who Bethel (1914:52) mentions as having made an excavation in the north side of the mound subsequent to Van Bibber and Agassiz’s investigation in 1872. Moore’s description of the mound is brief but informative in that it confirms the previous observations of Bethel and Walker, while correcting the description of the ramp as descending from the mound’s southern, not western, side (Moore 1900:355-356). Moore’s measurements are slightly different from Walker’s: 155 feet long and 47 feet wide with a height of 17 feet. The “graded way” on the southern side extended almost due south for a distance of 112 feet, much farther than is visible today. Two large, circular borrow pits were observed, one to the east and one to the east-southeast, from which sand for the mound’s construction was taken.
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Moore dug into the western end of the northern side of the mound, encountering “irregular layers of sand and shell” (Moore 1900:356). The only artifacts reported are sherds of “rude, undecorated” ceramics, a fragment of a “bone piercing instrument,” and a fragment of a chert projectile point. Several other low sand mounds are noted in the neighborhood, but none were investigated.

R. D. Wainwright briefly visited the mound in the spring of 1916 accompanied by G. W. Bennett who lived on Maximo Point (Wainright 1916:142-143). Wainwright estimated the mound to be 100 feet by 50 feet and 30 feet high, and he describes the causeway mentioned by Moore as being “very discernable” and covered in thick vegetation.

In 1925, David Bushnell, Jr. a “collaborator” of the Bureau of American Ethnology, briefly visited the mound (D. Bushnell 1926:126-127). He refers to the previous work of Walker in 1879, but not Moore, and remarks on the amount of digging in the mound “by persons seeking hidden treasure,” which had left the surface “quite irregular.” His mound measurements were taken directly from Walker: 200 feet long and 20 feet high. It does not appear that he did any digging, but he did make a collection of marine shells from the spoil of previous excavations. Bushnell also provided one of the earliest photographs of the mound, reproduced here as Figure 4.

For the next 50 years, the Princess Mound received only brief mentions in the archaeological literature and no substantive investigations were conducted. In his Archeology of the Florida Gulf Coast, Gordon Willey (1949:335) merely repeats the descriptions of Walker and Moore. University of Florida archaeologist John Goggin also used this information when he recorded the mound in the University’s Archeological Site Survey as Pi-18 (Goggin 1951).

In 1952, William Plowden, an avocational archaeologist who lived in Hillsborough County, recorded the mound again and gave it a new site number, 8Pi30, apparently unaware that Goggin had already assigned a number. Unlike Goggin, however, Plowden did visit the mound although his brief description is slightly at odds with all previous descriptions in that he indicates that the horizontal dimensions were only 40 feet by either 40 or 60 feet (the 4 appears to have been typed over a 6 on the site form); the height is given as 24 feet (Plowden 1952b). The smaller size might be explained in part by the presence of the house on the west side. The house was constructed in 1929 for soon-to-be owners Mr. and Mrs. E. G. Deane and in order to make room for the house on their lot, a portion of the mound had to be removed (Blackstone 1940).

During the 1970s and 1980s the only investigations of the mound were related to local surveys and inventories. In 1970, members of the Suncoast Archaeological Society (SAS) recorded the site under a third site number, 8Pi108 (Robinson 1970). The site file form provides no new information other than officially assigning the Hirrihigua name to the mound. Goodyear (1972:29) briefly mentions the mound and his Table 2 cites it as an example of a Safety Harbor culture “temple town.” Importantly, he suggests that a shell walkway extended from the south side of the mound to the bayshore, citing observations made by a local resident, Frank Bushnell,
prior to the construction of intervening homes. This seems consistent with Moore’s observation of a “graded way” extending for over 100 feet from the mound’s southern face.

In 1974, J. Raymond Williams, an archaeologist and professor of anthropology at the University of South Florida, was contracted by the Pinellas County Environmental Task Force to conduct a survey of prehistoric archaeological sites in the area encompassed by the USGS Pass-a-Grille Beach and Oldsmar quadrangle maps (Williams 1974). This area included Pinellas Point. Williams compiled information on previously recorded sites in the area, including 8PI18, 30, and 108, and he recognized that 8PI30 and 8PI108 were probably one and the same; i.e., the mound referred to today as the Princess Mound. He thought that 8PI18 could be either this mound or part of another nearby site, 8PI61 (Williams 1974:II-4, II-5, II-11).

The mound was recorded yet again under two separate site numbers in 1978 by a historical researcher, Douglas Davis. Site number 8PI732 was issued to the Juan Ortiz-Princess Hirrihigua Site, which the FMSF form “commemorates the Juan Ortiz-Princess Hirrihigua story” (Davis 1978a). The form provides no information on the mound and instead relates the well-known story of Ortiz and his presumed saving by the Indian “princess.” According to the story, Ortiz was captured by the princess’s father, Hirrihigua, chief of the Timucua, and was condemned to death. The princess intervened three times to save Ortiz’s life and when he was threatened again, she helped to escape, enraging her father who forbid her to marry Mucoso, a sub-chief of the Timucua. Hernando de Soto rescued Ortiz in 1539 and the latter became his guide and interpreter. A sign commemorating this story was erected in the park in 1960 by the Hirrihigua Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR).

The story contains some elements of truth. Juan Ortiz, Hirrihigua (Orriyuga), and Mucoso (Mocoso) all existed; Ortiz was captured by the Indians, was threatened with death by Hirrihigua, and was rescued by de Soto in 1539. Hirrihigua was chief of the Uzita, however, who were more likely related ethnically to the Tocobaga rather than the Timucua. Moreover, the Uzita are believed to have lived near the mouth of the Little Manatee River in what is now southern Hillsborough County (Milanich and Hudson 1993:56). When Ortiz escaped, he fled to Mocoso, whose territory encompassed Hillsborough Bay down to the Alafia River (Milanich and Hudson 1993:124). Hirrihigua’s daughter also is mentioned in Spanish accounts, and while she may have helped Ortiz to escape her father, the theme of a chief’s daughter saving a captured white male is widespread, with the Pocahontas story being the most well-known. According to Jerald Milanich, the "hero" themes in the de Soto narratives appear much earlier in western literature and the Princess Hirrihigua story may have been appropriated from these (J. T. Milanich, personal communication to Robert Austin, March 7, 2014). We probably never will know if the Tampa Bay story is true but the mound has been known as the Hirrihigua Mound or Princess Mound ever since the DAR erected its sign.

The second number, 8PI728, was assigned to the Father Cancer site which refers to another historical event that was alleged to be associated with the Princess Mound. According to the FMSF form “It was at this old Indian mound that Dominican friar, Fray Luis Cancer de Barbastro, became one of the first martyrs on U. S. soil when he was clubbed to death by native
Indians on June 26, 1549” (Davis 1978b). Like the Juan Ortiz story, the narrative of Father Cancer and his death is based on fact, as he did encounter native peoples in or near Tampa Bay (Sauer 1971:189-190), but there is no evidence to indicate that Pinellas Point was the scene of his demise.

One of the first attempts to synthesize and interpret the existing data on platform mounds in the Tampa Bay region was a paper published by George Luer and Marion Almy in 1981. The Princess Mound, which they refer to as the Pinellas Point Temple Mound, is included in their review. Using C. B. Moore’s measurements, they calculated an approximate volume of 2000 cubic meters of sand and shell fill that was used to construct the mound (Luer and Almy 1981:Table 1). They performed similar calculations for 12 other temple mounds and used the volume estimates along with morphological characteristics to develop a temple mound typology (Luer and Almy 1981:138-140). The Pinellas Point (Princess) Mound, which ranked eighth in terms of total volume, was included in their Group II, mounds with a high height and narrow summit. Similar mounds include Mill Point at the mouth of the Alafia River, Harbor Key near Bishop’s Harbor in Manatee County, the Bickel Mound on Terra Ceia Island, and the Dunedin Mound. Luer and Almy (1981:138-146) offer several hypotheses to explain the differences in mound size (volume) and configuration. Large-volume mounds, such as the platform mound at Safety Harbor, may have been more important politically, serving as paramount towns within a hierarchically organized settlement system. These mounds also have large, broad summits with enough area to support one or more structures, presumably those of a chief, as well as public ceremonies. Smaller-volume mounds with narrow summits, like the Princess Mound, may have supported a chief’s residence, but was probably not large enough to accommodate ceremonies.

A city-wide survey and assessment of resources was conducted in 1987 by Piper Archaeological Research, Inc. (PAR) and the mound was revisited at that time. Although no testing was conducted, the confusion regarding the three site numbers was resolved, with both 8PI18 and 8PI30 being voided by the FMSF and 8PI108 assigned as the official state designation. The mound was recommended as eligible for city landmarking because it represented a relatively well-preserved example of a probable Safety Harbor platform mound (PAR 1987:43-44).

In his 1989 dissertation, Jeffrey Mitchem provided a brief description of the mound based on the writings of Walker, Moore, and Goodyear (Mitchem 1989:74-75, 91-92). He was the first archaeologist to suggest that the mound may be late Weeden Island in age, rather than Safety Harbor.

In 1992, an Eckerd College field school was conducted at the park under the direction of archaeologist Robert Austin (2014b:30-32). Austin and his students made a topographic map of the mound, excavated four 1-x-1-m units in off-mound locations, and made a small surface collection. The topographic map is reproduced in Figure 13. The southern ramp is clearly shown as is a possible ramp on the north side.

The four test units encountered fairly similar deposits. The upper 10-12 cm consisted of light gray sand and marine shell underlain by 15-20 cm of pale gray to white sand to a depth of 40 cm
where excavation ceased. Marine shell was present in the upper 30 cm, but decreased dramatically between 30 and 40 cmbs. Table 1 provides a summary of the materials recovered. Of the 34 prehistoric ceramic sherds from the four test units and a small surface collection from the north side of the mound, sand-tempered plain is the most common (n=21). Twelve very small pieces of pottery that were too small to accurately assign to a type also possessed sand tempering. Only one sherd of Pinellas Plain was recovered. The only other materials were a few waste flakes of chert and fragments of quartz, limestone, and ferrous concretions.

Shells of the quahog clam (*Mercenaria* sp.) were common followed by Eastern oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) and small amounts of other bivalves and gastropods. Historic artifacts (primarily bottle glass) were found in all excavated levels and in all four units, indicating a high degree of mixing of modern and prehistoric deposits. The only bone that was recovered included one piece of modern cut bone and a fragment of mineralized bone.

In 2007, archaeologists with the Florida Public Archaeology Network monitored the installation of sod along the southern side of the mound to prevent erosion of sand and shell into the adjacent street (Estabrook 2007). This work was performed as an initial phase of a park restoration project sponsored by the Greater Pinellas Point Civic Association. Only minor modifications were made to the existing surface. This included a shallow “toe in” cut along the curbing to keep the sod from pushing down over the concrete and into Mound Place. All the sand and shell that had recently eroded into the street was placed back on the slope. Only a few pieces of worked shell were identified, but these were not collected.

A management plan for the park was developed in 2010 by Janus Research/Preservation Resources, Inc. in which a history of previous work is provided as well as a detailed description of the park at that time. The plan was developed in cooperation with the Greater Pinellas Point Civic Association and incorporated many of its recommendations. As part of implementing one of these recommendations, the construction of a wooden stairway on the mound’s north side, archaeologist William Burger monitored the excavation of two slot trenches for the horizontal side frames, 32 post holes for the 4-x-4-inch handrail uprights, the removal of a 6-x-6-foot wedge of mound from the base to accommodate the lower steps, and grading of the mound surface within the frame to maintain a consistent riser height (Burger 2011). The only artifacts that were recovered came from the excavation at the mound base; Burger also made a small collection of faunal remains. Among the ceramics were 22 sand-tempered plain, 5 limestone-tempered plain, and 1 Pinellas Plain. Except for the addition of the limestone-tempered sherds, this collection is similar to that documented by Austin in 1992. Also notable is that Burger collected three pieces of faunal bone, one identified as deer and the other two as fish, suggesting that the mound either contains a midden at its base, or that it was constructed with midden material collected from elsewhere and redeposited in this location.

The most recent archaeological work occurred in February of 2014 when Southeastern Archaeological Research, Inc. conducted a survey of the non-mound portions of the park (Austin 2014b). Ten shovel tests (STs) were excavated and seven contained cultural material (Figure 14). The shovel tests established boundaries for the non-mound shell midden at approximately.
60 meters in diameter covering all of the park except for the extreme northern area near Pinellas Point Drive.

The stratification was consistent in all the STs: dark or very dark gray sand, 5-10 cmbs; medium gray to light gray sand, 10-40 cmbs; very pale gray to white sand, 40-100 cm. The only difference between positive and negative shovel tests was the presence of marine shell and prehistoric artifacts in the upper 40-50 cm of the positive tests. This stratification is consistent with the strata identified during the 1992 excavation.

The artifacts and shell samples recovered from the STs are listed in Table 2. Although the sample size is small, the artifacts recovered from the STs are similar to those from the 1992 testing and from the 2011 monitoring project. The ceramics are sand-tempered plain and lithics consist primarily of chert and quartz waste flakes and quartz pebble fragments; however, one biface and two pieces of ground sandstone also were recovered.

Only samples of shell were collected from the STs, but the species identified are consistent with those identified in previous work at the site. Fragments of quahog clam shells (Mercenaria sp.) are the most common and many display impact fractures from intentional breakage. Other shellfish species include oyster (Crassostrea virginica), possible sunray venus (Macrocallista nimbosa), cross-barred venus (Chione cancellata), crown conch (Melongena corona), and fighting conch (Strombus alatus).

Only one bone was recovered, a probable human cranial fragment. It was recovered from ST 15 at a depth of 35-40 cmbs. The shovel test was stopped at this point and the bone was reburied. No further excavation occurred in this location.

D) ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXTS

Late Manasota/Weeden Island (AD 300-900)
Safety Harbor (AD 900-1500)

Although no radiocarbon dates have been obtained from the park’s archaeological deposits, diagnostic ceramics suggest that the mound and surrounding midden dates to the Late Manasota/Weeden Island period, AD 300-900, or possibly the Englewood Phase of the early Safety Harbor period, ca. AD 900-1100. The dominance of sand-tempered plain pottery, the presence of limestone-tempered pottery, and the near absence of Pinellas Plain pottery from the mound and surrounding midden are important clues to the possible age of the mound. Sand-tempered plain was the primary utilitarian ware during the Early Manasota and Late Manasota/Weeden Island periods, ca. 500 BC to AD 900 (Luer and Almy 1980). Limestone-tempered pottery also was used over a long time span, but was more common in the Tampa Bay region during the Transitional through Early Manasota periods (Luer and Almy 1980, 1982). Pinellas Plain was first manufactured in small amounts in the Tampa Bay region around AD 200-400 during the Late Manasota/Weeden Island-related period, but increased in abundance through time until by about AD 1200-1300 it was the dominant pottery being made and used by Safety
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Harbor people (Austin et al. 2014). This suggests that the Princess Mound may date slightly earlier than the Safety Harbor period, when it was assumed that it was constructed (cf.; Goodyear 1972; Luer and Almy 1980; PAR 1987; Williams 1974). Alternatively, the mound may have been constructed during Safety Harbor times using shell from middens that were deposited during the earlier Manasota and Weeden Island-related periods. The ceramics recovered from the surface of the mound by Austin in 1992 and from the stair-step cut by Burger in 2011 are virtually identical to those recovered from the deposits surrounding the mound. Significantly, Moore (1900) does not mention any decorated sherds from the mound; i.e., no Weeden Island or Safety Harbor series pottery. The use of earlier midden materials in mound construction was common in the Tampa Bay region, particularly during the Safety Harbor period (e.g., Austin and Mitchem 2014).
8. Statement of Significance

**Applicable National Register Criteria**
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

- [ ] A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- [ ] B. Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- [ ] C. Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- [x] D. Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

**Criteria Considerations**
(Mark “x” in all the boxes that apply.)

- [ ] A. Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes
- [ ] B. Removed from its original location
- [ ] C. A birthplace or grave
- [ ] D. A cemetery
- [ ] E. A reconstructed building, object, or structure
- [ ] F. A commemorative property
- [ ] G. Less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years
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Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)

ARCHAEOLOGY/prehistoric

Period of Significance
AD 300-1500

Significant Dates
AD 300-1500

Significant Person
(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)
NA

Cultural Affiliation
Manasota (Late; aka Weeden Island)
Safety Harbor

Architect/Builder
NA
The Princess Mound, 8PI108, is significant at the local level under Criterion D for its potential to contribute important information on the transition from Manasota/Weeden Island to Safety Harbor and specifically on the development of settled communities and social/political complexity in the Tampa Bay region. The Princess Mound is one of only a few remaining shell mounds from what was a major pre-Columbian Native American settlement that once stretched from Pinellas Point west to Frenchman’s Creek. It also is one of the few remaining platform mounds in Pinellas County.

The Princess Mound is considered eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D. It contributes to the Multiple Property Listing, Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula, as the sole representative one of the six property types described in Section F(3) of the Multiple Property Documentation Form: platform mound. Except for the removal of a small portion of the mound’s western edge, some early digging in the mound’s surface, and the construction of a stairway on its south side, the integrity of the mound is very good. The surrounding midden deposits exhibit evidence of disturbance and this may be due in part to erosion of shell and artifacts from the mound surface over time.

Although data from the mound are limited, the available evidence indicates that it was rectangular in shape with a flat, narrow summit and one, possibly two, ramps; that it was constructed of layers of sand and shell; that it contained at least one burial; that ceramics are mostly plain, sand-tempered wares; and that at least the lower shell layers contain vertebrate faunal remains suggesting that they consist of midden material, possibly from an earlier midden used as construction fill. If, as the ceramics from the site suggest, the mound is indeed a Weeden Island-related platform mound, it would be the only documented pre-Safety Harbor platform mound in the Tampa Bay region. Thus, it has the potential to contribute information on the development of Weeden Island and Safety Harbor cultures, monumental mound construction and use, and the emergence of social complexity. The fact that the mound may be partially constructed of midden material indicates that it contains data classes (vertebrate and invertebrate fauna, dateable materials, ceramics) necessary to address several important topics. Specifically, the site has the potential to contribute information on 1) seasonality of mound use and/or construction; 2) coastal adaptations during the late prehistoric period; 3) reconstruction of the social, political, and economic spheres during the late prehistoric period; 4) and the role of coastal and maritime economies in the development of social complexity.

Table 3 summarizes the specific research questions that can be addressed by the archaeological resources at the Abercrombie Park Complex. See Section F, Multiple Property Documentation
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form (Archaeological Resources of the Lower Pinellas Peninsula), for detailed discussions of areas of significance.
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10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property ~0.63

Use either the UTM system or latitude/longitude coordinates

Latitude/Longitude Coordinates (decimal degrees)
Datum if other than WGS84:__________
(enter coordinates to 6 decimal places)
1. Latitude: ____________________ Longitude: ____________________
2. Latitude: ____________________ Longitude: ____________________
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UTM References
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1. Zone: 17 Easting: 336460 Northing: 3065330
2. Zone: Easting: Northing:
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Verbal Boundary Description (Describe the boundaries of the property.)

The northern boundary is an irregular line located about 30 meters south of Pinellas Point Drive. The western and northeastern boundaries are arbitrarily set at the boundaries between Indian Mound Park and adjacent private properties. The southern and southeastern boundaries are Mound Place South and an irregular line with a maximum distance of 18 meters from the park’s southeastern corner. The boundaries are shown on Figure 2.

Boundary Justification (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)

The archaeological site boundaries have been established through archaeological investigations including topographic mapping, subsurface shovel testing, visual observation, and excavation, as described in Section C of the Narrative Description.
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**Photo Log** (See Figure 15 for sketch map with photo locations).

Name of Property: Princess Mound, 8PI108
City or Vicinity: St. Petersburg
County: Pinellas State: FL 33705
Photographer: Unknown, scanned image courtesy of St. Petersburg Museum of History
Date Photographed: ca. 1950s
Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera: Mound and open area, view to the north_SPMH_PO1060.jpg.
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Name of Property: Princess Mound, 8PI108
City or Vicinity: St. Petersburg
County: Pinellas
State: FL 33705
Photographer: Robert Austin
Date Photographed: 1987
Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera: Entrance to Indian Mound Park, view to the north_DSCN_1171.jpg.
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Name of Property: Princess Mound, 8PI108
City or Vicinity: St. Petersburg
County: Pinellas
State: FL 33705
Photographer: Robert Austin
Date Photographed: 2014
Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera: Platform mound, view to the west_DSCN_0210.jpg.
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Name of Property: Princess Mound, 8PI108
City or Vicinity: St. Petersburg
County: Pinellas
State: FL 33705
Photographer: Robert Austin
Date Photographed: 2019
Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera: Platform mound, view to the south_IMG_1638.jpg.
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Name of Property: Princess Mound, 8PI108
City or Vicinity: St. Petersburg
County: Pinellas
State: FL 33705
Photographer: Robert Austin
Date Photographed: 2019
Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera: Interpretive signs, view to the east_IMG_1635.jpg.
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Figure Captions
Figure 1. Location of the Princess Mound, 8PI108, in St. Petersburg, Pinellas County, Florida.
Figure 2. Google Earth aerial photo (2018) of site location in relation to surrounding landscape.
Figure 3. Digital Elevation Model (DEM) derived from aerial LiDAR in combination with terrestrial LiDAR data, showing 1-foot contouring and elevations for 8PI108.
Figure 4. Photograph of the south side of the Princess Mound in the 1920s showing scrub vegetation on and around the mound. Reproduced from D. Bushnell (1926:Figure 121).
Figure 5. View of the north side of the Princess Mound ca. 1950 with pine trees on the mound and a young banyan tree to the left. Photograph courtesy of the St. Petersburg Museum of History.
Figure 6. View of the south side of Princess Mound Park from Mound Place in 1987.
Figure 7. View to the west of the Princess Mound in 2014.
Figure 8. South side of mound in 2019 showing stairs leading to the mound summit.
Figure 9. Interpretive signs in Indian Mound Park.
Figure 10. US Coastal Survey map from 1879 showing the Princess Mound at Pt. Pinelos (Pinellas Point). SOURCE: http://historicalcharts.noaa.gov/historicals.
Figure 11. S. T. Walker’s map of the lower Pinellas peninsula showing the locations of several mounds. Arrow points to his #10, believed to be the Princess Mound. Reproduced from Walker (1880a:406).
Figure 12. S. T. Walker’s illustration of the Princess Mound (bottom, Fig. 3 and Fig. 4) showing previous excavations and the southern ramp or “roadway.” Reproduced from Walker (1880a).
Figure 13. Topographic map of the Princess Mound made during 1992 Eckerd College Field School. Locations of four 1-x-1-m test units excavated during the field school also are shown. Reproduced from Austin (2014b:Figure 17).
Figure 14. Locations of shovel tests excavated at Indian Mound Park in 2014. Test units excavated in 1992 also are shown. Reproduced from Austin (2014b).
Figure 15. Sketch Map of photograph locations.
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Figure 3. Digital Elevation Model (DEM) showing 1-foot contouring and elevations for 8PI108.
Figure 4. Princess Mound in the 1920s, view to the north.
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Figure 10. US Coastal Survey map (1879) showing the Princess Mound at Pt. Pinelos (Pinellas Point).
Figure 11. S. T. Walker’s map of the lower Pinellas peninsula showing the location of the Princess Mound (#10).
SOURCE: Walker 1880a.
Figure 12. S. T. Walker’s illustration of the Princess Mound (bottom, Fig. 3 and Fig. 4) showing previous excavations and the southern ramp or “roadway.”
SOURCE: Walker 1880a
Figure 13. 1992 topographic map of the Princess Mound showing locations of excavated test units.
SOURCE: Austin 2014b
Figure 14. Locations of shovel tests excavated at Indian Mound Park in 2014. Test units excavated in 1992 also are shown.

SOURCE: Austin 2014b
Figure 15. Photo locations and directions.
Table 1. Artifacts and faunal material recovered during 1992 excavation at Indian Mound Park, all test units combined. Reproduced from Austin (2014b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifacts and Fauna</th>
<th>Mound Surface</th>
<th>Lv. 1</th>
<th>Lv. 2</th>
<th>Lv. 3</th>
<th>Lv. 4</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ceramics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand-tempered Plain</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand-tempered crumbs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas Plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lithics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flakes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartz pebble</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concretion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shell</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mercenaria</em> spp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Crassostrea</em> virginica</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Macrocallista</em> nibmosa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. <em>Macrocallista</em> nibmosa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. <em>Dinocardium</em> sp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chione</em> cancellata</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aequipecten</em> irradians</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Noetia</em> ponderosa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Crepidula</em> sp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Busycon</em> sinistrum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Busyctopus</em> canaliculatus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Strombus</em> alatus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pleuroloca</em> gigantea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Polygyra</em> spp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bulimus</em> spp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID Bivalvia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID Gastropoda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID Shell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID mammal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic Artifacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete with asphalt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tile, ceramic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tile, asbestos</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe, ceramic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull tab, aluminum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum foil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transistor solder board</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Artifacts and faunal material from 2014 shovel tests, Indian Mound Park. Reproduced from Austin (2014b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifacts and Fauna</th>
<th>ST2</th>
<th>ST5</th>
<th>ST12</th>
<th>ST13</th>
<th>ST14</th>
<th>ST15</th>
<th>ST17</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand-tempered Plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand-tempered crumbs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flakes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Stone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartz pebble</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercenaria sp.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crassostrea virginica</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. Macrocallista nimbosa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chione cancellata</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melongena corona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strombus alatus</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID Bivalvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID Gastropoda</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIS Shell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homo sapiens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Artifacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass, bottle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Research questions by archaeological site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Domains/Questions</th>
<th>Maximo Beach</th>
<th>Abercrombie Park Complex</th>
<th>Jungle Prada</th>
<th>Princess Mound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I) Human-Environment Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) What was the environment and climate of Tampa Bay and the Pinellas peninsula like during the Late Holocene (3000 BC-AD 1888)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Is there evidence for climate or sea level variation during the period 3000 BC to AD 1888?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Is there evidence for short-term weather events that may have affected local communities (e.g., hurricanes, storm surges)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) What was the effect of these perturbations on local resources (plants, animals, fish, shellfish)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) How did coastal populations respond to these changes?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Changes in subsistence patterns (e.g., species or habitats exploited)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Changes in resource acquisition strategies?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Changes in settlement patterns (e.g., movement, abandonment, migration)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Changes in community organization (e.g., aggregation, dispersal)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Changes in community structure (e.g., purposeful construction and/or of higher elevations for structures)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Were there social or political effects related to climate/sea level changes?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Differential access to fishing/shell fishing areas by settlements or lineages?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Differential access to specific species?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Territorial expansion or contraction by political entities.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) What effect did human occupation of the coast have on maritime resources?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Is there evidence of overharvesting of shellfish or fish populations?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Are there increases or decreases in the use of terrestrial species through time?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II) Late Archaic/Transitional Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) How was the Late Archaic/Transitional Period on the Pinellas Peninsula and the greater Tampa Bay region similar or different from contemporaneous cultures elsewhere on the Gulf Coast? Florida?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) What do preceramic lithic scatters represent? Small campsites?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Were larger settlements situated on a shoreline now inundated?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) How were Late Archaic/Transitional groups organized socially and politically?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Was there movement of populations into or out of the Tampa Bay region?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Is there evidence of exchange relations with non-local groups?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III) Manasota/Weeden Island Periods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) What was the relationship between Late Archaic/Transitional culture and subsequent Early Manasota developments? Is there a difference other than the introduction of pottery?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) How does the Manasota settlement pattern in the Tampa bay region compare with the regional pattern posited by Luer and Almy?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) What influence did Weeden Island cultures to the north have on local Manasota cultures?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Was it only in the mortuary sphere, or were other influences felt in the domestic sphere?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Is there evidence for pre-Safety Harbor platform mounds? If so, what do these represent in terms of influences and political/social developments?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV) Safety Harbor Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) What does the Englewood phase of Safety Harbor (AD 900-1100) represent?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) What was the influence of Mississippian cultures farther north on local cultures?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Were Safety Harbor societies ranked?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Were individuals or groups accorded differential status? Did they have differential access to wealth goods (e.g., Spanish artifacts) or subsistence items (e.g., larger fish, better cuts of meat)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Is there evidence of craft specialization (e.g., shell beads, mortuary ceramics)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Were the several mound centers on the peninsula contemporaneous or occupied sequentially?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Do Safety Harbor mound complexes represent independent politicoes? Or were they part of a hierarchical political system?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>If the latter, when did this hierarchical system occur and what were the factors leading to its development?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>If mound centers were politically independent and contemporaneous, how did the large number of mound centers on the Pinellas peninsula interact politically and socially?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Was there competition for resources?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>If the mound centers were occupied at different times, what caused the shifts in settlement location? Population growth? Group fissioning? Environmental constraints?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>What effects did the Little Ice Age have on local coastal populations?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V) First Spanish Period

| A | Is there additional evidence for occupation of the peninsula by indigenous groups post-contact? | X |
| B | What was the impact of European contact on indigenous societies? | X |
| C | What did the availability of Spanish goods, either through direct contact, trade with other native people, or shipwreck salvaging, have on indigenous technology, social relations, and politics? | X |
| D | What material correlates equate to ethnohistorically defined political or ethnic units. | X |
| E | When were Tampa Bay indigenous sites abandoned for good? Is there evidence for the causes of abandonment? | X | X | X | X |

### VI) Second Spanish and Pioneer Periods

| A | When was the peninsula reoccupied following the disappearance of indigenous groups? | X |
| B | Who reoccupied these sites? Seminoles? Spanish Indians? Cuban fishermen? | X |
| C | Is there evidence of a Seminole or Spanish fishing rancho at Maximo Beach (8PI31)? | X |
| D | What evidence is there of late nineteenth-century occupation and use? | X | X | X |
| E | What was the layout and structure of a Spanish fishing camp and early pioneer homesteads? | X | X | X |
| F | What was the relationship between Spanish/Cuban fishermen and the “Spanish” Indians? | X |
| G | Who were the Spanish Indians? Seminole? Others? | X |
| H | In addition to fishing, what dietary information can be obtained? | X | X | X |
| J | What was the relationship between wild, domestic, and commercially obtained goods? | X | X | X |
| J | What was the material culture of ranchos and homesteads? Spanish Indians? | X | X | X |
| K | Were women and children present at the ranchos? | X |
| L | What was the influence of wider political events on the ranchos and homesteads? | X | X | X |

### VII) Regional Patterns

| A | Were individual sites occupied seasonally or year-round? | X | X | X | X |
| B | Did occupation patterns and settlement organization change through time? | X | X | X |
| C | If so, what were the factors (environmental, political, social) that contributed to these changes or lack thereof? | X | X | X |
| D | What was the relationships of individual sites to other sites on the peninsula? | X | X | X | X |
| E | Were components of sites contemporaneous with each other (e.g., Safety harbor occupations at Maximo, Jungle Prado, and Abercrombie/Kuttler), with other sites on the peninsula (e.g., Maximo Point, Weeden Island), and in the greater Tampa Bay area (e.g., Safety Harbor, Safford Mound)? | X | X | X | X |
| F | If contemporaneous, what were the political relationships between mound/village complexes? | X | X | X | X |
| G | Is there evidence for population increase and competition for territory and resources? | X | X | X |
| H | Is there evidence of group aggregation at any sites? Evidence of non-local peoples visiting or living at the sites (e.g., different ceramic types, pastes, tempering)? | X | X | X |
| I | What were the economic and social relationships between sites on the peninsula and those in Florida and the greater Southeast? | X | X | X | X |
| J | Is there evidence of non-local or exotic materials suggesting trade or exchange? | X | X | X | X |
| K | What do Late Archaic, Manasota, and Safety Harbor villages look like? How do they differ from contemporaneous sites elsewhere in Florida and the Southeast? | X | X | X | X |
Appendix F:
Letter of Recommendation
Dear Mr. Acosta,

As the chair of the Community Planning and Preservation Commission of the City of St. Petersburg, I am pleased to inform you that the Commission is in support of listing the Abercrombie Park Site Complex, Jungle Prada, Maximo Beach, and Princess Mound in the National Register of Historic Places. We concur with the nominations’ evaluation of the resources’ significance under Criterion D and, in the case of the Abercrombie Park Site Complex, Jungle Prada Site Complex, and Maximo Beach, Criterion A. These resources are united by the Multiple Property Listing’s theme of Living on the Coast: From Prehistory to the Dawn of the Modern Era, and their documentation is important to the history of our community.

As the Commission charged with determining eligibility of properties for both the local and National Register, we are excited to support these designations of archaeological sites in our City. Our aim is to educate the public regarding the importance of every aspect of our history and cultural legacy. This Multiple Property Listing and associated individual designations will provide greatly increased recognition to the archaeological resources in our community and serve as an important step. Therefore, our Commission supports this valuable initiative to designate and preserve these sites which represent some of our earliest residents. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jeff Rogo, Chair
Community Planning and Preservation Commission
Appendix G:
Maps of Proposed Boundaries
1 Abercrombie Park Site Complex – 19-90700002
2 Jungle Prada Site Complex – 19-90700003
3 Maximo Beach Site – 19-90700004
4 Princess Mound – 19-90700006
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