

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY BOARD (HPAB)  
MEETING MINUTES**

**Location:** Pinellas County Planning Department Conference Room

**Date:** Friday, November 21, 2008

**Time:** 2:05 p.m.

**Attendees:** Commissioner Karen Seel (presiding), Brian K. Smith, Ellen Babb, Wally Clark, Joan Deming, Terry Fortner, Charlie Harper, William Heinig, Bob Jeffrey, Stephanie Oddo, Robert Ray, David Sadowsky, Greg C. Smith, Carol Stricklin, Patrick Sullivan, Cyndi Tarapani, Gordon Beardslee, Marcel Mohseni, and Colleen Tracy

- I. Call to Order** – Chair Commissioner Karen Seel called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.
- II. Minutes of Thursday, October 9, 2008** – It was moved that the minutes be approved; the motion was seconded and carried.
- III. Consultant Report – Final Presentation**

Brian passed around 15 copies of the Final Report to HPAB members. He introduced Greg Smith, the archeologist, and Patrick Sullivan, the architectural historian, with New South Associates, who were to give the PowerPoint presentation. Topics outlined were the goals of the study, the easy-to-use format, and the different components of the study. Components included historic context site types, the historic themes used to group the different resources, the archeological sensitivity maps that were developed, and the recommendations designed to help the ordinance be put to use. Then Greg Smith began the presentation by outlining the following:

Project Goals: *Update the known historical resources done in 1991.*  
*Collect more necessary data from the State.*  
*Categorize those [known resources] according to the historical themes identified by Pinellas County.*  
*Integrate all Master Site File data into GIS.*  
*Create site sensitivity maps using GIS.*  
*Develop recommendations for preservation in the county and the municipalities.*

Format Organization:

*Introduction.* (Chapter I)

*Context.* (Chapter II) Historic context developed by the county just a couple of years ago. Put in new images (photographs, maps and so forth) to go along with the text. Updated and expanded the prehistory text.

*Resource Types, Themes, and Florida Master Site File Inventory.* (Chapter III) This chapter dealt with the resources, explicated the themes that were used, and presented and quantified the Master Site File data to make it more useful.

*Expanded Data, Archaeological Sensitivity, and Preservation Concerns.* (Chapter IV) Expanded on the data and looked at some of the other information types that fleshed out the resources and added to what was known from the Florida Master Site File. Archaeological sensitivity was discussed and preservation concerns related to both archaeological sites and historic structures were discussed as well. This was followed by

*Recommendations.* (Chapter V)

Greg Smith proceeded to discuss the context which traces Pinellas County's history from prehistory to present day. The context is especially important when broken down into the different themes. It is just

like archeological sites that are taken into account by time period and culture. By doing that with the historic structures and other resources, it provides a lot more information for understanding them, making comparisons, seeing where there are gaps to be filled in with future work, etc. So, the themes are included and there are accompanying pictures that reflect some of those themes. Effort was also made to identify some possible subthemes that could be pursued in the future if additional data became available.

In terms of the resource types, there were many more historic structures than archeological sites. Resources include 409 archeological sites, 10,031 structures, 8 cemeteries, 33 bridges, and 18 resource groups (a relatively new category). There is a map showing cemeteries that are known but have not been documented sufficiently, and that would fall under some of the goals outlined in the ordinance pretty well. Genealogical societies in the area might be interested in partnering such an effort.

Putting all this into the Geographical Information System (GIS) took a lot of work: editing and filling in the gaps in the data (site forms are not always complete or may be wrong). Making the information compatible with the county system was part of the goal as well.

The next one: sites by time period. The time periods were built on the earlier results from 1991. A total of 123 sites were added and that is a 43 percent increase in just 17 years. When looking at the breakdown of these types, the first is the Paleo-Indian period with 1.6 percent (9 sites). For that reason the prehistoric context has much more potential significance because so little information is available. If a site is discovered, and even if it is disturbed but has Paleo-Indian artifacts in it, there is still reason to do some additional work because the site itself is so rare.

Another point of interest is the transitional one, the third one down, 4.8. Archeologists always like the transitional periods as they are times of change. The low numbers of those sites often reflect that they are getting short shift because people may not be aware of the nuances of identifying transitional sites because they are periods of change.

The other one to be pointed out at the bottom, historic 12.1 percent. There are about 10,000 historic structures as opposed to 400 archeological sites, quite an imbalance. In recent years, the state has started asking for two types of site numbers: one for the structure itself and one for the archeological component. So, it may be that many of these historic structures of some antiquity would have archeological components not yet identified. In the future, this may be a fruitful avenue of research to see if there are some good archeological components associated with these buildings. Such components include old wells, trash pits, privies, and so forth. This could result in a great increase in the number of historic sites. Depending on the time period, the archeologist would be able to identify certain – have certain expectations going in – and if Sanborn insurance maps are available – sometimes these show the location of the privies, outbuildings, or installation of indoor plumbing. One thing about historical archeology: when there is the opportunity to link the low ground remains with documentary records, there is a much stronger means for interpretation and learning something new.

Patrick Sullivan continued the presentation showing the breakdown of the historic property data – including the structures layer, which in turn encompasses buildings, objects as well as the bridges, cemeteries, and resource groups. The date range of resources in Pinellas County was between 1850 and 1960. During that time period, it seems only about 11 percent of what is shown in tax parcel data has been surveyed. The biggest discrepancy is in the post-World War II resources; this occurred during one of the largest construction booms in the county, so it is obviously going to be weighted that way.

A good useful component of this project is the Geographical Information Systems (GIS) data, essentially a data management tool that allows the showing of geospatial relationships of the objects and the areas.

Hopefully it will be a good starting off point for the catalog of historic resources in Pinellas County once that is made available.

Properties were categorized into their correct historic themes, and the data was also edited so that the properties were assigned the correct tax parcel data. Incomplete building dates were added and survey work for destroyed or demolished properties, moved properties – that was the bulk of the work done on the data.

Regarding the Site File: properties have been recorded since the 1970s, a lot of that is back catalog and put into GIS more recently. Address finders were used – also other methods (mapping devices) – were used to determine where the structures were located, and they were not always accurate. Patrick Sullivan went through and looked at addresses, original survey maps, historic aerials, and tried to assign the correct point data, which is the Site File data, to the tax parcel. A tax parcel number was able to be assigned to a historic resource. That was also used to get a good idea of which properties might have been destroyed or demolished since they were first surveyed. The color blue represents a vacant parcel, so any point that ended up on that parcel was looked at – surveyed – to determine if indeed that resource had actually been destroyed or lost.

Each resource was categorized according to its historic theme. Subthemes were also added to help specify some of these properties; hopefully when the data is disseminated, searches can be conducted by theme and by subtheme. The Florida Boom Era and Community Life themes were the most represented for Pinellas County.

Sullivan showed a screen shot of the data in GIS: the site ID number, the site name of the resource, the cataloged theme, and a secondary theme for resources that were related to two themes. (For example, the hotels built during the Florida Boom Era would also be related to the Tourism theme.) Sullivan also showed an illustration of the attachment of the parcel ID number to the resource. So, the Site File data is able to be integrated with planning data and tax resource data for future planning purposes.

Greg Smith picked up the presentation at this point regarding properties that have been evaluated and are considered National Register listed properties. There are 59 properties and 9 districts in the county. Potentially eligible are 9 sites and 65 buildings. There are over 9,800 resources of the total that have not been evaluated. That seems like a lot but this is not uncommon, especially for archeological sites, which are often identified at the survey level. A lot of excavation and testing is not part of the scope, so it is hard to make those determinations. Perhaps Pinellas County can establish more of a rapport with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). Pinellas County may also make some recommendations based on local work as to whether things are eligible or not; or at least, help the SHIPO update its files if sites become disturbed or destroyed. There's a lot of room to grow in terms of making those evaluations of sites and structures.

The presentation then moved on to the topic of expanding the data, that is, going beyond Master Site File information and looking at other sources to identify resources important to history. These include schools, hotels, motels, mobile home parks, golf courses, and so forth. As time goes on, judgments on whether a property is considered a historic resource or not will change. Some examples are bridges, cemeteries, orchards, citrus groves, and packing houses. Another aspect involves other considerations of resources for the future: local landmarks, historic districts, and Main Street programs. Pinellas County has been active in seeking grants; hopefully when money is available, that will continue.

In terms of site predictability, GIS is a useful tool in predicting sites. These were developed using United States Geological Survey (USGS) maps and a soil survey geographic system. Probability in this map is based on the drainage of the soil, for example: low (swampy area) or high (well-drained location

next to a stream or river). Probabilities are color coded and based on environmental variables: is it a good location for a site based on what archeologists know about site location. In checking the predictive modal versus what was known already about previously recorded sites, 90 percent of the known sites occurred within either the high or medium probability areas; 10 percent were in the low probability areas.

In terms of historic sites, two historic probability maps were developed based on the available data. This one is based on government land office plat maps from 1843 to 1876. Probability is based on areas that indicate that some kind of subdivision of the property was going on. There were surveyors going out there and dividing the property, and perhaps land grants being given. Probability is also based on areas within a quarter of a mile of early road corridors. So, those two variables were used. The second one is late 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> century and is based on the Florida Land and Improvement Company map of 1882. The probability was determined in areas where there was defined ownership (for example, the Jones tract) and within a certain distance from transportation networks (roads and railroads).

Updating the archeological and historical structure data beyond what was in the Site Files involved the following steps. For archeological sites: looked at current land use map; then looked at sites that were within certain locations zoned as commercial or industrial; followed with reconnaissance to determine sites that had been impacted (or not); and lastly, made recommendations.

For structures, Patrick Sullivan indicated that Site File data, which was downloaded in June 2007, identified only 52 resources in Pinellas County as destroyed. The number of destroyed properties has increased to 373 by editing that data and making use of tax parcel data, regional survey manuscripts, aerial photos, and so forth,. If the parcel number was not able to be identified, the property was not counted. However, the original Site File information is still in the system; the site just does not have its parcel ID.

Greg Smith indicated that the section entitled Recommendations is designed to move the ordinance forward in a number of ways. All the comments from committee members were integrated into this section, and it is suggested that the ordinance be updated periodically. Encourage coordination with the SHPO for resource evaluation. Emphasize survey of under recorded and diminished cultural resources, for example, the Paleo-Indian sites. Promote nominations for the National Register for existing resources and districts that have not been elevated to that stage yet. Encourage wider participation and adoption of local ordinances and any other partnership programs. Involvement could include tax incentives, Certified Local Governments (CLGs), private investment assistance, easement donations, and Main Street programs. Promote heritage tourism. Each of the historical themes could be a subject of a heritage tourism aspect. For education: theme-based curriculum of Pinellas County history for local schools. Take advantage of national, state, and local preservation grants. Provide leadership to the municipalities. There can be different professional networking with those groups, and Pinellas County can always sponsor workshops, training conferences, and so forth. Implement preservation measures for the county and municipalities. Strengthen coordination for all the players/participants within the county, and integrate your preservation goals in long-range planning, which is ongoing. Consider and develop strategies for natural disaster and emergency preparedness.

The disc in the back of the document contains the appendices that had been shown before. It has all the Site File data that had been categorized according to municipality. Other elements include grant history and survey history of Pinellas County.

Discussion ensued regarding when and how much of the historic data might become available to governments and the public. The data from the CD still needs to be imported into the GIS system; a sample has already been imported and it did work with the GIS. Data on the archeological sites need not

be made available to the general public but rather upon request to individuals and/or institutions having a specific interest in that information. Such information is protected under Florida Statutes. Within the GIS system, there is a portal open to the general public; for the historic resources (and that is by parcel), there could be a layer accessible to the local governments and the public. The CD could also be provided to the local governments as well. It would be a matter of doing the following – showing the data, how to use it, and what to use it for – to representatives of the local municipalities. For the cities that do not have the capability of printing out the information, it could be made available to them for a fee.

Brian also brought up distributing copies of the consultant's report to local governments (irrespective of computer accessibility because the files would be quite big for the web site). Have a special printing of the report while it is still timely. As part of the Program/Education Subcommittee, Commissioner Seel suggested that copies could be taken to city commissions and council meetings. Go over what is being done at this point, hand out the information, and encourage government representatives to look at the recommendations for their city. As a research tool, copies of the report should also be made available to libraries – including university libraries. The GIS data on CD can be reproduced as a PDF file. It is also a digital file that could be passed on for information purposes.

#### **IV. Review of Committee Work Activities -- Review Work Chart**

Before moving on to Review of Committee Work Activities that is related to **Item IV. Reports by Subcommittees**, Brian addressed the topic of Comprehensive Planning on the work chart. He suggested reviewing a draft update of the Comprehensive Plan documents and policies at the next HPAB meeting before it is presented to the County Commission.

#### **V. Reports by Subcommittees**

- A. Toolbox Subcommittee** – Has not met yet; subcommittee member Kim Hinder will be back from vacation next week and then the committee will meet. The current thinking is to contact some of the local municipalities and have each of them write a section once the material is put together, so that there will be larger “buy in” from other groups and organizations. There is a list already put together for the topics to go into the Toolbox; refine that list, break it up [into sections], and then start writing!
- B. Program/Education Subcommittee** – Has not met either. Definitely meet in January and set out a work plan for educating the municipalities. Get that started by presenting the assembled data and the recommendations from the consultant's report on historic resources countywide.
- C. Demolition/Finance Subcommittee** – Has not met. However, Cyndi Tarapani has been e-mailing information on different demolition ordinances to Commissioner Seel, who liked the Gainesville ordinance in particular. It has some provisions that deal with economic hardships, and she thought that the ordinance outlined a pretty good process for a quick review of about 90 days. It was noted that some of the cities are rather nervous about Pinellas County telling them what to do regarding historic preservation. Cyndi stated that perhaps a consultant familiar with Pinellas County (such as New South) could cull the list of over 10,000 resources down to those of county, state, and national significance. Developing this list could accomplish two things: (1) People would see that it is the cream of the crop making the list (not everything in the world); and (2) it may make David [David Sadowsky of the County Attorney's Office] more comfortable from a legal point of view. There might be a caveat that sites not yet been surveyed would have to go through a procedure determining whether they are significant or not. David indicated that the cities do not want Pinellas County telling them what to do in the historic preservation process, putting delays on their building permits on an open-ended basis, and Pinellas County

does not have the authority to do so without their agreement. Perhaps an inventory could be made and an agreement obtained from local municipalities ahead of time. Thus, Pinellas County would be working with them rather than against them; this would go a long way towards obtaining a demolition ordinance.

Brian indicated that the contract with the present consultant was written so that additional tasks could be requested provided money was available. Marcel pointed out that there is a window of time to let New South know if Pinellas County wished to continue on to the next phase. Brian indicated that for a small amount of money, the contract could be kept open or extended.

Joan Deming commented that the consultant had already shortlisted the sites and had taken it to the next step – to look at those potentially eligible. So, there should be a core of less than 125 buildings and archeological sites. Cyndi then raised the question about how to protect archeological sites put on the list. Joan commented that it is a double-edge sword; and as a group, members would need to develop very specific criteria. If an archeological site is to be listed and made accessible to the public, then the responsibility would be to protect it from possible looting. Such a list would provide “red flags” for buildings and archeological sites within the municipalities. Also, sharing the information in the consultant’s report will make the cities aware of historic sites within their boundaries. In addition, information for the list should be provided as to whether the sites are in unincorporated or incorporated areas, and whether the sites are protected by a preservation ordinance or not. If protected under a preservation ordinance, the next question would be if the resource has been designated as historic (county, state, national level). Brian, Gordon, and Marcel will talk to the consultant, keep the contract open, and negotiate what the fee will be for a follow-up work item: to develop the “red flag” list for historically significant resources.

## **VI. Other Business**

### **A. Next Meeting**

During the discussion regarding the next meeting time, Board members decided that Brian should contact the consultant about the follow-up item and then e-mail everyone with a draft scope of work. If there are any questions, members are free to contact Brian. Subcommittees therefore will meet in January; then a standard meeting time will be found for the HPAB starting in February 2009 (that is, February, April, and every other month).

## **VII. Adjournment**

Commissioner Seel adjourned the meeting at 3:20 p.m.