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This research prioritized the identification and retention of African American cultural heritage in the face of dramatic landscape alteration associated with comprehensive redevelopment. As an approach aimed at providing the most comprehensive understanding of cultural phenomenon, the holistic tradition applied by anthropology asserts that it is productive to identify and apply as many sources of data toward engaging research as is possible. Consistent with this goal, this study applied several categories of data toward investigating material symbols of African American cultural heritage in Tampa, Florida. The holistic anthropological approach demonstrated the relevance and complementarity of research documenting cultural heritage and its relationship to Tampa’s contemporary urban landscape, urban archaeology, participatory research, anthropological advocacy, and historic designation and preservation research in a community threatened by large-scale redevelopment.

Tampa represented a fruitful context for this research because for the second time in less than forty years, the urban landscape historically associated with African Americans in Tampa is slated to be impacted by wide-ranging demolition resulting from the actions of city and county planners. This research is particularly important in Tampa because urban policy carried out in this area of Tampa during the 1970’s eradicated the
vast majority of physical reminders of the African American cultural heritage in Tampa. This research proposes that even in the face of dramatic demolition resulting in comprehensive change in urban landscapes, anthropologists have an obligation to prioritize material symbols of cultural heritage which in this context represent enduring evidence of African American cultural heritage in Tampa. Collectively the components of this study represent an anthropological model defined as an Urban Model of Applied Preservation (UMAP) designed to facilitate the anthropological engagement of evolving relationships between urban spaces and their cultural associations with urban populations. This model clarifies a set of complementary methods that might be applied toward investigation prioritizing the effects of urban change on cultural heritage.
Chapter One: Introduction

This study clarifies a set of complementary methods utilized to investigate historical and contemporary trends in urban landscape alteration potentially affecting cultural heritage preservation and representation. Consequently, a model was developed as a framework clarifying this approach. This model (outlined in chapter five) was formalized as an Urban Model of Applied Preservation (UMAP) intended to be applied at the city level to augment the anthropological analysis of cultural heritage retention and suppression through time and across urban space. This research facilitated the formation of this model which identified and utilized research strategies such as urban archaeology (as a method applied toward recovering and analyzing material evidence)
and urban anthropology (including anthropological advocacy) facilitating the application of action research linked with historic designation initiatives. Likewise, this research investigated federal and state policies affecting urban locales in the U.S. such as Urban Renewal and segregation of public spaces and facilities (especially schools) along with the residual effects of these policies on cultural heritage representation. This research recounts the application of this model in Tampa, Florida. An initial assessment of trends in historic designation in the State of Florida conducted as a component of this study demonstrates that this model might be modified to account for broader scale analysis and be applied toward statewide, regional, intra-regional, national, and international studies seeking to identify and compare trends in effects of urban landscape change on cultural heritage representation and preservation.

It is my hope that this research will motivate others to question the residual effects of urban change on the historical and contemporary representation of urban space. This research sought to identify and apply research strategies that might facilitate a model for clarifying the anthropological study of such potential effects on dynamic urban environments. Consequently, this study addresses the question: To what extent does alteration of the urban landscape effect cultural heritage and how might anthropologists engage this process and evaluate the magnitude of its effect?

As an approach aimed at providing the most comprehensive understanding of cultural phenomena, the holistic tradition applied by anthropology asserts that it is productive to identify and apply as many sources of data toward engaging research as is possible. Consistent with this goal, this study applied several categories of data toward investigating material symbols of African American cultural heritage in Tampa, Florida.
The holistic anthropological approach demonstrated the relevance and complementarity of research documenting cultural heritage and its relationship to Tampa’s contemporary urban landscape, urban archaeology, participatory action research, anthropological advocacy, and historic designation and preservation research in a community threatened by large-scale redevelopment. Tampa represented a fruitful context for this research because for the second time in less than forty years, a considerable portion of the urban landscape historically associated with African Americans in this city is slated to be impacted by wide-ranging demolition resulting from the actions of city and county planners. This research is particularly important in Tampa because urban policy carried out in this area of Tampa during the 1960’s and 1970’s eradicated the vast majority of physical reminders of the historic African American Central Avenue community.

This research proposes that even in the face of dramatic demolition resulting in comprehensive change in urban landscapes, anthropologists have an obligation to prioritize material symbols of cultural heritage which in this context represent enduring evidence of African American cultural heritage in Tampa. The investigation of twentieth century Urban Renewal projects in Tampa indicates that the City has pursued consistent priorities over the last five decades. Further, this analysis reveals that the twenty first century redevelopment plan affecting the last vestiges of the principle community with a tertiary historical connection to African Americans in Tampa indicates that not much has changed. For example, contemporary planners assert that the redevelopment plan will provide a new “gateway” into Tampa supposedly improving the viability of its downtown business district and the economic potential of the Ybor City tourist district. Not unlike the Maryland Avenue Tampa Urban Renewal project of the late 1950’s, this project will
link a consolidated business district with Ybor City (the City’s primary tourist district). Likewise, this plan is consistent with the Riverfront Tampa Urban Renewal project of the early 1960’s because it seeks to eliminate a “substandard” area of Tampa and consolidate business districts thereby providing direct Interstate access. This is evidenced by the fact that the current Central Park Community Redevelopment Area Plan (WilsonMiller, Inc. and the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission:2006) calls for a six lane thoroughfare improving access to I 275 to be constructed right through the center of the Central Park Village neighborhood (which contains Meacham Elementary).

This research represented a unique approach to the anthropological study of cultural heritage and urban landscape change. Often in an urban context the work of applied anthropologists, archaeologists, and historic preservationists is disconnected. Even though researchers with these specialties may investigate the same urban spaces, they rarely serve corresponding roles. Generally, historic preservationists interact with city and county political entities rather than community members. Unfortunately, as this study demonstrates, this can lead to their research serving the interests of urban planners rather than the communities their decisions affect. Urban anthropologists on the other hand, typically work with living communities and conduct research that results in or augments ethnographic data. Urban archaeologists investigate material remains representative of a city’s past and the results of their research is all too often disconnected from contemporary populations.

This study demonstrated the utility of applying this research as a means of directly connecting material evidence symbolizing the past with contemporary populations. Consequently, these categories of evidence served complementary roles.
connecting contemporary populations with material symbols of their past. For example, ethnographic data has the potential to connect individuals and groups with cultural heritage while urban archaeology and historic preservation prioritize material symbols and provide tangible evidence documenting that connection. The current research demonstrated that urban anthropology, urban archaeology, and historic preservation efforts can generate complementary forms of evidence connecting cultural heritage with contemporary urban landscapes. These research strategies were applied toward the study of two components of the urban landscape in Tampa. The symbols of cultural heritage directly engaged by this research include Perry Harvey Park (the site of the 2003 excavation discussed in chapter two) and Meacham Elementary school (the focus of preservation efforts and community action discussed in chapters three and four). These symbols of urban cultural heritage currently manifest as complementary sources of data.

The park represents a historic archaeological site rich with material evidence demonstrating the African American occupation of this urban space. Meacham Elementary represents a standing structure that symbolizes the cultural heritage of African Americans in Tampa. The school was constructed in 1926 and originally was referred to as the India Street School; was renamed Meacham Elementary in 1927 following the death of Christina Meacham, Tampa’s earliest black female principal.
Figure 2. Aerial Image Depicting Local Context of Study
Christina Meacham (1865-1927) worked in Tampa as a teacher and then in 1914, became the first African American woman principal of a Tampa school-Harlem Academy. Mrs. ‘Tina’ taught schoolchildren for 40 years. As a leader, she Spurred the growth and development of the Hillsborough County and Florida Negro Teachers Associations…Christina Meacham was married to Robert A. Meacham, Jr. Today, Meacham school in Tampa is named in her honor; thousands of Children in Tampa owe much of their education to Mrs. Tina. (Hillsborough County Schools et al. 2006:2).

Despite the long standing historical connection with the community, this school’s significance became jeopardized since it is located directly in the center of a multi-million dollar construction project that threatens to demolish all out dated buildings not incorporated into this process of urban change. Consequently, the school was the center of a conflict in which I found myself involved for over three years. Entities engaged in
this conflict over the historic status and the future of the school have included myself, the community surrounding the school, other supportive African American residents of Tampa, and the family of Christina Meacham on one side, and various county and city entities such as the Tampa Housing Authority, Hillsborough County Schools, The Tampa Preservation Office, and The Tampa Historic Preservation Commission on the other.

Resistance against those who devalued this symbol of cultural heritage manifested as a collaborative effort. I applied a variety of methods toward this research serving as an archaeologist (I am certified as a Registered Professional Archaeologist; ROPA certified in 2001), an anthropological advocate and action researcher, a historic preservation expert, a Tampa History expert, and a political ally. This effort was complemented by the support of Mary Alice Dorsett (civic leader and business owner whose son attended Meacham Elementary), the great granddaughter of Christina Meacham Arndreeta Harris, and her son William Jason Harris (Christina Meacham’s great great grandson). These individuals contributed significantly to this effort by providing critical support at key meetings addressing the significance of the school to the history of the community and by mobilizing local support needed to bolster our position (discussed in chapter four).

Historical Context of the Study Area: Historic Change and African American Education

During the eighteenth and early nineteenth century southern states enacted legislation making it a crime to teach African Americans to read and write (Anderson 1988:2). Following an end to the Civil War, education for African Americans was legalized throughout the country and the Reconstruction era saw an increase (although disproportionately small compared to those provided for other Americans) in educational facilities. “After the Civil War, local communities were in no mood to provide funding
for Black schools. Nevertheless, schools sprang up all over the South, reflecting the strong desire of African Americans to gain the literacy skills that previously had been denied them”(Curtis1996:15). According to Anderson (1988:18) and Sman (2002:196-197) African Americans embraced this opportunity and viewed education as a means to overcome exploitation and become informed political participants. Addressing the significance of nineteenth century black schools in Tampa, Howard et al. (1994) assert:

There were, of course, no educational facilities for Tampa blacks before 1860, and after the Civil War the ex-slave population resolved that its children would learn to read and write. The evidence shows that the city’s blacks began setting up their own schools in the 1870’s and 1880’s: Robles Pond, Harlem Academy, Mt. Zion Public School, as well as the Lomax and Rutledge Academy. These schools, along with the teachers and principals represented the African American community’s faith in education, and these nineteenth-century beginnings revealed that Tampa blacks embraced education as a concerted action designed to collectively elevate the race (Howard et al. 1994:6).

Anderson (1988:19) explains that by 1870 there were no southern states without funds specifically allocated for a public school system that included public funding for African American education (Anderson 1988:19). Thus, after the Civil War, educational facilities for African Americans remained largely separate from educational facilities for other Americans (Kluger:1976). This state of affairs was promoted by racist ideologies such as those clarified by state laws (especially the Jim Crow laws established in many southern states following an end to the reconstruction era in 1877) specifying which public spaces catered to black as opposed to white populations specifically mandating separate educational facilities and other public accommodations. For example, the 1885 Florida State Constitution established separate schools for white and black children attending both public and private educational facilities in the State (2007:http://www.florida
memory.com/Collections/Constitution/). In Tampa this policy was carried out and Howard et al. (1994) explain “White authorities deliberately demanded a segregated school system” (Howard 1994:7). Likewise, Greenbaum (1998:3) asserts “History in Tampa’s black community has followed a familiar pattern. Beginning in the early part of the century, Jim Crow segregation produced a highly insular enclave” (Greenbaum 1998:3). This course of action was consistent with federal policy justifying separate treatment for African Americans such as the result of the 1896 Plessy v. Ferguson Supreme Court ruling which upheld the constitutionality of racial segregation by maintaining that public accommodations (this case addressed railroad systems as public transportation facilities) remain “separate but equal” (Fireside:2004).

This study asserts that racist policies such as segregation impacted the spatial distribution of historic ethnic communities (particularly those established in the nineteenth century) in the U.S. The historic spatial distribution of ethnically distinct communities in Tampa demonstrates this phenomenon and the spatial distribution of properties designated as historically significant is consistent with this trend. The spatial distribution and historic preservation of Tampa’s largest and oldest urban African American enclave is prioritized by this study. However, it is important not to overlook the fact that there were also historic Cuban (both black and white), and Italian populations in the city. African Americans have been prioritized by this study due to the disproportionate demolition of the urban landscape they historically occupied. The economics of real estate have systematically devalued black places in Tampa and elsewhere and made neighborhoods, houses, and institutions of black people highly vulnerable to demolition (Greenbaum 2002).
The constitutionality of segregation was challenged by Brown v. Board of Education in 1954 which determined that educational integration would occur because separate facilities were inherently unequal. This case clarified the federal government’s stance on this issue, however, the implementation of this policy was largely left to local school districts whose plans for desegregation were either voluntary, ordered and supervised by federal courts, or ordered and supervised by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW).

The implementation of this federal mandate was met with resistance by many southern states and it was not until the 1964 Civil Rights Act (which outlawed segregation in schools and public places) that momentum shifted toward comprehensive change (Kotz 2005). Walker (1996:3) explains “Legally mandated separation continued into the 1940’s and was not governmentally dismantled until the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Walker 1996:3). Integration was promoted further by Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education which was argued in 1970 and decided in 1971. This Supreme Court case held that busing students to facilitate integration was constitutional and this decision forced southern states to institute busing promoting integration. There was variation at the local level accounting for disparity in integration implementation in Florida. However, due to pressures from the federal government and the courts, by 1971, most Florida school districts were operating desegregation plans either by court order or under the supervision of HEW. Scholars (Greenbaum 2002:19, Howard et al., Klugh 2004:21) point to the fact that segregated African American schools existed within the larger context of American education, however they point to the significance of these educational facilities as mechanisms facilitating social connections.
Pre-desegregation era black schools were a part of the larger institution of American education in which acceptable standards for curriculum, teaching-styles, student behavior, and most school-related activity, was defined by the dominant class of society…these schools developed as community institutions wherein community members could focus their collective energies toward a common goal—where they could ‘invest in each other’ and actively create ‘palpable resources’ to improve their lives (Greenbaum 2002:19). And because these were community institutions that everyone had a vested interest in, they reinforced the educational and communal values that allowed their construction—thus providing a locus for further cultural, social, and symbolic capital development (Klugh 2004:21).

Community intervention often led to these schools performing functions outside their designed function such as after school childcare programs which were established at Meacham Elementary in Tampa to aid the surrounding community. As Tampa expanded north and east during the latter half of the nineteenth century the Central Avenue African American business district and the Scrub (a historic residential African American enclave) were incorporated into the city. Within the city limits of Tampa, Meacham Elementary is located 1.5 miles northeast of the center of downtown and is only two blocks west of Nebraska Avenue which is a primary north-south thruway connecting downtown Tampa with its northern suburbs (see Figure 4 below).
Tampa History and African American Education

By 1900, black residents comprised almost 28 percent of the city’s total population (Brown 1998, Colburn and Landers 1995:209, Howard et al. 1994, Mohlman 1995). The black community located nearest to downtown Tampa at the beginning of the twentieth century was known as the Scrub (which was named for the scrub palmettos that
typified the area). When Ybor City was established in 1886 just to the east and south of the Scrub, this black community found itself sandwiched between white Tampa on one side and the Latin village of Ybor City on the other (Greenbaum 2002). This spatially and ethnically distinct African American community persisted in this region of Tampa since the 1860s. The southeastern section of this neighborhood became the African American business district which was concentrated along historic Central Avenue in Tampa in the vicinity of the intersection of modern-day Nebraska Avenue and Interstate 4 (just east of the confluence of Interstate 4 and Interstate 275). These African American businesses, like many others in Tampa, enjoyed prosperity as a result of the Florida boom of the 1920s. The majority of these enterprises were clustered in a district located at the intersection of Central Avenue and Scott Street, just northeast of downtown Tampa. Black businesses such as the Central Theater, the Palace Drugstore, and the Tampa Bulletin Publishing Company once lined the streets however none of the independent black–owned businesses once found there still exist today (Weisman et al. 2004).


Although scholars have examined the history of African Americans in numerous Southern and Florida cities, surprisingly little has been written about the black community of Tampa, one of the South’s most unique cities, well known for its Latin flavor, high quality Havana cigars and Cuban cuisine. During the early decades of the twentieth century, the energy and labor of Tampa’s African Americans contributed significantly to the town’s dramatic growth into an important multicultural, urban manufacturing center (Howard 1994:1).

Despite the oppressive social and political atmosphere of the Jim Crow South, in the early 20th century, some African Americans in Tampa emerged as professionals,
public servants, business people and business owners. By the mid-1910s, the African American community of Tampa had a substantial number of citizens that enjoyed sufficient income and social standing to sponsor educational, cultural and religious institutions aimed at enriching the lives of Tampa’s African American children (Jones and McCarthy 1993).

Teachers such as Christina Meacham (the first African American female principal in Hillsborough County and the namesake of Meacham Elementary) strove to improve the educational facilities and curriculum provided for black children in Tampa (Howard et al. 1994, Jones and McCarthy 1993:37-38). Relatively little public funding was made available by local or state governments for the education of black children in Tampa and elsewhere (Shircliffe et al. 2006). Consequently, elementary school classes were often held in private homes, churches, and make-shift buildings, with books and other educational supplies being made available by black business men, church congregations, and African American social service organizations (Greenbaum 2002:20). Mays et al. (1927: 53-56) clarified that in the early 1920’s African American educational facilities in Tampa were typified by “poor ventilation, insufficient blackboard space, poor seating, dark rooms, inadequate desks-some made of boxes. Some of the buildings were old, dilapidated and unfit for human habitation” (Mays et al. 1927:53-56). These conditions point to the significance of Meacham Elementary as an improvement to the infrastructure supporting black education in the 1920’s in Tampa.

One of the earliest schools for black children in Tampa was the Harlem Academy, which was founded in 1889 (Greenbaum 2002:20, Mays et al. 1927). In 1910, it became Harlem Elementary School (a wood frame building located at the corner of Harrison and
Morgan Streets next to St. Paul’s A.M.E. Church). The building had no electric lighting and only a single wood stove for heat. The only other formal institutions for the education of black children in Tampa by 1915 were private facilities which points to the lack of public infrastructure catering to this population. These schools were St. Peter Claver’s Catholic School on Scott Street, located next to the Allen Temple Institutional A.M.E. Church, and Benedict’s School Convent, located at the corner of 20th Street and East Michigan Avenue. Like Harlem Elementary School, these other institutions lacked electric lighting and were heated with wood stoves. By the early 1920s, the educational situation for Tampa’s black children had improved, but only marginally. The Harlem Academy was now a three-story brick building with electric lights and central heating and nine other church schools in Tampa were providing some schooling for more than 600 children. Such schools were held in church auditoriums or rooms in the back of the church. Blackboards and other essentials were usually lacking. The public street and vacant spaces around the church often served as the playground. By 1927 (Mays et al. 1927:53) there were over 3,000 African American students enrolled in public educational facilities and over 600 enrolled in various private institutions. At this time schools and classroom spaces catering to this segregated student population were described as being typically undersized and often lacking sufficient materials (such as books) to accommodate their students (Mays et al. 1927:55). Therefore, when Meacham Elementary was constructed in 1926, this structure represented a hallmark achievement that represented a key improvement in the classroom/educational environment for African American children in Tampa and Hillsborough County and served as a symbol of

From 1926 until 1971 (the year Hillsborough County implemented a desegregation plan mandating busing to facilitate integration) Meacham School stood as a segregated black school in the heart of a formally segregated neighborhood, in the proximity of Tampa’s historical black business district. Although its construction did not bring about equity in the matters of teachers’ salaries and the availability of new books and other educational needs, the construction of the new elementary school did symbolize significant improvement to the infrastructure of African American education in Tampa. The construction of Meacham Elementary School was complemented by the construction of Booker T. Washington on 3rd Avenue established in 1925 as a Junior High School; however, this institution came to serve grades 1-12 until 1926 when the elementary students were transferred to Meacham Elementary. Booker T. Washington then received state accreditation as a High School in 1930 and this was followed by the construction of George S. Middleton High School on 24th Street in 1935 (City of Tampa 2003, Kerstein 2001).

Meacham Elementary was constructed in 1926 as the first modern public facility in Tampa with the purpose of educating the city’s African American children. Within the confines of the Scrub, the school was initially surrounded by a segregated residential neighborhood and was located just three city blocks east of the historic black business district (Mays 1927). In 1954 the completion of Central Park Village (consisting of 483 public housing units) altered the residential layout of the urban landscape surrounding the school (Kerstein 2001). The urban landscape changed from narrow streets lined with
modest, “shotgun” style residential dwellings some of which were dilapidated clapboard shacks (Mays et al. 1927), to rows of connected public housing apartments. The eleven or so acres of this neighborhood (formerly in the heart of the residential portion of the Scrub) that was transformed into public housing units in the 1950’s is currently the focus of multi-million dollar redevelopment efforts by the City of Tampa and the Tampa Housing Authority.

It is because of the fact that Meacham Elementary is surrounded by this valuable real estate that it is and has been threatened by demolition. Rather than prioritizing the school as a historic structure (which it clearly is since it is listed on the National Register of Historic Places) Hillsborough County schools has prioritized selling the school property. This property is especially valuable because if Meacham Elementary were destroyed, this would potentially provide developers with a large contiguous parcel of land devoid of standing structures. The Chief Facilities Officer of Hillsborough County Schools stated in the Historic Preservation Board Meeting (April 2005) that if they were to sell the school property the Housing Authority (or a private developer with their approval) would demolish the school and have a contiguous parcel to redevelop. In March of 2007, Hillsborough County Schools made their intentions clear when they designated the school as surplus property. They plan to liquidate this property by exchanging the parcel containing the school with another parcel deemed appropriate for a new school location provided to them by the Tampa Housing Authority. In turn, according to Leroy Moore (Chief Operating Officer, Tampa Housing Authority) (2006 personal correspondence) if the Housing Authority acquires this property it intends to pull a permit to demolish the school. As of March 7, 2007 the school had not been slated
for demolition. However, as chapter four will explain, despite my actions, as well as those of the Division of Historical Resources and supportive members of the African American community in Tampa, this status changed for the worse in April 2007.

Despite the ignorance of Hillsborough County Schools and the Tampa Housing Authority, Meacham Elementary represents the struggle by African Americans in Tampa to achieve social, political, and educational equality during the segregation era from 1926-1971. In 1971, Meacham School became an integrated sixth grade center as a part of a court ordered desegregation plan for the district containing Hillsborough County Schools (City of Tampa 2003). During the late 1970s, the school was transformed into an early childhood center serving pre-kindergarten and kindergarten students. Meacham has won three EDDIE Awards (given to schools by local school districts to recognize teaching excellence and innovation) and is one of the largest centers accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) (Bair 2000:89). Currently the school is an alternative center catering to students from grades 4-12 with behavior problems. In 2006 there were 127 students attending the school; according to Hillsborough County Public Schools 70% (89 out of 127) are African American and 88% (112 out of 127) are categorized as economically disadvantaged (indicating the continued role of this school in educating Tampa’s African American student population) (Hillsborough County Schools 2007: http://www.sdhc.k12.fl.us/schools/School_Info.asp?Site=4326). Virtually all of the schools and other facilities that catered to Tampa’s historically segregated downtown black enclave were destroyed under the auspices of Urban Renewal policy (discussed in chapter three and four). For example, nearly the entire historic black downtown business district along with hundreds of homes in the
surrounding “scrub” neighborhood (just east and north of the business district) were destroyed in the early to mid 1970’s (Greenbaum 1998). This policy left African American communities without many of the spaces that formerly symbolized and served as social spaces for their community (Greenbaum 2002). Meacham Elementary managed to escape the initial destruction set in motion by twentieth-century Urban Renewal. Although this school escaped Urban Renewal in Tampa in the 1970’s, contemporary revenue seeking activities by Hillsborough County Schools and revitalization efforts by Hillsborough County, the Tampa Housing Authority, and the City of Tampa have threatened to overlook, devalue, and ultimately destroy this landmark of African American history in Tampa (Froelich 2007, WilsonMiller, Inc. and The Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission 2005).

Despite the fact that Urban Renewal resulted in the demolition of the vast majority of buildings historically associated with African Americans in Tampa (a historical trend that will be analyzed in chapters two, three, and four), archaeological research has discovered residual elements of the structures themselves as well as associated cultural behavior. Chapter two investigates urban archaeology and demonstrates that this anthropological specialization has the potential to produce material evidence directly connecting the present with cultural heritage symbolizing the past even after comprehensive urban demolition. I argue that when urban demolition projects destroy evidence of cultural heritage above the ground, archaeology might be applied as a tool capable of producing material evidence supplanting the loss of visible structures. Therefore, archaeological data has the potential to exemplify the dynamic process of
urban change and serve as a potential avenue of research that links anthropologists with
evidence symbolizing cultural heritage across the urban landscape.

Chapter three undertakes a critical assessment of historic preservation practice in
urban contexts via an investigation of material symbols of African American cultural
heritage in Tampa (as a case study). Likewise, this chapter provides an initial
assessment of historic designation and preservation trends accounting for racial
difference in the State of Florida. Chapter four recounts the collaborative efforts
undertaken to preserve Meacham Elementary’s place in Tampa History (as an example of
action oriented research). Likewise, this chapter relates this process to anthropological
ethics while utilizing Tampa as a case study to examine historic preservation practice in
urban contexts. Chapter five summarizes the overall research project, clarifies the Urban
Model of Applied Preservation (UMAP), and recounts its application to this study.
Urban Archaeology and UMAP

Archaeological research is well suited to the assessment of urban landscape change. This category of research is a significant component of UMAP because material evidence has the potential to represent evolving urban landscape usage through time and across space. The chronological and cultural affiliation of this evidence can serve to enhance the work of anthropologists investigating cultural heritage and its association with intact or altered urban landscapes. Therefore, urban archaeology as a method of assessing residual components of culture demonstrates the potential for material evidence to augment our understanding of cultural heritage through the investigation of material evidence within the context of distinctive urban landscapes. As a doctoral graduate assistant, my involvement with the 2003 archaeological investigation of Perry Harvey Park facilitated daily interaction with community members as they traversed the park and took site tours of the ongoing archaeological dig. This interaction was complemented by archival research into this neighborhood clarifying the long standing historical connection of this urban landscape with the African American community in Tampa. This realization led to my subsequent involvement with the preservation of Meacham Elementary (which is located less than three blocks east of the park) as a symbolic component of this historical community.
What is Urban Archaeology?

Urban archaeology is defined by Bradley and King (1989:ix) as “The study of the evolution and changing character of urban communities from their earliest origins until modern times” (Bradley and King 1989:ix). Likewise, Landmark Archaeological Services, Inc. suggests that “Urban archaeology examines the development of towns and cities” (1999:http://www.fromsitetostory.org/sources/archinmn/archinmnurban.asp). While definitions of urban archaeology are few and far between in archaeological literature, these definitions clarify that the goal of urban archaeology is to investigate the origin and evolution of urban communities. As the focus of research, it is significant to note that urban communities, towns, and cities vary according to their cultural and temporal context. Anfinson (1990:4) makes it clear that urban archaeology practiced within the historical context of the United States prioritizes the investigation of modern “industrial” cites (rather than prehistoric urban centers). Anfinson (1990:3) explains “Some may define a city as any incorporated town even if only a hundred people live there. Others think of a city as a major population center…When we talk about urban archaeology, we generally are talking about doing archaeology not just in a city, but in a large population center” (Anfinson 1990:3). Therefore, urban archaeology in the United States is the archaeological study of urban centers (which usually developed as nineteenth century industrial cities) with a focus on their inception and change through time.

The Temporal Context of Urban Archaeology in U.S. Cities

Given that industrial centers in North America developed well after European contact in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, these archaeological resources are designated as historic archaeological sites. Due to this temporal context, this
specialization has been the focus of historical archaeological practice in the United States. Referring to the archaeology of U.S. cities, The Institute for Minnesota Archaeology explains “Lying under our city streets and sidewalks, warehouses and parking lots, is the history of our cities, in mute layers containing the remnants of lives gone by…and so it is historical archaeologists—those who use both text and artifact in their quest to understand human life in earlier times—who delve beneath concrete and asphalt to uncover what lies beneath” (1999: http://www.fromsitetostory.org/sources/archinmn/archinmnurban.asp). Therefore, due to the post-European contact context of urban archaeology in the United States, historical archaeologists typically pursue this specialty.

Archaeology undertaken within the confines of contemporary urban settings in the U.S. has only been prioritized for a few decades. The relative lack of antiquity of U.S. cities when compared to other parts of the world such as Europe resulted in their relative lack of study by contemporary archaeologists. However as time progressed they became less likely to be overlooked by contemporary archaeological practice. In addition, the emergence of government mandates stipulating when and why urban archaeology must be undertaken in U.S. cities complemented their antiquity and led to their recent emergence as loci for potential archaeological research.

The Institute for Minnesota Archaeology (1999: http://fromsitetostory.org/sources/archinmn/archinmnurban.asp) reveals that “The archaeology of cities has been going on for a long time. Rome, Babylon, Pompeii, and Mexico City are all cities where urban archaeology has been undertaken. Only in recent times, however, have the sprawling North American metropolises been considered fit for archaeological research. Yet every
city is in fact a huge archeological site” (1999:http://www.fromsitetostory.org/sources/archinmn/archinmnurban.asp). Garrow (1991:1) clarifies that “Urban archaeology as a distinct discipline, is still in a formative stage within North America. Relatively little attention was paid to archaeological resources within urbanized areas prior to the 1970’s…”Garrow:1991:1). Piper and Piper (1987:260) reiterate this sentiment and further assert that urban archaeological resources have often been under appreciated by contemporary archaeological practice in the United States. Staski (1987) explains that the archaeology of contemporary United States cities has only been pursued consistently as part of the profession since the 1960’s (Staski 1987.ix).

The Section 106 review process initiated by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 was the first comprehensive government mandate that affected the practice of archaeology and led to its consistent practice in urban settings (King 1998, 2004, 2005; Neuman and Sanford 2001). Therefore, archaeologists in the United States began to undertake consistent research in contemporary urban settings after the initial laws mandating the assessment of potential impacts on the cultural and natural environments were formalized in the mid 1960’s. Anfinson (1990:5) explains “What is now known as urban archaeology arose in North America during the 1960’s due to the requirements of federally mandated environmental review (what is commonly called cultural resource management or CRM)”. Since the 1960’s a host of legislative mandates at the local, state, and federal level have further promoted the practice of urban archaeology in North America. Further, Anfinson (1990:5) asserts “These federal requirements were coupled with the realization that…many American cities were finally considered old enough to be worthy of archaeological study”. Therefore, the relatively recent emergence of urban
archaeological practice in the U.S. has resulted from the passing of time and the implementation of government mandates.

The temporal context of urban archaeological practice in the United States necessitates its pursuit by historical archaeologists who are typically provided with the opportunity to formulate research questions within a historically documented context. Archaeological practice in U.S. cities has been stimulated by the passing of time and contemporary legislation which has led to the relatively recent prioritization of archaeology in urban contexts in the United States. The urban archaeological research undertaken in Perry Harvey Park (Tampa, Florida) in 2003 is consistent with this pattern and represents an example of how urban archaeology can provide links to a city’s past even when those links are no longer visibly apparent. The connection between an urban landscape devoid of visible evidence of cultural activity (such as Perry Harvey Park) and a present-day city (such as Tampa, Florida) can be clarified through archaeological research. Weisman (2004) asserts that urban archaeology is especially important “Particularly in cities that have experienced extensive loss of the built environment through urban renewal, archaeological resources represent the only physical link to a city’s past” (Weisman et al 2004:i). Therefore, especially in the absence of evidence above the ground, urban archaeology is uniquely suited to recover material evidence below the ground that has the potential to be representative of a city’s past. What urban archaeology does is provide an avenue for research producing material links serving as verifiable proof of the inception and evolution of an urban landscape.
Categories of Urban Archaeological Evidence Considered

Archaeological specialties are defined by the temporal and cultural context of their research focus and the evidence generated by their research. Therefore, the practice of urban archaeology will be analyzed by identifying common categories of evidence harnessed by urban archaeologists in Florida and the United States. The unique historical context of the state of Florida (within the larger historical context of the U.S.) impacts the specific research questions (and evidence used to engage those questions) related to the inception and development of urban sites in the state. Weisman (2004:4) explains that currently the archaeology of cities in Florida suffers from a lack of academic training programs designed to prepare archaeologists for urban archaeology in Florida, and because of the fact that most contemporary urban settlements did not develop until after the Civil War (with the exceptions of St. Augustine on the east coast and Pensacola on the west coast). Further, he points to the fact that the post-Civil War through World War II archaeological time period has thus far not been prioritized by urban planners or researchers in the state (including most urban archaeologists) (Weisman 2004:3-4). The specific historical trajectory of the state of Florida impacts urban archaeological practice in Florida by affecting what research questions will be addressed by archaeologists within the state.

The historical urban context provides archaeologists with opportunities to utilize sources of data that may not exist in non-urban archaeological research settings. For example, city directories can sometimes provide addresses and names of residents in a particular urban context (city or community within a city). Likewise, historic fire insurance maps (Sanborn Maps) are an excellent source of data that describe the state of
an urban landscape at the time of their production (Kester 1993, Oswald 1997, Ristow 1986). Documentary resources like these are significant to historical urban archaeology because they provide the archaeologist with a snapshot of urban context that might be compared with previous or future (perhaps contemporary) cultural landscape use. Weisman (2004) explains “Other documentary sources include aerial and life-scene photographs, building plans and construction permits, newspapers and commercial advertisements, and virtually every written source available to the historian. The archaeologist needs to know what kinds of documents are available and most appropriate for the type of archaeological problem being studied” (Weisman et al. 2004:6). Therefore, documentary evidence might be applied as a basis of comparison (as in the case of evolving landscapes) and or as a source of data describing details about material evidence related to particular structures (such as descriptions of a building’s use and construction materials). However, this documentation cannot inform the urban archaeologist as to subsurface reality of an urban landscape; documents provide a snapshot of urban space while archaeological practice seeks to reveal urban evolution from its inception to the time of excavation. Historical references cannot see into the ground and reveal their accuracy, nor can they reveal potential disturbance/land alteration that may have occurred since they were produced.

Therefore, historical documentation serves as a useful tool for urban archaeology; however, it cannot ultimately predict what will be found at urban archaeological sites. Weisman (2004) describes the interplay between historical documentation and urban archaeology as beneficial and prioritizes a balance between the two forms of data.
However, he also cautions against casual use of historical documents in urban archaeology.

The historical or documentary record can be the source to begin forming research themes and questions, which are then taken to the archaeological record for answers. However, archaeology should not be the mere ‘handmaiden of history’ and can also be the source of both questions and answers. When trying to understand site formation processes through stratigraphic analysis, the archaeologist is in essence developing an archaeological model of the relation between human action and technonomic processes. In this respect, good solid archaeological reasoning (and training) is still required, and the archaeologist cannot simply be a historian who happens to like getting his hands dirty (Weisman et al. 2004:5).

While taking cognizance of the fact that historical documentation represents a source of data to be confirmed and complemented by excavation, the connection between material evidence and the cultural use of urban landscapes might provide the urban archaeologist with an opportunity to correlate specific behaviors with the cultural use of urban landscapes. Even though this evidence must be recognized as a tool complementing archaeology and not a replacement for excavation, this documentation provides urban archaeologists working in the U.S. and Florida with potentially valuable sources of data tracking changes allowing for insight into the specific context of urban research.

**Urban Archaeological Practice at Perry Harvey Park**

Changes through time in the city of Tampa, Florida are recorded by a host of historical documents and the Perry Harvey Park excavation of 2003 (Principal Investigator: Dr. Brent Weisman, USF) undertaken as a component of a Florida Department of Transportation research initiative culminating in the production of a report titled “A Model for Evaluating Archaeological Site Significance in Cities: A Case Study from Tampa, Florida” (Weisman et al. 2004). This study utilized available documentary
evidence such as historical documents, (e.g. Brady 1997, Greenbaum 2002, Saunders 2000, Mohlman 1995, Mays et al. 1927) city directories, newspaper articles, photographs and Sanborn maps as primary forms of evidence aiding in the archaeological research design employed at the park. The urban archaeological research undertaken at Perry Harvey Park in 2003 took cognizance of these forms of data and the excavation strategies pursued at the park demonstrate the potential results of applying documentary evidence as a research tool impacting research design in urban archaeology.

Rather than approaching this landscape in a random fashion and establishing an arbitrary grid across the park, excavation was centered on recovering material evidence from specific locations chosen due to their depiction in maps and descriptions in other historical documents. Photographs and Sanborn maps depict enduring elements of this urban landscape such as extant streets (which now dead end into the park) and enduring residential structures that were employed as landmarks providing a basis of comparison with historic maps and other documentation. At Perry Harvey Park, six Sanborn Maps were employed as a means of evaluating recorded changes and those were compared with the current urban landscape at the park (1895, 1899, 1903, 1915, and 1931 v1. and 1931-51) (Weisman et al. 2004). Weisman (2004) explains that “…these maps are an excellent source of information about the placement and material composition of structures within the city limits of many U.S. cities…Additionally, the maps show the position of structures and give the street addresses” (Weisman et al 2004:68). These maps facilitated the incorporation of extant components of the built urban environment into an informed research design.
This project demonstrates the utility of integrating available documentary evidence into the formulation of an informed research methodology facilitating excavation strategies focused on specific elements of the historic landscape directly linked to prior landscapes through extant roadways and structures. Existing urban landscapes have the potential to manifest as a form of evidence serving as a basis of comparison with historic references. Weisman’s strategy in 2003 clarifies that a historically informed research design must be accompanied by appropriate archaeological field methods. This historically informed approach, in conjunction with controlled recovery and comprehensive contextual interpretation produced superlative results. For example, this combination of research and field methodology led to the identification of “…a number of intact significant archaeological deposits associated with former activity areas of Central Avenue…Our investigations focused on sampling portions of three blocks, and uncovered deposits associated with an 1880’s saloon, backyard bottle dumps and midden deposits associated with two different residential areas on the block, and deposits that accumulated behind several businesses on Central Avenue” (Weisman et al. 2004:14). This excavation revealed that archaeological field methods have the potential to confirm and enhance historical documentation by identifying stratigraphic indicators (stratigraphic context) associated with the evolving urban landscape. For example, Weisman explains that “…we were able to identify and stratigraphically define the ‘urban renewal layer’ consisting of demolition rubble and fill material and show that it is consistently above intact deposits” (Weisman et al. 2004:14). Archaeological research at this park accomplished something historical documentation cannot bring about. Specifically, it identified archaeological indicators (stratigraphic indicators)
demonstrating changes in this urban environment resulting specifically from demolition associated with urban renewal in Tampa. Archaeological data does more than discuss historical events, it provides material evidence.

Material evidence produced by urban archaeology established that artifacts and features complemented by stratigraphic context at Perry Harvey Park confirmed the presence of a nineteenth century African American urban business district (to be discussed in detail in chapter four) destroyed during the early 1970’s. With this project Weisman (2004) demonstrated how urban archaeological practice has the potential to be enhanced by applying methods justified by a targeted (rather than a random) research design. He explains “Overall, the method was successfully applied to this particular research problem, and in this particular location. A much clearer picture of the site was obtained because of intensive coverage of a small area” (Weisman et al. 2004:90).

No amount of historical documentation can confirm material evidence it describes. Urban archaeology can be applied as a research tool to evaluate the presence or absence of material evidence which may or may not always correlate with recorded history. The archaeological project undertaken at Perry Harvey Park demonstrates that interplay exists between documentation, contemporary urban landscapes, material evidence (what archaeological excavation confirms), and the stratigraphic context of archaeological deposits. These forms of evidence facilitate the formation of research designs informed by cross referencing historical documentation of the urban environment with contemporary landscapes. This process sets the stage for the application of methods designed to maximize the efficiency of excavation prioritizing the stratigraphic context and meticulous recovery of material evidence.
Local Informants and Urban Archaeology

As well as being informed by historical documentation and material evidence accurately recovered and interpreted in stratigraphic context, the research at the park was enhanced by engaging local community members serving as formal or informal informants (including oral histories, formal and informal interviews and daily discussions with neighborhood residents as archaeological fieldwork was undertaken). This interaction with residents of the public housing surrounding the park (and interested passers by) serves as another a basis of comparison with written documents (comparing memory with documentation) and it also provides an opportunity to involve the community in research undertaken near their residences. Weisman (2004) explains that “Through oral histories and various forms of formal and informal consultations, the research team learns what resources within the project area might have particular value or importance to the community” (Weisman et al. 2004:15). This source of data was sought after and prioritized by the principal investigator of this project (Dr. Brent Weisman) and his leadership instilled this philosophy in his supervisors (myself included) and his field crew (archaeological field school participants).

Many urban archaeological projects in Florida and in the U.S. overlook or do not pursue interaction with key informants. As an archaeological field technician working my way through graduate school I have personally participated in dozens of urban archaeological surveys in Florida that have had no interaction with the community where they took place. Qualitative data generated via interaction with key informants is important to urban archaeology and community members should not be overlooked as resources with the potential to augment research. This interaction has the potential to
produce a category of evidence that might serve urban archaeologists by affording an opportunity to gain invaluable insight into the evaluation of a given urban landscape (i.e. what if memory is correct and historical documentation is wrong?). Prioritizing the views and insights of those who may have been a part of events described by history allows for the participation of community members in the research process thereby adding to the significance of archaeological resources to a given community. This interaction allows the urban archaeologist to learn from informants and gauge community support for and awareness of cultural resources such as the archaeological signatures lying beneath the surface of Perry Harvey Park.

*Urban Archaeology and the Holistic Approach*

Urban archaeology is uniquely suited to consolidate evidence from the five sources of data identified in this chapter. First, urban archaeology has the potential to recognize that the contemporary built environment in proximity to and within defined archaeological study areas are important resources that may serve as a valuable basis of comparison with historical depictions of urban landscapes. For example, extant roadways or other landmarks have the potential to be used as spatial references for locating archaeological evidence. Next, archaeological signatures themselves (material evidence) associated with human behavior linked with the inception and evolution of cities were identified as significant categories of evidence for urban archaeologists in the U.S. Third, the significance of stratigraphic context of material evidence (as a gauge of the integrity of archaeological evidence) is of paramount importance to the practice of urban archaeology. Fourth, the importance of background research investigating all available forms of documentary evidence detailing urban inception and change in and in
the vicinity of archaeological study areas was highlighted as an important category of evidence. Lastly, interaction with local informants was identified as a potentially vital resource that is often overlooked by urban archaeologists. Because archaeological practice begins and ends with research designs that serve to justify appropriate methods applied to the collection of data and answer research questions, the Perry Harvey Park case study demonstrates that taking cognizance of all recognizable forms of data (i.e. applying the holistic approach) and applying them toward the formulation of informed research designs in urban contexts in the U.S. has the potential to enhance the practice of urban archaeology.

Recent urban archaeological research in Tampa has demonstrated that material evidence can symbolize African American cultural heritage which may be overlooked or misrepresented by written history. The material evidence generated by the archaeological assessment of Perry Harvey Park confirms the historic association of this landscape with African American cultural heritage in Tampa. This research provides comprehensive evidence documenting the process of urban change described in chapter three. Likewise, this research clarifies the historical relationship between Meacham Elementary (discussed in chapter four) and the segregated neighborhood it catered to for nearly fifty years. Archaeology has demonstrated that there really was a thriving segregated African American business district less than three blocks from the school when it was constructed in 1926 and that this business district was accompanied by a segregated neighborhood (the Scrub) that surrounded the school when it was constructed.

Researching Meacham Elementary as an element of this study led to my evolving interest in learning more about how this landmark was a component of the historic and
more contemporary community. This awareness served to highlight the significance of the urban landscape as symbolic and representative of cultural heritage. Therefore, validating the historical relationship between this community and African Americans in Tampa by means of urban archaeology served to justify my actions described in forthcoming chapters. This research strategy provides urban anthropologists with a method capable of generating material evidence potentially complementing other data sources accounting for urban cultural behavior. This tangible connection with the past ensured that my resolve would remain steadfast as I confronted challenges associated with engaging the process of urban change in Tampa.
Chapter Three: Investigating Material Symbols of African American Culture and Heritage in Tampa, Florida - A Case Study

The analysis presented in chapter three includes a critical overview of cultural heritage as symbolic of cultural behavior taking cognizance of the representation of that heritage in written history and contemporary urban landscapes. This study demonstrated that in Tampa the process of Urban Renewal had the potential to effect this representation. Likewise, this overview facilitated the classification of African American cultural heritage sites into two temporal categories. The investigation of these sites pointed to the significance of the built environment as representative of culture and led to the examination of historic preservation practice in Tampa and in Florida. This assessment prioritized extracting data from and adding to existing historic designation databases such as the statewide historic structure summary data organized for this project (See Table ), National Register of Historic Places district and individual site nomination forms for designated sites in the City of Tampa (See Appendices A,D,E), and local landmarks and districts generated by the City of Tampa (See Appendices B and C).

These databases represent summaries of historic designation forms intended to detail the significance of designated properties. The data extracted from the aforementioned databases was utilized to investigate overall trends such as the distribution of designated historic sites relative to ethnicity. Likewise, these data were applied in the analysis of descriptive characteristics for individual sites such as the ambiguous assignment of cultural affiliation on designation forms. Therefore this study
critiqued these forms as data representative of the historic designation process at the local, state, and federal levels. Criteria utilized by governmental entities to establish historical significance of properties are clarified by the forms they utilize to designate them as such (see Table 2 for a full explanation of this criteria). Therefore, this study critically examined these forms representing the existing framework utilized and established by the Tampa Preservation Commission (local designations), the State of Florida (state historic structures), and the federal government (National Register of Historic Places sites).

Cultural Heritage and the Urban Landscape

If we recognize the potential for elements of the urban landscape to symbolize a group such as African Americans, it is important to note the anthropological interpretation accounting for cultural significance of that physical space. Written interpretations of urban historical spaces and events comprise the historical narratives that symbolize urban physical space and its role with African American Heritage in U.S. history. These narratives, like the spaces they represent are static representations that symbolize cultural behavior at a given time in a designated place. This analysis demonstrates that the contemporary historical representation and preservation of urban space representing cultural heritage has the potential to mirror the incomplete and/or inaccurate presentation of written history. Trouillot (1995:23) suggests that history is a social process and that historical representation is impacted by the power structure of the society when and where it unfolds. He contends that “For what history is changes with time and place or, better said, history reveals itself only through the production of specific narratives” (Trouillot 1995:25). While Trouillot (1995) is critical about the
production of history he also is quick to point out that it is not only “actors” that have the potential to be misrepresented or left out of history, but that symbolic spaces representing time and place associated with those actors can also be overlooked or misrepresented. “We cannot exclude in advance any of the actors who participate in the production of history or any of the sites where that production may occur” (Trouillot 1995:25). Therefore, it is significant to recognize the potential for written history and/or other methods producing data symbolizing cultural behavior to leave out actors as well as the possibility that history may turn a blind eye to the urban physical spaces associated with them. Likewise, these spaces may be misrepresented in written history and associated with cultural heritage deemed consistent with current normative views. It follows that these places associated with specific events or people in a given cultural and temporal context represents cultural heritage and that these have the potential to be overlooked as symbolic points of historical reference (i.e. cultural heritage); especially since others might be created as a result of landscape alteration that redefines the symbols associated with urban space.

Blake’s 2000 overview of “cultural heritage” through the lens of International Cultural Heritage Law suggests that definitions of “heritage” vary across time and between national and local contexts. Blake (2000) concludes that a primary element of “cultural heritage” “…is its linkage with group identity and it is both a symbol of the cultural identity of a self-identified group, be it a nation or a people, and an essential element in the construction of that group’s identity” (Blake 2000:84). Therefore, when the location where cultural activity occurs is recognized by a cultural group as significant to their history that space qualifies as a symbol of their “cultural heritage”. Cultural
heritage is purposefully selected from a myriad of cultural events and associated locations where they occur across a given cultural landscape. The process associated with the selection and recognition of these spaces as symbolic of cultural heritage is broad and complex and varies from one context to the next (Pollock-Ellwand 1992:71). When a cultural group (i.e. a group with common origins, territory, and traditions such as a historically segregated ethnic group in a U.S. city) prioritizes a “space” as significant to their cultural heritage, this does not guarantee that it will be respected by others outside the group and be preserved (serving as a physical representation of history) for future generations. For example, cultural landscapes can be altered and “cultural heritage” can be destroyed (bulldozers do not negotiate and when tangible history is demolished it is gone forever).

Scholars point to the fact that African American history in Tampa as well as the vast majority of urban contexts in the U.S. has been overlooked by contemporary historians (Greenbaum 1998:2, Mohlman 1998:12). This relative lack of representation in written history is consistent with a void in preserved material symbols representing African American culture and heritage. Before investigating Tampa as a specific city representing a case study, the context of the examination of African American cultural heritage will be evaluated by assessing contemporary African American cultural heritage sites.

Temporal Context and Representation of African American Cultural Heritage Sites

Contemporary recognition of African American Cultural Heritage sites in the U.S. can be organized into two temporal categories: 1) heritage sites associated with African Americans prior to emancipation (pre 1863) and 2) heritage sites associated with African American
Americans during times of state sponsored segregation in the U.S. (post 1863-circa 1970). Heritage sites associated with the time period prior to emancipation in the U.S. are largely made up of historic plantation sites associated with the practice of slavery. For example, Jackson’s (2003) critical analysis of historical representation of plantation community life highlights the oversimplification and inaccuracy of some historical depictions of African Americans who occupied plantation “space” at Snee Farm Plantation in South Carolina. Specifically, she critiques the use of the label “slave” as applied to some inhabitants of the plantation. She contends that “The continued use of the label ‘slave’ in the public forum productions of American history (i.e. National Historic Site venues) serves to mask the diversity of African plantation experience and minimize the cultural contributions in the everyday lifeways of Africans in plantation communities. One way of expanding the view of African life in plantation settings is to critically examine the use of the label slave”. (Jackson 2003a:97-98). Jackson (2003a) demonstrates that this label does not account for specialization and oversimplifies the variation that existed between African American individuals who were enslaved in plantation contexts. Ruffins (1992:572) also underscores the significance of critically assessing the historical representation of African Americans at plantations through the analysis of Colonial Williamsburg. “Throughout most of its existence, this living history museum made no mention of the nearly fifty percent of the city’s 1770’s population that was black” (Ruffins 1992:572). Likewise, Potter and Leone (2000) are critical of historical representations of African Americans at outdoor museums in Historic Annapolis, Maryland. They point to these outdoor museums to demonstrate that historical representations of “space” associated with African American cultural heritage
have the potential to be incomplete and inaccurate (Potter and Leone 2000:494). These examples demonstrate that historical representation of places associated with cultural heritage should prioritize quantity (does representation exist?) as well as quality (is representation comprehensive and accurate?).

Anthropologist Jacqeline Nassy Brown (2000) prioritizes the significance of contemporary representation of historical “space” associated with the practice of slavery in the U.S. and England. She highlights the example of the seaport at Liverpool, England as a significant “space” associated with the international practice of slavery. Brown (2000) prioritizes the symbolic nature of space and its association with Africans as a “race” (distinct ethnic group). When referencing the attitudes of contemporary Black Liverpoolians, Brown (2000:343) notes that “…their own knowing eyes grant “place” a highly symbolic, yet exalted role: witness. The brick of this building and the mortar of that one together give evidence, just as did the embodied presence of ex-slaves who many generations ago, traveled to Britain with their stories of bondage. Now that no living person can give witness, it is place that speaks” (Brown 2000:343). Brown (2000) contends that material evidence of the slave trade in Britain (and elsewhere) is highly significant to the heritage of Africans because it stands as an interpretive resource that symbolizes the “narrative” of African history. Brown’s (2000) analysis demonstrates that places associated with cultural heritage potentially serve as a source of tangible acknowledgement providing physical evidence associated with written history. Therefore, urban places and spaces serving as material evidence of cultural behavior have the potential to enhance anthropological knowledge the same way artifacts do because they can symbolize cultural heritage and provide tangible proof of cultural behavior in a
given context. It is critical that the cultural use of significant historic places is accurately represented; when urban places or spaces are preserved for future generations the potential for inaccurate representation arises when they are accounted for in written history and presented to the public.

Contemporary anthropological research (Jackson 2003b; Kahn 1996, 2000) addressing the description/representation of cultural heritage sites call for a comprehensive approach to augment the understanding of “space”. Kahn (2000) and Jackson (2003b) assert that anthropologists have the opportunity to generate more diverse presentations of cultural heritage associated with cultural heritage sites. In her research on the Kingsley Plantation, Jackson (2003b:12) explains that “…it is the combination of the plantation as a physical space in the form of tangible and interactively accessible reminders (i.e. graves sites, housing remains, waterways) and socially constructed space that help keep it in the minds and memory of those who visit it” (Jackson 2003b:12).

Therefore, elements of the landscape associated with cultural heritage such as buildings in urban contexts such as the school prioritized by this study can serve as material evidence representing physical reminders of the past thereby engaging the validity of written history. Consistent with material evidence generated via urban archaeology, urban places preserved as cultural heritage have the potential to augment written history or to question its validity.

Historic locales in the U.S. representing African American cultural heritage following emancipation (circa 1863) have also been cited by a number of contemporary researchers as significant symbolic points of reference. Some researchers contend that the dynamic nature of urban landscapes has had a devastating effect on the material
evidence of African American cultural heritage. Greenbaum (1998:3) explains that the demolition of buildings associated with African American cultural heritage in U.S. cities affects contemporary awareness and material representation of African American culture. Boyd’s work in a formerly segregated African American enclave in Chicago, Illinois (2000) illustrates the importance of recognizing cultural heritage when it is threatened by contemporary redevelopment projects. Boyd’s (2000:116) analysis of twentieth century Bronzeville as a “historic” African American space (a formerly segregated neighborhood within the City of Chicago, Illinois) points to the importance of physical urban space in contemporary representations of the past (especially in light of community redevelopment) and to the identity of contemporary community members. When community members refer to the value of “space” to their community “They assert that the buildings in the neighborhood are a part of the history of the race. To them, the identity of Bronzeville is not just contained in these threatened buildings: it is these threatened buildings” (Boyd 2000:116). Further, Boyd (2005:278) states “According to Mr. Ingram, the buildings in the neighborhood are physical monuments to the potential and abilities of the entire race, ones that serve as an example of what each black person can do, and achievements of which the entire community can be proud” (Boyd 2005:278). Boyd’s analysis of the importance of buildings as symbolic spaces representing African American heritage in an urban context in the U.S. during times of state sponsored segregation asserts “In Bronzeville, buildings are not just pieces of individually owned property, but symbols of community spirit;…This interpretation frames building destruction as equivalent to the demise of racial history, and suggests that the plight of individual place entrepreneurs is really the plight of the entire racial
community” (Boyd 2000:117). The Bronzeville example demonstrates how the process of urban change and redevelopment can lead to increased cognizance of cultural heritage and promote the recognition of “space” as a symbol of culture. Commenting on the significance of space to identity in a contemporary African American neighborhood in New York City, Gregory (1998) asserts that “…threats to the built environment were also assaults on shared memories of the past that formed the bedrock of the community’s political culture and identity” (Gregory 1998:143). However, chapter four demonstrates that symbolic space cannot speak for itself. Preservation must complement recognition (especially in evolving urban contexts) if places are to serve as references for future generations.

**Urban Renewal and Altered Landscapes**

Two processes associated with urban history in the U.S. and Tampa that have disproportionately affected African American cultural heritage and potential preservation of that heritage are urban renewal and gentrification. Urban renewal acts as a byproduct of urban planning that is typically aligned with the implementation of eminent domain and federal funding associated with drastic changes in urban landscapes. While the participation of Florida Cities in this initiative was limited due to a 1952 Florida Supreme Court decision that effectively blocked access to federal subsidies associated with urban renewal, Tampa was an exception to this trend. In 1958 the state legislature passed a local bill allowing Tampa to initiate an urban renewal program. Consequently, between 1959 and 1966 the City of Tampa participated in three Urban Renewal projects subsidized by the Federal Government (Kerstein 2001:134-135).
The first of these projects was the 1959 federally funded demolition of the “Maryland Avenue” site in Tampa. “The Maryland Avenue site included a sixty-one-acre tract in a lower income African American area that housed more than 300 families and included several businesses” (Kerstein 2001:136). Commenting on this project, planners boasted that this would eliminate a “…slum area that provided the city only about $1,000 per acre in taxes in 1959” (Kerstein 2001:136). Likewise, planners suggested that this project would do away with “a slum district that divided the two main business areas of downtown Tampa and Ybor City” (Kerstein 2001:136). Therefore a clear goal of the earliest example of Urban Renewal in Tampa is a byproduct of federal funding allocated to increase the City’s tax base and consolidate business districts by eradicating areas designated as “blighted or substandard” and then recreating an urban landscape to best suit the economic interests of the City. In 1963 another comprehensive federally funded “redevelopment plan” promoted by the City of Tampa cleared the way for consolidation of business districts and had a dramatic effect on its African American population. “The Tampa City Council approved the urban renewal plan for the 160-acre Riverfront project in January 1963 which called for the razing of virtually all the structures on the site. Of the 737 buildings in the project area, 599 were residential…A survey in 1961 recorded that 10 white and 670 African American families had lived there” (Kerstein 2001:138). The Riverfront Urban Renewal project served to consolidate and expand the downtown business sector while facilitating direct interstate access to this part of the City.

In 1964 Tampa’s third Urban Renewal project was initiated. This project focused on Ybor City with the goal of maximizing tourist potential while retaining a “Spanish
atmosphere” (Kerstein 2001:142-143). This project also served to directly connect the downtown business district with Ybor City. This plan “…encompassed about 160 acres and 900 buildings. The plan called for the demolition of more than 700 of the buildings, most of them occupied by African Americans” (Kerstein 2001:143). At the time the head of the Barrio Latino Commission touted the economic intent of the plan and declared that “a revitalized Latin Quarter would draw to Tampa millions of tourists, equivalent to $150 million in new industry, and that Ybor City would become a tourist center second to none in the nation” (Kerstein 2001:143). Therefore, consistent with the previous two Urban Renewal plans carried out in Tampa this one disproportionately affected African American population at the cost of improving the economic viability of Tampa. This plan provided opportunities for developers that would increase the City’s tax base while directly linking business districts with a tourist center.

These Urban Renewal projects were followed by the Jefferson Avenue thoroughfare to Interstate 275 which under the auspices of eminent domain initiated the demolition of African American businesses in the vicinity of Central Avenue. This was followed in 1973 by multi-million dollar federal grant (facilitated by eminent domain) which destroyed the remaining African American businesses along Central Avenue and improved interstate access to the downtown business district (Kerstein 2001:170). Therefore, in Tampa, Urban Renewal and subsequent federally funded projects have historically disproportionately affected its lower income residents (especially African Americans).

This research indicates that a purposeful strategy has been in place for decades to consolidate business districts and directly link them with Tampa’s interstates. Consistent
with this objective, in 2007 the Community Redevelopment Plan for the Central Avenue Park Village calls for the eradication of the last enduring historic enclave associated with African Americans in Tampa. This project will serve to directly connect Ybor City with I-275 to the north (which connects Tampa with cities to the north such as Gainesville and to the east such as Orlando) and will expand the downtown business district to the east linking it with Nebraska Avenue (a primary north-south thoroughfare connecting downtown with northern suburbs). Contemporary urban “redevelopment” plans are on the verge of completing what was started in the 1950’s and one is left to wonder if this plan has been in the works for nearly fifty years just waiting for federal funds to surface once again to serve the interests of local elites.

Contemporary urban researchers demonstrate a pattern that is consistent with the analysis of Tampa’s Urban Renewal projects. For example, Fullilove (2000:58) speaks to the racially disproportionate demolition historically associated with urban renewal policy in the U.S. She suggests that Urban Renewal was used as a method to disperse poor African Americans from inner city neighborhoods so that the land could be “renewed” and transformed into more productive economic space for downtown investors. “The land-claiming strategy embodied in the Housing Act of 1949 was straightforward. An interested city had first to identify the ‘blighted’ areas that it wished to redo…Once those areas had been defined, the city had the task of developing a ‘workable plan’. The workable plan was forwarded to regional urban renewal offices for approval by the federal government” (Fullilove 2000:58). When such a plan was approved, the selected areas could be seized by applying eminent domain. Residents and business owners occupying such sites were given minimal compensation and were forced to move on.
The seized urban landscapes were demolished and federal subsidies allowed cities to sell such property to developers at a fraction of their cost. “The developers then built businesses, educational and cultural institutions, and residences for middle- and upper-income people” (Fullilove 2000:58). This pattern unfolded across urban landscapes in the U.S. during the 24 years that followed the Housing Act of 1949. As is recounted above, Tampa embraced this program with blight identification being followed by land procurement and demolition of its primary low income African American neighborhoods. This action taken by the City of Tampa is directly tied to the interplay between race, place, and power in this urban context. The choice to implement this strategy aligns the position of the City of Tampa with what some might equate to a racist ideology dictating who’s history is important, what people are significant, and what enduring elements of the landscape should represent these people (if any).

Material cultural objects and physical spaces represent static symbols serving as cultural markers. These cultural markers do not embody culture itself (a dynamic process) rather they act as symbolic points of reference (spaces) that signify material representations of cultural behavior. These spaces are sometimes employed as references indicative of a specific cultural group and a particular temporal period. When referring to the representation of places or “space” Kahn (1996) asserts that “They represent people, their actions, and their interactions and a such become malleable memorials for negotiating and renegotiating human relationships” (Kahn 1996:168). Urban Renewal in Tampa in between the 1950’s and the 1970's led to the demolition of multitudes of spaces formally associated with African Americans during times of segregation. In Tampa, Florida, historic buildings and the material evidence (artifacts and features)
discovered in Perry Harvey Park are material symbols of cultural history that add continuity to Tampa’s African American heritage (Weisman et al. 2004). Therefore, physical spaces associated with the historic African American Central Avenue district in Tampa potentially impacted by contemporary construction projects should be designated as historic and prioritized as significant components of African American Heritage (i.e. they should be preserved for future generations). The City of Tampa has an obligation to be as thorough and inclusive as possible when generating lists of historically significant properties that should be protected from current “redevelopment” plans.

To engage this process, I worked for nearly four years to document and demonstrate the significance of Meacham Elementary to the City of Tampa, Hillsborough County, the State of Florida, and the Federal Government. It was hoped that the City would add Meacham Elementary to this list prior to it being impacted by contemporary redevelopment efforts. However, despite efforts aimed at affecting its future culminating in the addition of this school to the National Register of Historic Places this study demonstrates that since the school has purposefully not been included in the future redevelopment plans of this area it will eventually fall victim to demolition (the struggle to affect the historic status and to preserve the school is recounted in chapter four). The justification for its demolition (redevelopment in the name of monetary gain) is consistent with explanations touted by urban planners who (starting in the 1950’s) have systematically demolished the vast majority of urban spaces historically occupied by African Americans in Tampa.
Gentrification and Urban Change

While the process is complicated and variable, gentrification is more often aligned with private investment than is urban renewal or contemporary large scale urban plans calling for comprehensive demolitions. More often, gentrification includes the renovation of deteriorated properties in low-income urban contexts. In certain urban contexts these processes overlap, however, when considering their cumulative effects it is important not to generalize to all urban landscapes where they have occurred; a localized contextual approach is more appropriate because it more accurately accounts for local manifestations of these processes.

Contemporary accounts of gentrification in anthropological literature (Lees 2000, Smith and Graves 2000, Perez 2000, Prince 2002, Paris 2001) prioritize interrogating the process of gentrification in local spatial and temporal contexts (such as communities) rather than focusing on “global” cities. Smith and Graves (2000) investigate gentrification as a strategy for corporate growth in Charlotte, North Carolina and suggest that in this context monetary gain was prioritized over cultural heritage. Consistent with the notion that monetary value has the potential to displace heritage value, Perez (2000) asserts that “People may, for instance, create supportive, place-based networks with neighbors, small business owners, schools, and other institutions that both provide material sustenance and engender emotional and sentimental attachments to a particular place. On the other hand, places generate capital; and like other commodities, they can be deliberately packaged and sold in order to maximize financial return. This pursuit of greater exchange value often conflicts with the use value of places;” (Perez 2000:37). Therefore, the process of gentrification (a process prioritizing financial return) has the
potential to highlight the tension between these two types of value (heritage value vs monetary value). Perez (2000) demonstrates that processes of urban change such as gentrification (even in the absence of demolition) has the potential to effect cultural heritage because of its effect on people’s ability to “use” the spaces historically associated with their culture. The processes of urban renewal, gentrification, and the de-institutionalization of segregation in Tampa’s Historic Central Avenue community motivated many of the upper class residents of the area to move elsewhere and left those who chose to stay (or could not afford to leave) with few resources to perpetuate their community.

Consequently, it is not a surprise to note that the properties that endured the processes of urban renewal and gentrification in Tampa represent structures that provided social services to the community and would not compete with the business interests of white investors in the area. Therefore, it is not a coincidence that buildings that provide social services such as the neighborhood community center, churches, and the neighborhood school is virtually all that is left of this community. Is it possible that they survived because they were not viewed as potential threats to the productivity of white business investments designed to replace those that catered to “segregated” community members? By eliminating the vast majority of African American owned businesses, blacks were forced to benefit white owned businesses. Perhaps this is just a coincidental byproduct of urban renewal policy or perhaps not (this would make an excellent research question for a future study). If purposeful elimination of potential competition represents an insidious component of the justification behind urban renewal policy why then would a school like Meacham Elementary be intentionally overlooked by the County Planning
Commission? One potential explanation is the relative location of the school and its geographic location within the overall area being “redeveloped” (the school is virtually in the center). Rather than having a contiguous parcel of land that could be “redeveloped”, if the school were preserved it would serve as an obstacle that developers would have to work around. Despite the fact that the school is recognized by the federal government as a National Register site symbolizing African American cultural heritage, to a developer focused on profit it may represent nothing more than an obstacle to work around affecting profit margins. I assert that the current redevelopment plan is a contemporary manifestation of the historical application of urban renewal policy in Tampa. Elements identified in previous and contemporary redevelopment plans in Tampa have included strategies designed to increase the City’s tax base and economic potential. Plans have consistently called for demolishing “blighted” or “substandard” structures and then rebuilding contemporary structures that yield more tax return. Further, these demolitions represent a racist ideology because they disproportionately affect urban landscapes historically associated with African American history; they serve to consolidate business districts to maximize revenue potential and are complemented by direct Interstate access.

Despite the urban focus of this study, this research takes cognizance of the fact that places associated with African American cultural heritage in rural contexts should not be overlooked. Green (1991) points to the significance of space as a marker of African American social identity set in historical context in a rural community in Georgia. Likewise, Guthrie (1996:1) points to the importance of space as emblematic of rural African American identity. Her investigation of African American history on the Sea Islands off the coasts of Georgia and South Carolina demonstrate that “The area and
its people are especially important to African Americans because we find in this sacred place physical, emotional, and spiritual roots of our present-day existence” (Guthrie 1996:1). These examples demonstrate that space can be aligned with representation and identity in a variety of contexts (large urban centers as well as rural communities) and that we should not turn a blind eye to the historical and cultural significance of physical space. However, community recognition of symbolic space is not enough; steps must be taken to preserve those spaces. If material evidence such as buildings or subsurface deposits (archaeological evidence) symbolizing cultural heritage are to persist as components of the cultural landscape the preservation of that landscape should not be disregarded.

*Cultural Heritage and Historic Designation*

In the U.S. physical space designated as “historic” by a government entity is recognized as such at the local, state, and or federal level. Overlap exists between these recognitions and they offer differing levels of protection for the historic sites they identify as significant. My experience drawn from this research demonstrates that federal and state recognition of historic sites is largely honorary. The intent of these designations is preservation; however, they do not provide direct avenues to secure the preservation of historic places. Federal recognition does go so far as to offer conditional grants for rehabilitation and tax breaks for recognized historic places. Local designations are usually more than honorary titles; they typically go further in protecting historic sites and may go so far as to protect them from future demolition. Addressing the intent behind designation of historical sites in the U.S., Coulson and Leichenko (2004) suggest that “Historical designation is a device that bestows recognition on particular properties
because of their importance, in some great or small way, to the history of the city or region in which they are located. While historical designation takes place at the local, state and national levels, the putative goal in all cases is the preservation of properties with historical and/or aesthetic appeal that would otherwise be neglected or even demolished” (Coulson and Leichenko 2004:1587). Therefore, despite the varying levels of protection they offer (equating to variable treatment of designated properties), historic designation from a government entity in the U.S. shares the common goal of preservation.

Criteria utilized to categorize sites as significant and justify recognition via historic designation are somewhat consistent within this hierarchy. Designation forms typically have statements intended to clarify standards for acceptance. The National Register of Historic Places criteria for evaluation states:

1) Districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects may be considered to have significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and/or culture if they possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:
   a) are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; and/or
   b) are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; and/or
   c) embody the distinctive characteristics of type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; and/or
   d) have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (http://www.dnr.mo.gov/shpo/national.htm#CRITERIA%20FOR%20EVALUATION).

For a property to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (and the vast majority of local nominations including Tampa) it must demonstrate integrity as clarified in the above statement and it must also meet at least one of the criteria listed above (a, b, c, or d). For example, the historical association with Tampa’s African
American community (social history) and architectural integrity justified Meacham Elementary as a National Register site under criteria a. Likewise the historical context of this school aligned this structure with African American (black) ethnic heritage and education. Historical context is a generic term utilized by these forms to account for historical and cultural variation. For example, the National Register of Historic Places bulletin number fifteen under the subheading “How to Evaluate a Property Within Its Historic Context” (http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb15/) clarifies:

Identify what the property represents: the theme(s), geographical limits, and chronological period that provide a perspective from which to evaluate the property’s significance…A theme is a means of organizing properties into coherent patterns based on elements such as environment, social/ethnic groups, transportation networks, technology, or political developments that have influenced the development of an area during one or more periods of prehistory or history. A theme is considered significant if it can be demonstrated, through scholarly research, to be important in American history (http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb15/).

Therefore, these themes are utilized to classify National Register sites into categories based on historical context. The category of themes most thoroughly evaluated by this study included those clarifying ethnic heritage. Table 1 (see below) illustrates the categories (including ethnic categories) utilized to clarify a property’s “area of significance” as a National Register of Historic Places site.
Table 1. National Register of Historic Places Areas of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Recreation/Entertainment</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Ethnic Heritage: Asian, Black, European, Hispanic, Native American, Pacific Islander, Other</td>
<td>Maritime History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology: Prehistoric, Historic-Aboriginal Historic-non-Aboriginal</td>
<td>Exploration/Settlement</td>
<td>Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Health/Medicine</td>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Invention</td>
<td>Politics/Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Planning and Development</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>Social History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These areas of significance represent the criteria used to justify inclusion into the national register and narrative descriptions are required to substantiate this categorization. The state historical structure form for the State of Florida classifies sites according to historical significance based on this criteria established by the National Register (http://www.flheritage.com/preservation/sitefile/forms/FORM_SS_V40.doc). However, this state form does not require a narrative description justifying this classification.
Therefore, an ethnic group’s historic association with a site designated by a state form in Florida may be overlooked or misrepresented. Likewise, the local nomination forms for the City of Tampa are designed to consider ethnicity as a potential area of significance with no required narrative to substantiate this classification. In City’s such as Tampa classifying ethnicity may be challenging. For example, Greenbaum (2002) points out that Tampa is a multi-ethnic place with a Cuban, Spanish, and Italian presence. Her research clarified that Cubans in Tampa are divided by race (a phenomenon easily overlooked by historic designation forms). Therefore, ethnicity as a means of classifying the association of historic sites or districts should be more accurately accounted for by state and local historic designation forms. Likewise, when appropriate, multiple ethnicities should be associated with single designations. Ethnic affiliation should be clarified by more than checking a box on a designation form. The amount of documentation utilized to make this determination is sometimes arbitrary; there is not a set standard for making this assertion. This designation has the potential to be ambiguous and inaccurate and protocol should be standardized to more accurately account for cultural affiliation.

The nominations for local districts in Tampa demonstrate the potential pitfalls associated with not accounting for ethnic variation. For example, locally designated historic districts in Tampa such as the Hyde Park district do not account for the African American presence in Dobyville which was a historic component of this urban community (see narrative summaries of historic districts in Tampa provided by Appendix 1). This oversight points to the fact that the designation form classifying the historical significance of this district is incomplete. This example, points to the significance of my
research indicating a relative lack of historic symbolic representation of African American cultural heritage in Tampa. Future research might prioritize revising current local historic district narratives to account for multiple ethnicities in single districts. Summary descriptions from designation forms for Tampa’s local historic districts are listed in Appendix C. District nominations typically establish broad patterns in architecture and cultural heritage and often leave out elements that do not conform specifically to these patterns (such as non-contributing structures). For example, the West Tampa district mentions working class minorities without any reference to who these people are.

Experience drawn from this research has demonstrated that knowledge preservation of cultural heritage in the absence of physical preservation has the potential to demonstrate its significance to contemporary and future members of society. After learning that Meacham Elementary was not to be preserved as a standing structure (details forthcoming) I searched for a positive result of my efforts focused on preserving the school. This led me to the recognition that it is possible to preserve knowledge (i.e. data) without preserving its place of origin. I have slowly come to realize that the archival documentation of Meacham Elementary cannot be affected by its demolition (this is not to suggest that documentation should supplant preservation). Therefore, the meticulous historical and architectural account of the school I organized for the National Register nomination form will serve as a resource that will symbolize this school’s place in history. Likewise, the results of mitigation have ensured that the school will be represented in the history of Tampa at the local, state, and federal levels. Ultimately, this study demonstrates that data such as material evidence generated by anthropological
research or representative historical documentation can symbolize physical spaces (when they are no longer standing) and it is better to have valid representative data than to have nothing at all.

While the recognition of historically significant sites by the federal government is based on the same set of criteria across the country, differing criteria for recognition and treatment of “historic” sites exists between states, counties, and cities. Therefore, a ranking system exists for symbols of cultural heritage. This system manifests as the historic designation process unfolds. Designated properties are ranked as significant and those that are overlooked may be demolished without consideration. This points to the significance of my research highlighting the impact of designation on the representation of cultural heritage.

Many U.S. counties and cities (especially those of small or moderate size) lack significant historic preservation legislation and instead rely on federal standards to designate local historically significant spaces. Since it is local preservation legislation that has the most tangible effect on historic spaces, this situation increases the chances that historic recognition will serve as an honorary title ensuring knowledge preservation rather than offering substantive physical protection. This inconsistency in preservation standards is compounded by a lack of consistency at the local level when legislation does exist. Bronson and Jester (1997:6) suggest “At the local level, the definition of the built heritage of the recent past varies from state to state and municipality to municipality…” (1997:6). Variation in standards for recognition and treatment of places symbolizing cultural heritage does little to clarify the future of significant historic places potentially impacted by contemporary landscape alteration. Consistency might better serve the
intent of historic preservation legislation which is recognition accompanied by preservation.

*Historic Designation versus Historic Preservation: The Tampa Case Study*

A primary goal of this analysis is to prioritize the significance of physical preservation as a variable measuring the effectiveness of “historic” designations as a vehicle for the preservation of recognized historic African American cultural heritage spaces in the City of Tampa, Florida. African Americans received attention as an ethnic group due to the historic processes associated with this context (such as Urban Renewal and educational segregation). Research indicates that this is the principal ethnic group in Tampa that has been disproportionately impacted by urban change. Historic African American communities are a component of many urban U.S. contexts and they have broadly similar historical and contemporary experiences. Afro-Cubans may be specific to Tampa’s history (Greenbaum 2002), but African Americans are not. Future statewide or regional comparisons in the U.S. could serve to elucidate which cities had nineteenth century ethnic enclaves thereby clarifying potentially productive contexts for the application of UMAP.

This study investigates whether the practice of historic preservation might be shaped by some of the same forces that impact the “narratives” that make up written history. Might the power structure of a given cultural context affect what is designated as historically significant and or what is preserved? Likewise, if this power structure varies according to ethnicity, might racial difference account for some of this variation? This analysis of preservation represents the first time racial difference has been prioritized as a variable to measure preservation equity in Tampa and in the State of Florida. This initial
research evaluating preservation equity will be carried out in this context by searching for patterns related to how sites were designated (locally and or nationally) across racially demarcated lines both within Tampa and in the State of Florida. This evaluation sought to provide a basis of comparison for representation between ethnic groups in Florida while investigating the recognition and treatment of cultural heritage sites by the City of Tampa. The research was carried out by investigating all designated local and national/federal “historic” sites in the City of Tampa and all structures recognized as the State of Florida as historic. This included extensive archival research investigating historic designations conducted at city, state, and federal levels. Therefore, tertiary sources documenting the practice of historic designation of culturally significant places were prioritized. These include: 1) local historic landmark designation forms 2) state historic structure forms and 3) National Register of Historic Places designation forms for National Register sites (federally recognized historic places).

Since ethnic affiliation was prioritized in this study as a variable in the recognition of historic sites representing cultural heritage and this had never been done before at the local or state level in Florida, I made some interesting discoveries related to available documentary evidence. While conducting this research I discovered that the quality and quantity of information included on the designation forms (especially the ones for the City of Tampa) varied greatly. While surveying the names of the authors of designation forms, I learned that some forms were completed by trained professionals (such as Architectural Historians) while others were completed by individuals with less training. While researching records detailing each designated “historic” local landmark in Tampa, I found that regardless of who filled out the forms, they were often incomplete.
(a realization that complicated my efforts). Keeping consistent records (and revising current records that are incomplete) would vastly improve this source of data. One example of a consistent omission was particularly aggravating. Specifically, City of Tampa designation forms provide a space to indicate “cultural affiliation” with historic places and this section of the form is often left blank. During one of my visits to Tampa (personal correspondence: July 2006) to collect data, a worker in the Tampa Preservation office told me in no uncertain terms that I was wasting my time because “Cultural Affiliation is not what we are about, we are interested in architecture”. I was inclined to ask why her department’s form had a space for documenting “cultural affiliation”, however I chose to continue my research and not be swayed by her lack of familiarity with the forms that justify her office’s existence (local landmark designation forms). This lack of awareness served as personal motivation and further highlights the significance of this analysis. Since cultural affiliation had never been prioritized by the City of Tampa’s preservation entity (or any published social science researcher) it was necessary to review all available data and uncover documentary evidence that may have affiliated ethnic groups with historic places. This search for relevant data pertaining to local historic designations required me to travel to Tampa and spend several weeks researching and making copies of Tampa Historic Designation forms housed in the Tampa Preservation office in downtown Tampa (the originals are not available electronically). This research identified key variables representing common elements of historic descriptions in this context and facilitated the development of a comprehensive listing of Tampa’s local historic landmarks (findings related to the investigation of this list are summarized in the conclusion).
At the state level, I was surprised to learn that the database listing historic structures did not account for cultural affiliation as a variable that could be used as a basis of comparison between cultural groups. At my request, the state entity responsible for maintaining this listing (the Florida Master Site File) reorganized their dataset and for the first time their listing accounted for cultural affiliation of historic structures. Therefore, one initial result of my research is that statewide data can now be evaluated by researchers prioritizing cultural affiliation as a component of state recognized historic structures in Florida. Research prioritizing nationally recognized historic sites (National Register sites) within the City of Tampa led me to the Florida Division of Historical Resources (the state entity that houses National Register designation forms and reviews potential new listings for the federal government). Following an interview with Dawn Creamer (Administrative Assistant II, Florida Master Site File), I arranged to have designation forms for all National Register sites in Tampa shipped to me from Tallahassee electronically. This facilitated research investigating cultural affiliation for these historic sites. I discovered that several pages into the designation forms there is a space for indicating affiliation either with cultural groups, individuals, or both. I was then able to evaluate these forms according to cultural affiliation (when indicated). This assessment is also discussed in the conclusion of this chapter. During the course of this phase of my research I also conducted informal interviews with the president of the City of Tampa preservation office and with the deputy State Historic Preservation Officer for Historic Preservation in Florida (the federal government’s representative in the State of Florida regarding historic preservation practice). Therefore, during the course of this investigation I conducted research at each of the levels of the preservation hierarchy in
the U.S. and gained valuable insight into accessing available archival resources. For example, data related to local historic designations in Tampa were collected from Tampa’s downtown preservation office, information pertaining to state historic structures was obtained from the Florida Master Site File in Tallahassee, Florida, and National Register data was compiled from the Division of Historical Resources (also in Tallahassee). The results of this groundbreaking research are summarized in the forthcoming conclusion of this chapter.

Evolving Urban Landscapes Considered

Tampa has expanded its recognition of African American cultural sites in light of this latest wave of demolition (what some might describe as Urban Renewal in the twenty first century) and has recently created a list designed to protect symbols of African American culture in the historic Tampa neighborhood discussed in chapters one and two. The Tampa African American multiple-properties listing (expanded significantly in 2005) described below serves as recognition of the historic significance of a group of properties to the Historic African American Central Avenue community that emerged in the nineteenth century within the City of Tampa. Economic opportunities emerged for business owners aided by federal policy which deprived the black community in Tampa of its infrastructure (medical services, social services and businesses that traditionally catered only to people in the segregated community). As contemporary researchers we cannot change the course of history. However, when confronted with dynamic urban landscapes that retain subtle historical associations with cultural behavior we have the opportunity and the obligation to clarify the cultural association of enduring elements of
historical data such as places and the material evidence they contain representing African American cultural heritage.

In 2005, the City of Tampa expanded the Multiple Properties Listing for African American historical sites representing historically significant sites associated with African Americans in Tampa. The intent of this preemptive strategy is to recognize and prevent the demolition of significant symbols of this Historic African American community before they fall victim to imminent “redevelopment” of the entire community. Currently, this list includes ten enduring structures in the vicinity of this neighborhood of historic significance. The City of Tampa Historic Preservation Commission’s narrative summary of this multiple properties list states that these buildings:

rank among the few remaining structures that represent an enclave that formed among the African-American community, starting as early as prior to the turn of the century. Racial segregation, in turn, included social, economic, and religious segregation and the Black community in Tampa responded by creating a complete, separate social structure within the framework of the City of Tampa. The Central Avenue Business District was the heartbeat of the Black community and provided all services needed for daily life to a restricted audience. It was razed by Urban Renewal in the 1970’s. The surviving buildings proposed for nomination, all built in brick delineating their importance and success through permanence in material and style, represent significant community structures that served as touchstones to the cohesive community that formed around the Central Avenue area (City of Tampa Historic Preservation Commission, Continuation Sheet Local Historic Property Multiple Properties List 2005: section E, page 1).

This modified listing of significant symbols of the historic Central Avenue community was established in 2005 and since its inception this group has grown from four to twelve structures. The timing of this expansion is probably not arbitrary. Rather, it is likely a result of comprehensive, calculated plans to demolish the vast majority of structures that persist across this urban landscape. The period of historic significance for this multiple-
properties listing is 1912-1948. All of these buildings are either schools or churches pointing to the social significance of these types of buildings as “spaces” utilized by African Americans within this segregated community. It is significant to note that the only building demonstrating characteristics consistent with these criteria that has been left off of this list is Meacham Elementary (1225 India Street). Furthermore, expansion of this list is likely the result of the threatened status of all structures within the current footprint of the “Central Park Community Redevelopment Area Plan” (WilsonMiller, Inc. and The Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission 2005). Consistent with the process of urban renewal in Tampa in decades past, this plan calls for demolition of structures not incorporated into the future of this “new” landscape. Therefore, even though this list has been expanded recently it has failed to recognize the historic status of Meacham Elementary which is Tampa’s oldest and only enduring historic public African American school. This “oversight” is significant to the future representation of African American history in Tampa because this redevelopment plan will have a dramatic impact on the cultural landscape of the Historic Central Avenue community and will lead to the demolition of virtually all structures not identified in the plan as “locally significant” by the City of Tampa Historic Preservation Commission.

The twelve properties currently recognized by the City of Tampa as components of the Historic Central Avenue multiple properties group include: 1) Dr. White SR. House 2) Ebenezer Missionary Baptist Church 3) Issac Gardner SR. House 4) Jackson House 5) Kid Mason Center 6) Longshoreman’s Hall 7) St. James Episcopal Church 8) St. Paul A.M.E. Church 9) St. Peter Claver School 10) The Greater Mount Moriah Primitive Baptist Church 11) The Greater Bethel Baptist Church 12) Paradise Missionary
Baptist Church. Based on first-hand observation of the properties in this community, I am of the opinion that this list is generally comprehensive and inclusive of historically significant structures that survived urban renewal in this neighborhood. However, Meacham Elementary should be included in this list. This school has been recognized by the federal government as historically significant to the cultural heritage of African Americans in Tampa but has been overlooked by the City of Tampa. This structure is listed on the National Register of Historic Places as an individual building and as a contributing structure to Florida’s Historic Black Public Schools Multiple Properties List. The local preservation staff are intimately familiar with the history and threatened status of this school. In spite of this, it is not included in the local African American multiple properties group and is NOT designated by the city of Tampa as a “local” landmark. If this school falls victim to demolition the City of Tampa, Hillsborough County Schools, the County Planning Commission, and the Tampa Housing Authority cannot claim ignorance. I have personally interacted with representatives of each of these entities and they are aware of Meacham Elementary’s historic status and significance (the details of this interaction are summarized in chapter 4 of this study).

The omission of Meacham Elementary is disturbing due to the proximity of the school to other recognized landmarks and its central location in the community. Likewise the characteristics of the school are consistent with the other properties on the list. For example, the function of this structure (i.e. a school constructed to cater to African Americans during times of segregation), the building material used (brick), and its construction date (1926) are consistent with other properties designated by this list. This omission is the most significant discovery of the current research regarding
“historic” structures at the local level. First hand interaction with key officials such as
the current Deputy SHIPO (state historic preservation officer) and the current and
previous Chief Financial Officers for Hillsborough County Schools has demonstrated that
this oversight is not consistent with federal protocol addressing potential effects of
construction on National Register sites (such as Meacham Elementary). Specifically, the
Deputy SHIPO informed me that the Compliance and Review section of the Division of
Historical Resources should have the opportunity to review the proposed redevelopment
plan prior to it being accepted and finalized by the City of Tampa or Hillsborough
County. This office, upon review of the threatened status of this National Register Site
has recommended that Meacham Elementary be added to Tampa’s Local Landmarks and
should be preserved.

An interview on August 2, 2006 with the current Chief Financial Officer of
Hillsborough County Schools (Cathy Valdez) indicated that they were doing their best to
sell the school and “make it someone else’s problem”. Evidently, Hillsborough County
Schools is not motivated to, or does not have the financial ability to, preserve this
valuable symbol of African American cultural heritage. They are desperate to liquidate
this “monetary asset”, sneak away with the dirty money, and wash their hands of
historical responsibility. Rather than recognizing the significance of this structure the
way the federal government has, they are doing their best to sell the property for profit
thereby abandoning the historic significance of this public holding. This example
demonstrates that the disconnect between the intent of historic designation and the
practice of historic preservation (and associated funding) can complicate the
contemporary representation of cultural heritage in urban space.
Considering the dimensions of the Historic African American Central Avenue community (less than one square mile), in light of the fact that relatively few structures that survived demolitions justified by urban renewal policy in the 1970’s, and because the majority of residences in the community are public housing units (constructed atop the landscape historically affiliated with African Americans in Tampa), the designation and preservation of properties in this community appears equitable across racial lines. If more homes and businesses had survived Urban Renewal, there would be more properties to consider. Certainly, if urban renewal demolitions had been proportional across racial lines in Tampa, there would be fewer historic properties that historically were associated with non-black communities.

_Urban Change and Historical Representation Considered_

Archival research at the local, state, and federal level detailing specifics related to historic cultural heritage sites is summarized in Appendices B-E. These tables were generated after analyzing designation reports; therefore, they represent summaries of the tertiary data (well over a thousand pages) designed to augment future research initiatives. The current analysis of the equity of historical designation in Tampa demonstrates that places recognized by the local government as “historic” associated with African American Heritage in the vicinity of Tampa’s Historic Central Avenue community (established in the 1880’s) are rare. Only a few structures associated historically with African Americans in Tampa have been designated as historic by the City of Tampa. For example, as of October 2006, only 6 out of 55 local historic landmarks were located in the historic Central Avenue African American enclave in Tampa.
Appendix B provides a table providing summary descriptions of Tampa’s Local Historic Landmarks. Variables describing these landmarks were established to facilitate an evaluation of commonalities and differences between landmarks as well as highlighting unique components of each. The current research laid the groundwork for making comparisons between individual landmarks and for evaluating trends present in the conglomerate. Available documentary evidence established variables representing these landmarks. These variables include: landmark name, address, date of construction, designation criteria (justification for historic status), landmark use (residential, commercial, public, religious, public education, public transportation, social club), historic affiliation/significance (individual, ethnicity/cultural), owner of landmark, and National Register status (is the local landmark also a National Register site?). Analysis of this data indicates that 22 out of 56 local landmarks (including those with pending status) are federally recognized historic landmarks (National Register sites). This study of Tampa local historic landmarks currently represents the most comprehensive analysis of this dataset. This analysis adds to the contemporary understanding of these landmarks representing cultural heritage because of the prioritization of cultural/ethnic affiliation associated with these sites. Also, descriptive elements of landmarks were consolidated for comprehensive analysis and local and federal designations of recognized historic landmarks in Tampa were synthesized as a single group for analysis.

The discrepancy in representation of African American cultural heritage sites is mirrored at the state level. For example, as of January 2007, 1,179 (less than 1%) out of 132,978 buildings designated as “historic” by the State of Florida are represented as having an association with African American Cultural Heritage. This contrasts with the
representative population of the State. For example, according to the 2000 census (U.S. Census Bureau 2000: http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?bm=y&-geo id=04000US12&-qr name=DEC 2000 SF1 U DP1&-ds name=DEC 2000 SF1 U) for individuals claiming affiliation with one race (97.6% of the total population), 78% (12,465,029) claimed to be White and 14.6% (2,335,505) claimed to be Black or African American. Likewise, this discrepancy between population and representative sites designated as historic exists within Tampa. According to the 2000 census (U.S. Census Bureau 2000: http://www.uflib.ufl.edu/fefdl/Cities.pdf/Tampa%20city.pdf) for individuals who claimed affiliation with one race (97.1% of the total population), 64.2% claimed to be White (194,871) and 26.1% (79,118) claimed to be Black or African American. For Tampa, population was considered a representative measure of equity due to the relative stability of the black and white populations over time (Howard et al. 2, Mohlman 1995:79). This comparison might not be valid for urban contexts witnessing dramatic ethnic population fluctuations through time. For example, we should not expect to see representative historical sites for newly established ethnic communities. Population as a measure of equity should be carefully scrutinized; when utilized as a variable accounting for difference in historic preservation practice, historic populations associated with historic designations should be the focus of the comparison rather than contemporary populations (unless they are consistent with historic trends; as was the case with Tampa).

As of January 2007, 1 out of 41 National Register of Historic Places site designation forms affiliated a federally recognized historic site with African American cultural heritage in Tampa. The lone representative listed by the National Register of
Historic Places is Meacham Elementary (to be discussed in the conclusion of this chapter and in chapter four). This assessment clearly indicates a lack of preservation equity at the local, state, and federal level. For example, 2% of National Register of Historic Places sites (compared to a 26% representative population) in Tampa are affiliated with African American cultural heritage, less than 1% of the historic structures listed by the State of Florida (compared with a 14.6% representative population) are affiliated with African American cultural heritage, and at the local level 11% of the City of Tampa’s historic places (compared to 26% representative population) have this affiliation. As has been mentioned in this chapter a variety of local factors (such as preservation legislation and consistent criteria) and the process of urban renewal and its residual affects potentially impact the public designation of historic properties.

Researching available state data yielded 2,942 state historic structures with ethnic affiliations recorded on historic structure designation forms. This assessment represents the first contemporary analysis of statewide ethnically affiliated historic structures. These state historic sites represent a sample of the 132,978 historic structures currently recognized by the State of Florida. According to the Florida Division of Historical Resources (Phone Conversation: Dawn Creamer 2006). Since this sample includes all historic structures in the state recognized as having “ethnic” affiliation, evidently the other 128,000 + structures lack an ethnic identity (see Table 2 below). The Florida codes for ethnic affiliation on designation forms are: abor (Aboriginal American Heritage), BLAC (African American Heritage), CUBA (Cuban Heritage), JEWH (Jewish Heritage), ETHN (Indicates non-specified “ethnic” designation).
Table 2. Ethnic Affiliation as Indicated on Florida State Historical Structure Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ABOR</th>
<th>BLAC</th>
<th>CUBA</th>
<th>JEWH</th>
<th>ETHN</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1569</td>
<td>2942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When considering physical space and historic affiliation of local and nationally recognized historic districts in Tampa, acreage and the time period of historic significance of those districts serves as an indicator that might provide insight into racial equity and historic status. All periods of historic significance associated with all historic districts in Tampa (local and national) correspond to times of institutionalized segregation in the U.S. Therefore, none of these districts are documented as being representative of African American heritage. The public spaces and institutions that typified these areas did not cater to African Americans (however they did work in many of these facilities). In addition to time serving as an indicator of a lack of racial equity and “historic” space, the acreage of non-black historic districts demonstrates how profound this lack of equity is in Tampa. For example, the African American multiple properties listing (a group of structures classified as historic, but not designated as a district) represents about 1 acre of space in the City of Tampa. The non-black local districts include over 2,000 acres of physical space. This demonstrates that less than 1% of the historic space recognized as historically significant to the City of Tampa is affiliated with African American heritage who in 2000 made up 26% of the population of the City: this does not represent racial equity.

This study represents a unique approach to the analysis of material symbols of culture because it prioritizes a critical approach aimed at investigating the process of Urban Renewal and its residual affects on equitable representation of potentially
significant historic places. Further, this analysis contrasted historic Urban Renewal
trends with contemporary “revitalization” efforts and clearly indicates the perpetuation of
the connection between economic benefit and the planned modification of urban
landscapes. This research indicates that urban planning designed to complement
economic growth has an impact on historic designation and preservation which in Tampa
affects the recognition and status of significant symbols of African American cultural
heritage. The same ideology that underlined segregation in the U.S. pointing to urban
manifestations of race, power, and place, is represented by historical Urban Renewal
policy and contemporary redevelopment plans and historic preservation policies.

The City of Tampa provides a case study investigating preservation practices
across racial lines taking cognizance of the significance of evolving urban landscapes and
the potential effect this change can have on representative cultural heritage. Since
historic places represent material evidence it follows that historic symbols representing
African American cultural heritage have the potential to manifest as standing structures
(buildings) or subsurface deposits (artifacts and features) both of which can and should
complement archival documentation and other relevant data.
Chapter Four: Taking a Stand…Prioritizing Meacham Elementary through Practice: Anthropological Advocacy, Action Research, and Historic Designation

*Anthropological Advocacy and Ethics*

This chapter analyzes and clarifies anthropological practice associated with collaborative research applied toward the preservation of Meacham Elementary. As a measure to curb potential bias affecting research, the discipline of anthropology prioritizes objectivity. However, when practice becomes intertwined with an agenda an anthropologist must decide whether or not to knowingly take a side and apply their research toward engaging an issue from an opinionated perspective. If ethical standards are not objective, and they affect the practice of anthropology, then it follows that data resulting from objective research designs have the potential to serve an agenda aligned with ethical practice. Therefore, it is feasible for an anthropologist to justify advocacy as an action consistent with ethical practice. Anthropologists have long asserted that an anthropologist’s primary allegiance should be to groups under study. For nearly four decades this priority has been reflected in the ethical code outlined by the most representative cohort of professional anthropologists in North America (Fluehr-Loban 2003:xii). For example, in 1971 this ethical policy was explicitly stated by the American Anthropological Association (AAA) in its published Statement of Professional Responsibility (2006:www.aaanet.org/committee/ethicsethcode.htm). One portion of this statement addressed an anthropologist’s ethical responsibility to groups potentially
affected by research as a primary component of ethical practice. The AAA statement states “In research the anthropologist’s paramount responsibility is to those he studies.

Figure 5. Aerial Image Depicting Meacham Elementary and Perry Harvey Park Indicating Locations Relative to Interstate 275, Tampa’s Downtown Business District, and Ybor City.
When there is a conflict of interest, these individuals must come first” (Fluehr-Lobban 2003:12). Despite the passing of decades and a series of revisions to these professional ethical standards, this feature of anthropological ethics has persisted and continues to set the standard for the ethical practice of anthropology. Fluehr-Lobban (2003:12) explains:

This fundamental responsibility to the people studied at once reflected the humanistic essence of the discipline, and as a core principle it guided anthropologist’s actions. The strength of this core principle was shown by the fact that it was left virtually intact (changing paramount to first) in the 1990 revised Principles of Professional Responsibility. Then, in 1998, it was modified to ‘primary ethical obligation’ and expanded to include animals and materials as well as people in the 1998 code.

This statement clarifies what anthropologists should do (prioritize groups under study when a conflict of interest arises) however it fails to explicitly define how to achieve this goal.

Halstrup and Elsass (1990) argued that ethical responsibilities such as whether or not to assume the role of an advocate manifest as components of research context. It follows that the methods of maintaining ethical responsibility vary between projects and among researchers; however, there are two trends in anthropological practice that reflect adherence to this ethical policy. One method is to discontinue research if one is made aware of a conflict of interest involving their research and its potential effect on a group under study. Another method applied toward maintaining the ethical prioritization of groups under study is anthropological advocacy. Fluehr-Lobban (2003) suggested that advocacy is an individual choice for anthropological researchers rather than a professional responsibility (2003:240). Halstrup and Elsass (1990) also asserted that advocacy is not a formal component of the discipline of anthropology. These researchers assert that anthropological data might be applied to particular contexts rationalized by
individual morality and that this morality is distinct from the discipline (1990:301). However, it is clear that this ethical decision is dictated by the ethical standards for practice that have persisted for decades. Therefore, it follows that advocacy as an application of anthropological knowledge represents applied anthropology grounded in ethical responsibility defined by the professional standards of the discipline.

The ethical decision to advocate for a group under study when a conflict of interest arises has been addressed by a host of anthropological researchers (e.g. Cook 2003:192; D’Andrrade, R. 1995; Davis 2003; Henriksen 2003; Ramos 2003). This decision is collectively viewed as one that must be made by individual anthropologists as potential conflicts of interest arise within specific research contexts. Halstrup and Elsass (1990) propose that “…the lesson of anthropological involvement in a multivocal discourse is ultimately moral” (1990:308). The morality of anthropological researchers is grounded in and shaped by ethical standards established and perpetuated by the discipline of anthropology. Therefore despite the fact that anthropological data cannot speak for itself and even though ethical decisions are made by individuals, ultimately their actions are supported by the ethical code of the discipline as a whole.

Consistent with the ethical practice of anthropology, when anthropologists take action to benefit groups impacted by their research, they move beyond making recommendations and choose to take action as applied anthropologists which may lead to advocacy (as in the case of my research agenda involving Meacham Elementary). A byproduct of my research (a phone call that will be clarified in the narrative sections of this chapter) motivated me to make a choice as to whether I was willing to take a side and apply my research toward aiding a cause and serve as an advocate or discontinue my
research. Therefore, the decision to advocate for the preservation of Meacham Elementary was a moral decision that I pursued because I considered this action to be consistent with the ethical standards of anthropological practice.

*Advocacy and Action Oriented Anthropological Practice*

The application of social science data to the engagement of real world problems (i.e. taking action as a social scientist) has been employed by researchers from a variety of social science disciplines (such as sociology, psychology, health, education, and agriculture) and is broadly categorized as action-oriented research. Social scientists from a variety of disciplines have pursued contemporary applications of action-oriented research and these applications are variable and contextual. My advocacy work aligned with the historic designation of Meacham Elementary (with the intent of preservation) represents action oriented research. Multiple elements of this approach are consistent with my research agenda. For example, scholars point to the significance of practical applications of data and collaboration with those potentially impacted by research.

Small (1995:942-943) asserts that “While the substantive focus has varied, common to all forms of action research is its agenda of producing research that can address practical concerns” (Small 1995:942). Further he explains that action-oriented research values collaboration with non-researcher participants and that “…action research is always conducted in the setting where the problem is encountered, and the focus is usually on a single case or unit” (Small 1995: 942). LeCompte and Shensul (1999:90) assert “Some researchers define action research broadly as any research conducted with a clear institutional or community structural change in mind. Others reserve the term for research designed to address structural inequalities…action-research is site-specific and
involves researchers and participants…” (LeCompte and Shensul 1990:90). Greenwood and Leven (1998) assert that social science researchers as action-oriented researchers should “…collaborate actively with their research subjects in order to promote social change. They define action research as research that aims to increase the ability of the involved community or organization members to control their own destinies more effectively” (Greenwood and Leven 1998:435).

Bennet (1996) describes action-oriented research explicitly undertaken as anthropological research to be “action anthropology”. According to Bennet (1996) action anthropology in the United States was initiated with the work of Sol Tax in the 1940’s. This approach “…renounced the employment of practitioners by government or any large organization in favor of voluntary academic projects engaging in intensive intervention in the problems and needs of local communities. The approach did not prevail, but its ideas continue to stimulate interest” (Bennet 1996:S23). Even though Tax’s agenda did not evolve into a standard anthropological model, his approach set precedent for future work by anthropologists that prioritize taking action aimed at addressing local needs and interests.

My advocacy and associated collaboration related to the plight of Meacham Elementary is consistent with the primary elements of action-oriented research including the prioritization of engaging research questions that address site specific (contextual) issues resulting in data that have the potential to affect the justification for the research. Specifically, this study indicates that data produced by my initial archival historical research addressing Meacham Elementary had the potential to affect the historic status and potentially the future treatment of a symbol of African American cultural heritage in
Tampa. Further, my research is consistent with Sol Tax’s philosophy because it represents a voluntary academic project. I became involved with this project as an advocate subsequent to being contacted by Arndrita Harris (the great granddaughter of Christina Meacham; the namesake of Meacham Elementary). She asked me if I could help preserve the school and when I agreed to volunteer my time to do so, I made the decision to act as an anthropological advocate. My name was passed along to the Harris family by Mary Alice Dorsett. During the course of this research Arndrita and William Harris (her son; the great, great, grandson of Christina Meacham) provided support at community events and meetings engaging the importance of the school. These two family members served a supporting role providing historical information detailing the history of their family and I was the primary representative of this cause. Even though I conducted the ethnographic, archival, architectural, archaeological, and historic preservation research, led discussions at key meetings, and produced the technical reports needed to substantiate our position, the collaboration with family members and other supportive members of the Tampa African American community was vital to this project. Their support demonstrated that the school was significant to the community; not just to an academic researcher. The final sections of this chapter will demonstrate that since 2003 I have spent literally hundreds of hours conducting research and attending meetings aimed at bolstering support for the historic status and future disposition of Meacham Elementary.

Contemporary accounts of action-oriented research in anthropological literature are often concerned with the application of data to an agenda aimed at solving a problem. Therefore in some contexts anthropological research undertaken as action-oriented
research might manifest as advocacy. LeCompte and Shensul (1999) assert that as anthropologists “…ethnographers are not only interpreters of words and deeds but participants or stakeholders in the uses of the research for problem solving. Stakeholders are people who have a vested interest in ensuring that the results of research are used to solve the problem the research is addressing” (1999:13). According to LeCompte and Shensul (1999:13) these stakeholders which might include anthropologists as well as collaborating community members collect, interpret, and apply that data in order to maximize benefits to affected communities. They explain that one clearly defined general approach aligned with the application of anthropological data to the resolution or engagement of real world problems has been discussed in contemporary anthropological literature as both action research (discussed above) and participatory action research (LeCompte and Shensul 1999:14).

**Participatory Action Research**

My research efforts surrounding the preservation of Meacham Elementary in Tampa serve as a general example of action-oriented anthropological research applied by an anthropologist. This study represents action research that was collaborative and it is aligned with what LeCompte and Shensul (1999) identify as participatory action research (PAR). Participatory action research represents a form of action-oriented research that has been described as “…one means of addressing the gap between researchers and the intended beneficiaries of research” (Turnbull et al. 1998:3). Turnbull et al. also assert that PAR “refers to a process whereby the researchers and stakeholders (those who potentially benefit from research results) collaborate in the design and conduct all phases of the research process. PAR’s ultimate goal is taking action to solve the problem that is
the basis of the research” (Turnbull et al. 1998:3). Chambers (1992:737) explains how “The PAR model is based on a partnership between practitioner and applied research orientations” (Chambers 1992:737). Likewise, consistent with the basic tenants of action-oriented research, White (1991) “…stresses the importance of relating participatory practice to the socioeconomic and cultural context in which interactions occur” (White 1991:37). Therefore, PAR represents a manifestation of action-oriented research that serves to directly align researchers with stakeholders as “participants” in the research process with the common goal of solving a problem or engaging a specific issue.

*Action Research and African American Cultural Heritage in Tampa*

When I agreed to advocate for the preservation of this school and take the side of the family and the community I moved beyond the realm of purely descriptive research and became an applied anthropological advocate taking action (i.e. an anthropological advocate pursuing action-oriented research). As will be explained in the upcoming sections of this chapter, the problem faced by this family as well as all supportive members of the public and the community surrounding the school was the potential loss of the school due to redevelopment of the entire neighborhood that encompasses the school (comprised of 483 connected public housing units). Therefore, the local context of my research and my ethical decision defined my role as an applied anthropological advocate acting as an action-oriented researcher engaging various political entities in concert with participating stakeholders. Rather than documenting the effects of redevelopment in this neighborhood and reflecting on the process and its effects on culture and the symbolic representation of culture across this urban landscape, I chose to
take action as an anthropologist and apply my research efforts explicitly toward the preservation of Meacham Elementary.

My role as an applied anthropologist in this context led to the application of action oriented research when the family of the namesake of Meacham Elementary contacted me and offered a research partnership aimed at the preservation of the school.

Figure 6. Representative Photo of Meacham Elementary Advocacy Group

Three generations of family members offered their assistance in the preservation project and the family and I in conjunction with other supportive African American’s from Tampa have worked together in various capacities since we joined forces in November of 2004. Consistent with the basic tenets of PAR such as collaboration, on more than one occasion, at meetings engaging various governmental entities involved with historic designation and preservation at the local, state, and federal level, members of the family, the community, and I have served complementary roles. For example,
family members (especially the great granddaughter of Christina Meacham: Arndrita Harris and Mrs. Meacham’s great, great, grandson William Jason Harris) have provided detailed family history demonstrating the significance of the school to their family and to African Americans in Tampa while I have served as an advocate providing technical information and insight into the historic designation and preservation process. Additional African American collaborators from Tampa have included: Jewel R. Aires, Doris Scott, Rutha M. Harper, Gloria Philmore, Mary Sheffield, Marie Sheehy, Sara Sims, Helen Taylor, and Oretha Wright.

As an anthropological advocate, my service to this community manifested as both a facilitator of technical information and as a political consultant and ally. My decision to serve as an advocate explicitly aligned me with one point of view and I worked to impact the outcome of a very challenging set of circumstances surrounding historic designation with the intent of preserving Meacham Elementary. Because I chose to take action and align myself with a particular group my research demonstrating the significance of Meacham Elementary represents anthropological advocacy and because I prioritized collaboration with other stakeholders this research represents action oriented anthropological research.

The goal of this action oriented research was to demonstrate the historical significance of the school with the intent of setting precedent for protecting the school from demolition (a tenuous goal that remains intact). Our opposition either explicitly aimed to destroy the school or sought to ignore its existence and significance as a symbol of African American cultural heritage in Tampa. By aligning myself against those who sought to ignore Meacham Elementary as a component of African American cultural
heritage in Tampa I sought to shed light on the inequities of preservation in this local context (highlighted in chapter three) by working toward a specific goal to address this problem.

By addressing this problem in a local context, this research served to recognize structural inequalities involved with historic recognition and preservation of African American historic sites and schools in the State of Florida. For example “Black Heritage Sites: An African American Odyssey and Finder’s Guide” (1996) lists only three African American educational facilities as significant to Black Heritage in the State of Florida: Bethune-Cookman College, Edward Waters College Centennial Hall, and the Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University Carnegie Library Black Archives, Research Center and Museum (Curtis 1996:60-76). Likewise, the National Register Multiple Properties Listing for Historic Public Black Schools in Florida lists only five schools: Deleon Springs Colored School (DeLeon Springs), Orange City Colored School (Orange City), Osborne School (Lake Worth), Liberty Hill Schoolhouse (Gainesville), and Meacham Elementary (Tampa) (2007:http://en.wikpd.org/wiki/List_of-Registered_Historic_Black_Public_School_Florida). This study demonstrates that the choices researchers make when they are faced with an ethical decision has the potential to significantly affect practice. For example, had I chosen not to take a side when the Meacham family and other supportive African Americans from Tampa contacted me, my research into the cultural heritage of African Americans in Tampa would have been markedly different (and have taken a lot less time). The final sections of this chapter will recount the narrative associated with successfully having Meacham Elementary designated by the federal government as a historically significant structure.
The Historic Status of Cultural Heritage: Justifying State and Federal Recognition of Meacham Elementary

The process associated with working toward the preservation of Meacham Elementary manifested as action oriented research within a turbulent urban context slated for large-scale redevelopment aimed at maximizing profit and the image of a revitalized downtown space for Tampa. Archival and ethnographic research focusing on the significance of the school to the history of the surrounding extant community demonstrated that comprehensive engagement of the power structure impacting redevelopment efforts was required in order to prolong its existence.

Figure 7. Meacham Elementary Primary Entrance

Decisions affecting urban landscape change potentially impacting historic structures serving as symbols of cultural heritage are made by the local power structure (which may be supported by federal funding) that drives urban planning. This power structure consists of local designation entities such as the Tampa Preservation Commission which
are responsible for identifying and designating historically significant properties at the local level. Likewise, urban planning strategies are formalized by architectural firms and lawyers who coordinate with entities that implement urban planning initiatives such as: City Councils, County Commissioners, Mayors, and private developers. This study demonstrates that other entities may impact urban planning such as School Districts, School Boards, the Housing Authority, and organized residents and citizens who may act effectively to modify urban planning initiatives. It became clear that the community’s recognition of this building as significant to its own history was not enough to prevent the building from being overlooked and or demolished as a byproduct of redevelopment. Therefore, I recognized a need for broader and more substantive support for this structure.

Consequently, I became versed in historic preservation strategies applied by historic architects, developers and planners, and consulting and engineering firms. This research was applied as I became a facilitator and interpreter of technical information that
eventually led to the school being placed on the National Register of Historic Places in April of 2005. This technical component of my advocacy involved a architectural evaluation of Meacham Elementary (typically this work requires the expertise of historic architects) along with the accompanying technical expertise required to complete state and federal historic designation forms. The architectural description of the school I provided for the 2003 National Register of Historic Places designation form clarifies the physical elements of this structure. Many of the characteristics described below can be observed in Figures 7 and 8 (above).

The Meacham Elementary School is a two story, Masonry Vernacular style, rectangular, building with a Portico and a one-story western extension. Above the portico is a portion of the school’s second story, above which lies the flat roof (which is reinforced concrete with built-up tar and gravel). The walls are finished with brick (English bond). The windows in the center of the school (upstairs and downstairs) are 4/4 double hung wooden sashes and the windows covering the eastern 1/3 and the western 1/4 of the building are 3/3 double hung wooden sashes (both have architrave trim, plain timber sills, with rails). The second story of the front (north) and rear (south) facades have windows aligned with those on the first story. The main, north façade of the school faces India Street and a yard with mowed grass, 2 live oak trees and a concrete walkway leading to the entrance. The portico (the most prominent feature of the façade) is accessed via the walkway. The entrance is double, metal frame, glass doors that are surrounded by modest casement windows (also framed in metal). The interior of the school reflects the typical schoolhouse interior with linoleum press tile flooring, and a double-loaded corridor with classrooms on either side (Butler 2003).

Subsequently, I filled the role of a negotiator as I interacted with multiple tiers of the preservation and development hierarchy including city, county, and state officials concerning the historic designation process. The timeline demonstrating this process was set in motion when my historic preservation efforts related to Meacham Elementary began in August of 2003.
As was mentioned in chapter two, I initiated research on Meacham Elementary as a component of background research undertaken as a doctoral graduate assistant for the 2003 University of South Florida archaeological field school (under the direction of Dr. Brent Weisman, USF). The nineteenth and early twentieth century artifacts uncovered in Perry Harvey Park (one of three project areas/excavation sites for the aforementioned archaeological field school) demonstrated the longstanding connection of the African American community in Tampa to the urban space in the vicinity of the school which is located three blocks east of Perry Harvey Park. At this point in my research, I had not been contacted by the Harris family and did not have any idea that researching the school would lead to a campaign that would become the focus of my professional life for the next three years.

After researching Sanborn maps (as was done with the investigation of Perry Harvey Park) in addition to county and school board records for documentation of the school, I found that the school was around 30 years older than the public housing units that make up the surrounding neighborhood. Subsequently, after learning that the school was constructed in 1926 to cater to the then segregated African American enclave adjacent to the Historic Central Avenue Business District/Historic Tampa Black Business District (the focus of excavation at Perry Harvey Park discussed in chapter two) it was recognized that the school was a component of the cultural landscape associated with archaeological context of the excavation undertaken in June, 2003. It would have been an oversight not to have documented the antiquity of this structure as it represents infrastructure associated with the extant African American community in the immediate vicinity of the archaeology project. In retrospect, it all seemed so simple: I thought I
would just make sure the state knew the school was there and then be done with that portion of my research (and of course this documentary research would have concluded at the end of the summer field school; at least that’s what I thought). After contacting the Florida Division of Historical Resources to make sure that they were aware of the school, I learned that they had no previous knowledge of this significant structure. I had assumed that the school was documented because I was aware of at least one very recent Cultural Resource Assessment survey that was conducted in the neighborhood (2002 Archaeological Site Report). This archaeological and historical assessment of the area failed to account adequately for Meacham Elementary in its documentation of the area. Therefore, I felt obligated to do so, (in reflection this “action” was probably my initial step toward applying Participatory Action Research). Since my initial background research assignment was to document the built environment of the neighborhood and because this school represented a significant cultural resource that could not be overlooked, I felt obligated to make sure that the State of Florida Division of Historic Resources knew its location and was aware of its relationship to the surrounding community. This endeavor entailed the filing of a Florida Master Site File state historic structure form. I began this form in August and it was accepted by the state (following revisions) in October of 2003. After filing the state historic structure form for Meacham Elementary I learned that the school was on the agenda to be considered for local landmark status (a discovery that temporarily set my mind at ease). As mentioned in chapter two this designation affords concrete protection by absolutely preventing demolition of locally designated historic properties in Tampa (consistent with
As indicated by a public notice at the entryway (an entryway that was approximately 25 feet behind a locked four foot high chain link fence) Meacham Elementary was on the agenda for the October 28, 2003 Tampa Historic Preservation Commission board meeting (the City of Tampa’s local preservation entity). A large poster in the window adjacent to
the front door of Meacham Elementary explained that the school was to be considered as a potential “City of Tampa Local Landmark” at the meeting. Such board meetings include votes to designate local sites and protect them against future demolition or deny them local historic status. However, the school was never afforded this opportunity because it vanished from the agenda prior to the meeting and was therefore never officially considered by the preservation board.

When I repeatedly contacted the local historic commission to inquire as to why this was the case, my question was avoided. A discussion with the head of the local preservation entity in 2003 (Annie Hart) revealed no explanation for its removal from the agenda. In fact, the person in charge of this City entity could not explain why the school had been removed from the agenda she told me she “wasn’t exactly sure” (Hart: personal correspondence 2003) and suggested that I fill out a form online recommending that the school be added to their next quarterly meeting (this I did on two separate occasions and the school was not placed on their agenda either time). After conducting this investigation, I became suspicious about the City’s motives and became encouraged to take further action. Had I chosen to stop here, it would have been relatively unproblematic for me to have stopped my involvement in the on goings of the school. Input from the Florida Division of Historic Resources served as incentive that fueled my desire to take action to advocate for this school. In response to the state historic structure form I submitted, the Division of Historic Resources Bureau of Historic Preservation communicated the following to me regarding the school:
If the major alterations to the school were made in 1954—and I will take your word for it—then the building is likely eligible for nomination to the National Register as an example of an African-American education facility from the segregation era…If you want to start the process of nominating this property to the National Register, please let me know (letter received on October 9, 2003 from Carl Shiver, Division of Historical Resources).

Partially in response to this letter and partly due to the fact that the school, with no explanation, had been denied the opportunity to be recognized by the local preservation entity in October of 2003, I began working on the National Register of Historic Places nomination form (the next step toward having this school recognized as a significant cultural resource). The National Register of Historic Places represents a list of historic sites recognized as such by the federal government. This list is maintained by the National Park Service (NPS) and represents an inventory of cultural resources such as “…districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects, each determined by the NPS to be of historic, cultural, architectural, archaeological, or engineering significance at the national, state, or local level” (King 2004:362). Acceptance to the National Register of Historic Places symbolizes a designation that potentially affords more protection than state recognition and provides opportunities for tax breaks and rehabilitation grants for these historic cultural resources. However, this project demonstrates that filing appropriate paperwork does not ensure that historic sites will be accepted as such by the federal government, nor does it mean that local planners will adhere to the intent of federal historic status (which is preservation).

Working toward National Register designation requires a tedious amount of paperwork. This paperwork is designated a form; however, it is really more like a short book including sections on historic and cultural context as well as architecture. To complete this form requires expertise in the practice of Cultural Resource Management
and historic architecture, as well as a great deal of patience. I started the Meacham Elementary National Register of Historic Places form in October of 2003 and after a few revisions it was accepted by the state of Florida Division of Historic Resources in November of 2004. Subsequently, the school was placed on the agenda for the quarterly meeting of the Florida National Register Review Board in Tallahassee on January 27, 2005. This board reviews nominations to the National Register of Historic Places and votes to determine whether or not properties will be accepted (recognized as historically significant by the federal government). Prior to this meeting I was confident that my involvement with the school was over; but I kept reflecting on the impact of my absence …“if I stopped here, who would be in Tallahassee to advocate for the school at the meeting?”.

This question was answered when later in November I was contacted by the descendants of the namesake of the school, Christina Meacham. Following a conversation with Arndrita Harris (the great granddaughter of Christina Meacham) the family and I (along with other interested community members) decided we would work together to do what we could to ensure that the school was not overlooked by the City, the State, or the Federal Government. This phone conversation initiated collaborative action research involving myself (as an applied anthropologist serving as a provider of technical information and an advocate), the Harris Family (including three generations of relatives from the Tampa area) and other interested community members. A particularly notable member of this group was Mary Alice Dorsett, a prominent local African American leader, advocate, political activist, and a generous, caring mother whose son attended Meacham Elementary and who knew Christina Meacham. Other supportive
community members who provided support at meetings and agreed to key informant interviews included individuals such as Jewel R. Aires who stated in an interview conducted as we drove to Tallahassee on January 27, 2005 (discussed below) “the school should be left intact to commemorate the importance of education to the community” (Aires: personal correspondence 2005). Likewise, on June 4, 2004, Helen Taylor who attended Meacham Elementary in the late 1930’s and early 1940’s and worked there in the 1970’s (interviewed at the Kid Mason Center) stated that “The city has already taken enough from the black community in Tampa…Meacham should not be torn down” (Taylor: personal correspondence 2004). This sentiment was repeated by a more contemporary member of the community who attended Meacham Elementary in the late 1970’s; Yolanda Lane was interviewed at the Kid Mason Center on June 4, 2004. She expressed resentment against demolishing the school and made this clear when she stated “The school is virtually all the community has left, I am completely opposed to the demolition of the school” (Lane: personal correspondence 2004). The opinions of these individuals are representative of the feedback I received from over a dozen community members and other supportive members of the Tampa African American community throughout this research. Their support fueled my aspiration to aid in the plight of the school and served as justification for this project. Likewise, without the collaboration of key individuals such as Mary Alice Dorsett and Arndrita and Jason Harris, this project may have manifested as a technical report describing events rather than an applied, collaborative, research study directly engaging historic preservation inequity.

On January 27 2005, I rented a bus and we traveled to Tallahassee for the quarterly National Register Review Board meeting (around a 5 hour drive north from
To our surprise, we found that the school had been taken off the agenda for the National Register Review board meeting two days prior to our arrival (due to complications with the certified local government process). After a few tense moments at the meeting, we learned that the school was taken off the agenda because both the local government entities involved with preservation in Tampa had abstained from commenting on their opinion. This abstention was significant because, before the National Register review board can vote, either the Mayor’s office or the local preservation commission is required to agree or disagree with the Florida Division of Historical Resources’ recommendation regarding consideration for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. I found out later that this local “complication” was the result of a lack of a quorum at the meeting of the local historic preservation committee. While this could have been a coincidental lapse in attendance by committee members, it could also have been used as an intentional strategy. Those who sought to prevent the school from being listed on the National Register hoped this would deter our preservation efforts. When I attended the next local quarterly meeting (details forthcoming), one member of the local preservation commission (the member who failed to attend the previous meeting) abstained comment on the topic of Meacham Elementary. This individual cited a “conflict of interest”. It was becoming more and more evident to me that local politics were playing a part in the treatment of this school.

Thanks to the understanding of the National Review board (Dr. Judith A. Bense: Chairman), Arndrita Harris, Mary Alice Dorsett, and I were afforded the unofficial opportunity to advocate for the school at the meeting in Tallahassee. After our presentations, we found the board to be very receptive, and, consistent with the initial
assessment by the state, they unofficially indicated that the school was a fine candidate for the National Register of Historic Places. At this meeting we also learned that the only way to get back on the agenda was to receive the support of the Tampa Historic Preservation Commission. This is the entity that suspiciously removed the school from their agenda in October 2003 and the entity whose lack of action removed the school from the National Register review board’s agenda. Despite this obstacle, we regrouped and decided we would aim for getting on the agenda for their next quarterly meeting in Tampa.

When we returned to Tampa we set our sights on the March 8, 2005 Tampa Historic Preservation Commission meeting. The political landscape of this participatory action research clearly changed at this point. It became apparent based on local media coverage that the neighborhood surrounding Meacham Elementary was definitely being considered for demolition and redevelopment by the City of Tampa (a process that would involve the City of Tampa, Hillsborough County, the Tampa Housing Authority and private developers). It became clear that this redevelopment plan that was in the works had likely been the source of resistance at the local level. Evidently, complications affecting the historic status of Meacham Elementary occurred as the local preservation commission stalled while urban planners sought consensus for their future plans for the area containing the school. At this point I decided to further my efforts by applying my anthropological research knowledge to prevent redevelopment from stealing history and heritage from this community that had so little left to symbolize the African American history of Tampa. In the back of my mind I knew this would have been another relatively easy time to disengage from this research; however at this point I was committed to the
preservation effort, so I decided I was not giving in without providing all the support I
could muster for this cause.

Prior to the March 8, 2005 Tampa Historic Preservation Commission meeting,
members of the Harris family and I attended several meetings aimed at bolstering
political and community support for the future of the school. For example, on February
19, 2005 we attended and participated in a “community forum” meeting organized by the
University of South Florida Anthropology Department and held at the Kid Mason Center
(the local neighborhood community center) located three blocks west of Meacham
Elementary. At this meeting I gave a short presentation in support of integrating the
school into future plans for the neighborhood. Additionally, members of the Harris
family and I met with Hillsborough County school board member Doretha W. Edgecomb
to ask for support regarding the future of the school, the Hillsborough County School’s
chief facilities officer (who in 2004 was Mary Ellen Ellia), members of the Tampa City
Council (including the chairman of the City Council, Gwen Miller), local community
members and leaders (including residents, business owners, and the director of the Kid
Mason Center: Helen Taylor). Likewise, I met with the head of the Tampa Historic
Preservation Commission (Hart: Personal Correspondence 2006) who told me that if
Meacham Elementary were added to the National Register, the commission would
advocate designating the school as a local landmark. Regretfully, despite what transpired
next, this never happened.

This same individual in the elevator on the way up to the floor where the meeting
was being held asked me if I would speak in favor of the school at the local historic
preservation commission meeting (despite the fact that her name was on the agenda to
represent the school on the meeting agenda pamphlet). Typically when historic properties are being considered by a local historic designation entity (such as the preservation commission) the local historic preservation entity provides information to the commission which they use to make their decisions. However, I learned on March 8, 2006 that this is not always the case. In retrospect, it is clear that the preservation office was purposefully avoiding addressing preservation of the school at the meeting because they were aware of its historic significance but did not want to promote a conflict of interest between their office (who would be obligated to advocate preservation if it recognized the significance of the school) and Hillsborough County Schools (whose ability to liquidate the school as a monetary asset would be compromised if it were preserved as a local historic landmark). Interaction with the local historic preservation office indicated to me that ethically they knew the right thing to do was advocate for the preservation of this school. However, they apparently thought it in their best interest to maintain a good working relationship with Hillsborough County and therefore did not publicly advocate for the school’s historic significance.

At the preservation commission meeting (Chairman: Catherine Byrd) on March 8, Arndrita Harris and I presented our case for the school. Following our initial comments, we met resistance from Hillsborough County Schools when their chief facilities officer (Mary Ellen Ellia) revealed that the county did not recognize the historic significance of the school and was not in favor of any steps that might complicate its destruction. It was evident that the Hillsborough County School Board failed to consider the significance of this school to the history of African Americans in Tampa. Rather, it was clearly indicated that they considered the school to be an economic asset to be destroyed to
produce revenue for future development (rather than preserved as a symbol of African American heritage). Following the chief facilities officer’s comments, I offered a rebuttal. Then, after asking me a series of questions related to the history of the school, the Tampa Historic Preservation Commission voted to support the school as a potential candidate for the National Register of Historic Places. This successful vote meant that the commission agreed with the state’s recommendation that Meacham Elementary be considered a National Register candidate. This did not mean that they were willing to support the outcome of this consideration at the local level. It is important to note that they did not designate the school a local landmark, they simply allowed the NR designation process to proceed by allowing the school to be placed back on the Tallahassee Review Board agenda. This Tampa Historic Preservation Commission meeting was partially filled with supporters of the school including members of the Meacham family, supportive community members, and a contingent of University of South Florida anthropology graduate students. The successful vote was followed by jubilant applause!

After gaining the local support needed to once again pursue National Register status for the school, it was placed on the April 2005 quarterly meeting of the National Register Review Board in Tallahassee. Once again we traveled to the meeting and presented our case to the board (this time officially). Following a series of questions directed to me related to the historic context and cultural significance of the school, a vote was taken, and the school was accepted by the board for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The process leading to the designation of Meacham Elementary as a National Register site was complicated and tedious, but it was also
rewarding. It has been my honor to work with the Harris family and others as an
advocate for this significant structure. Interestingly, the steps in the preservation process
which deterred our efforts to protect the school also provided avenues for our group to
circumvent those who sought to devalue this symbol of African American history in
Tampa and allowed us to make legitimate change regarding the historic status of this
school by negotiating varying political and preservation contexts. Ironically, the same
regulatory framework that prevented designation at the local level (and took the school
off the agenda in Tallahassee three months previously) eventually facilitated its
recognition at the federal level.

In this case action research was applied to engage the potential oversight of what
the federal government has recognized as a culturally and historically significant school.
This manifestation of action oriented research demonstrates one method that urban
applied anthropologists might apply as a form of action-oriented research aimed at
combating the destruction of public symbolic representations of cultural heritage
especially in the face of comprehensive urban redevelopment. In an urban context,
components of culture such as Meacham Elementary should not be overlooked by urban
planners. This research demonstrates that even though local politics and urban planning
should not stand in the way of preserving significant symbols of cultural heritage, they all
too often do. This study has made it clear that it is possible for city and county planners
to overlook the significance of historic cultural resources that symbolize heritage in urban
space especially when they are in the way of profitable redevelopment.

By May of 2005, according to the head of the Tampa Preservation office (phone
conversation May 4, 2005: Dennis Fernandez) the Tampa Housing authority initiated a
Request for Proposals (RFP) from private investors interested in redeveloping the neighborhood that surrounds Meacham Elementary. Thanks to our efforts, this RFP mentioned Meacham Elementary and suggested that the private developers treat the school as a National Register property, which means they should be less likely to demolish the school and be more likely to incorporate the building into their redevelopment plans. Between May of 2005 and March of 2006 the City of Tampa accepted a contract for the redevelopment of the urban landscape surrounding Meacham Elementary with the initial plans calling for the treatment of the school as a historic structure to be incorporated into the “revitalized” neighborhood. By May of 2006 the “Central Park Community Redevelopment Plan” had been formalized. This plan was prepared by the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission and WilsonMiller, Inc. (a local developer). As was mentioned in chapter three, despite the fact that Meacham Elementary is on the National Register of Historic Places, it was overlooked by this plan.

The Harris family contacted me in June 2006 and alerted me that an upcoming Tampa City Council meeting was going to determine whether or not they would side with the redevelopment plan. Arndrita Harris, William Jason Harris and I attended this meeting and I gave a presentation explaining that Meacham Elementary was not addressed in the redevelopment plan. At one point in the meeting the City Council asked if there was anyone who would like to comment on the plan. At this point I was given the opportunity to address the Tampa City Council regarding the importance of Meacham Elementary and to make sure they knew it was not included in the redevelopment plan. Following my presentation, Gwen Miller (city council member) assured me that she was
aware of the school and “guaranteed” her support toward ensuring it was not overlooked by city and county planners. This was encouraging and the Harrises and I were hopeful that the sentiment voiced by the city council would lead to substantive protection for the school. At this meeting I made sure to clarify that if the current redevelopment plan did not include the school, it was likely to be demolished (a point the council listened to but failed to act on).

In March of 2007 as I was preparing the final draft summarizing these events I received a phone message from the Harris family that ended with “Mr. Butler we need you to come and take charge once again, the heat is on, the school is in serious jeopardy”. A conversation on March 3, 2007 with William Jason Harris informed me as to a startling change in the status of the school property. He informed me that in February 2007, Hillsborough County Schools made it clear that they planned to sell the school for profit when they designated Meacham Elementary school as “surplus property”. Also, he told me that the Tampa Housing Authority was planning to acquire the property and that a demolition permit had been initiated for the school. Next, I learned that this proposed demolition permit was to be considered by the Tampa Preservation Commission on March 20, 2007. Consequently, we decided to attend this latest event addressing the school and I once again chose to advocate for the preservation of Meacham Elementary.

Following our conversation, I spent the next several hours making strategic phone calls aimed at searching out methods to bolster support for the school. Initially, I spoke with the Chief of the Bureau of Historic Preservation for the State of Florida (Barbara Mattick). I informed her about the direct threat to a National Register site (Meacham Elementary) and asked for her insight. As mentioned in chapter three, earlier in this
process the Division of Historic Resources (a department of the Bureau of Historic Preservation) sent a letter of support to Hillsborough County Schools and to the Tampa Preservation Commission supporting the preservation of the school. However, this time Mrs. Mattick explained that their role in urban planning (not unlike historic designation) is limited to making suggestions regarding the status of historic properties (Mattick: Personal Correspondence 2007). She informed me that the Meacham Elementary preservation issue was “…primarily a local problem and that the State merely makes recommendations” (Mattick: Personal Correspondence 2007). Suggestions do not necessarily affect redevelopment plans designed to maximize profit. There is not a legislative mechanism in place in the United States to legitimize the opinion of the federal government or of states as it relates to historic structures. No matter how historically significant a property is, if local planners justify demolition it can be razed without recourse. It would seem that the role of states and the federal government is to designate properties as historically significant rather than to regulate the practice of historic preservation.

Because of federal inability to regulate preservation practice, support was mobilized and I attended the March 20, 2007 meeting of the Tampa Historic Preservation Commission Meeting (Chairman: John Tennison) and advocated the preservation of Meacham Elementary. What remained to be seen was whether this local preservation entity (headed by Dennis Fernandez) would side with the demolition plan advocated by their City and County colleagues or whether they would side with the preservation of Tampa’s only enduring symbol of public educational opportunity for African American’s: Meacham Elementary. It became apparent that this decision would likely
determine how this significant historic structure would serve this rebuilt community (if it were given a chance to do so) and how its association with Tampa’s African American history would manifest as a byproduct of its future use.

As the time of the meeting neared I learned that it had been planned specifically to address the future of Meacham Elementary. The meeting was touted as a “demolition review” and the school was the only item on the agenda. On March 19, 2007 (the day before the Historic Preservation Commission Meeting) I spoke with the chief of the Tampa Preservation Office; Dennis Fernandez. He alerted me that his office had already held its monthly meeting and that this was a special meeting organized explicitly to consider the demolition permit request for Meacham Elementary. The National Register status of the school justifies the initiation of a process clarified in Tampa’s City ordinances addressing the demolition of such “controversial” properties (Fernandez: personal correspondence 2007). It is significant to note that this step would not have been required had the school not been on the National Register of Historic Places; had this status not been achieved the school would have been demolished without consideration.

The local process initiated in this situation calls for the chair (John Tennision) or vice chair (David Rigall) of the Tampa Historic Preservation Commission to conduct a meeting to receive public testimony regarding the school. This individual (rather than the entire commission) is responsible for determining whether the demolition permit will be opposed by the commission. It came as no surprise to me to learn during the conversation with Mr. Fernandez that the chair of the commission had a “conflict of interest” and could not conduct the meeting. Subsequently, I learned that this individual
had previous business ties with Hillsborough County Schools; the county entity that initiated the demolition permit and sought to liquidate the school as surplus property!

The irony of this saga never seemed to end…the chair of the Tampa Historic Preservation Commission (the entity who is responsible for prioritizing preservation of cultural heritage in Tampa) is chaired by an individual who has a conflict of interest related to a previous affiliation with the entity seeking to demolish a National Register site (Meacham Elementary).

The vice chair (David Rigall) assumed responsibility of this meeting and was responsible for making the decision that would determine the treatment of the school. The protocol for this meeting accounts for three possible outcomes. If the vice chair chose not to stand in the way of demolition the commission would declare that they did not oppose demolition and the proposed permit would be approved. A second option was for the vice chair to opt for a mitigation plan representing a compromise between interested parties. The third option results from a decision to oppose the demolition and this involves initiating an emergency local designation to preserve the property and then the issue would move on to the City Council who would vote to determine the treatment of the property (Fernandez: personal correspondence 2007).

On March 20, 2007, once again, I pushed aside my other responsibilities and drove over a hundred and fifty miles (round trip) to downtown Tampa to advocate for Meacham Elementary. As I made the trek I found myself contemplating the process in which I had participated since 2003. As I watched the cars crisscross the lanes of the interstate I had a brief moment of satisfaction recognizing that no matter what the outcome of this meeting, my actions since 2003 had demonstrated a steadfast
commitment to this project; this moment of clarity was soon muddied by thoughts of how I would respond to the City and County lawyers as they plotted to justify the demolition of the school.

At the demolition review meeting I made a lengthy presentation and engaged in a lively debate with representatives of Hillsborough County Schools and the Tampa Housing Authority. Jason Harris (the great grandson of Christina Meacham mentioned previously) also gave a short speech stressing the significance of the school to the historic African American community in Tampa. However, despite our efforts the vice chair of the Tampa Preservation Commission decided not to oppose the demolition of Meacham Elementary. Instead he opted to define a mitigation plan that required certain actions to be taken by Hillsborough County Schools and the Tampa Housing Authority. Therefore, this preservation effort failed to result in physical preservation of the school building; however, the place of this school in Tampa’s history was clarified and preserved by this process. Likewise, mitigation clarified several conditions that must be met by these entities. First, archival quality photos and drawings of the school are to be produced and housed in the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C. Next, a historical marker is to be placed at the location where the school once stood. Also, the name of the school is to be transferred to a new school within Hillsborough County. Likewise, this mitigation plan called for the production of a narrative description of the school’s place in Tampa history. Lastly, the plan facilitates salvage of building material following demolition and advocates the construction of an African American museum in a wing of the St. James Episcopal church which is situated one block north of Meacham Elementary (specifics defining the size and makeup of this museum were not clarified by this mitigation plan).
Despite the fact that the school is slated for demolition, a positive outcome of this meeting was that it facilitated knowledge preservation demonstrating the historical significance of the school. The outcome of this process demonstrates that urban planning in Tampa over the last five decades demonstrates a pattern prioritizing the consolidation of business districts and a tourist district augmented by interstate access. Scholars (e.g. Greenbaum 2002, Fullilove 2000) assert that the Tampa example is not an exception to the rule and that many urban centers in the U.S. have pursued urban planning initiatives that have had similar outcomes differentially impacting historic African American communities. Greenbaum suggests “These events in Tampa were scarcely unique or isolated. In virtually every city in the United States, federal bulldozers destroyed the homes and businesses of African Americans…” (Greenbaum 1998:2). Therefore, future research might prioritize investigating additional urban contexts where this pattern has taken place and clarify the outcome of this process via the application of UMAP (discussed in chapter five).
Chapter Five: Lessons Learned: Contested Urban Space and Cultural Heritage

In this study I sought to identify and apply urban research strategies facilitating the anthropological investigation of the process of urban landscape change. This analysis led to the identification of multiple lines of evidence and avenues for engagement that might be pursued by anthropologists working in urban contexts. The complex nature of this study carried out in a tumultuous urban context required a dynamic approach facilitating research designs aimed at engaging multiple research questions that emerged as conditions evolved in a discrete urban context. Recounting the related facets of this study demonstrates if one is to maintain a research agenda impacted by political and economic context, flexibility is a necessity. Collectively the components of this study represent an anthropological model designed to engage evolving relationships between urban spaces and their associations with urban populations. This model clarifies a set of complementary methods that might be applied toward investigation prioritizing the effect of urban change on cultural heritage.

Initially, this study asserted that archaeology is well suited to the investigation of urban landscape change across space and through time. Evidence produced via the archaeological project cited by this study demonstrates that residual evidence of urban change is accessible when subsurface deposits are intact and proper recovery methods are applied. This archaeological component of the study confirms the historical processes that justified my actions as an anthropological advocate. Archaeological excavation and its results provided me with a first hand experience that confirmed the historical
relationship between a historic African American community and Meacham Elementary. I was therefore steadfast in my commitment to perpetuate and enhance its contemporary association with the historic African American community in Tampa that had been largely eradicated in the 1960’s and early 1970’s due to Urban Renewal policy and was once again impacted by redevelopment plans. The value of archaeology to the interpretation of urban space is highlighted by this research because this excavation was conducted in an urban space that currently exists as a park (explained in chapter two). Fortunately, the current redevelopment plan indicates that this park is slated to be left intact as an archaeological resource and a symbol of cultural heritage. However, no visible evidence indicates its historical association with African American cultural heritage in Tampa. Therefore, my initial research agenda was aligned with the investigation of material evidence (artifacts and features) symbolizing the cultural heritage of African Americans in Tampa. This archaeological phase of the study demonstrates that residual material evidence of cultural heritage persists even after comprehensive demolition of urban landscapes. In addition to field and laboratory responsibilities associated with this project, I researched historic buildings with associated cultural, spatial, and temporal affiliation in Tampa.

While reviewing documentary evidence clarifying the historical affiliation of buildings standing in this neighborhood I became exposed to a larger body of knowledge related to processes and trends in historical designation and preservation of buildings which I later identified as a source of evidence complementing the material evidence generated via the aforementioned urban archaeological project. Consequently, I conducted extensive research investigating the processes of urban change taking
cognizance of racial gaps in representation in terms of historic designation in Tampa, Hillsborough County, and Florida. This comprehensive comparison of the ethnic affiliation of historic sites had never been done in the City, County, or the State, and the results of this analysis (detailed in chapter three) clearly indicate a gap in the diversity of representation with regard to the treatment of historic buildings.

This analysis suggested that this lack of equity is tied to key historical and contemporary processes such as Urban Renewal and segregation policy that have affected the formation of contemporary urban landscapes. For example, this research indicates that in Tampa segregation led to the formation of a distinct historic African American urban enclave established in the mid to late nineteenth century (the Scrub and the associated Central Avenue business district). Likewise, the investigation of Urban Renewal projects and contemporary redevelopment plans demonstrated that this urban landscape has been greatly affected by demolition projects and that virtually nothing has been left intact to commemorate this landscape’s association with African Americans in Tampa. Greenbaum (1998) clarifies the extent of this demolition “Demolition of surrounding neighborhoods and ultimately the near total destruction of buildings in and around Central Avenue was the result. By the 1990’s there were few visible signs that it had ever existed. The eradication of Central Avenue eliminated evidence of the ‘business traditions’ that had existed in the African American community” (Greenbaum 1998:3). This analysis demonstrates that racist policies such as segregation accompanied by disproportionate demolition of African American urban enclaves have had a residual effect on historic preservation practice. The Tampa case study clearly demonstrates this pattern and the distribution of designated historic properties and districts is consistent
with this trend. Greenbaum (1998:3) explains that this pattern is not isolated to Tampa; indicating that future studies might apply UMAP toward the investigation of additional urban contexts in the U.S. “The same things that happened on Central Avenue more than twenty years ago were occurring in cities throughout the United States. Beal Street in Memphis, Auburn Avenue in Atlanta, Twelfth and Vine in Kansas City, and scores of other cultural treasures were thoughtlessly harmed or destroyed” (Greenbaum 1998:3). Further, the economics of real estate have systematically devalued black places and made neighborhoods, houses, and institutions of black people highly vulnerable to demolition.

Consistent with the current redevelopment initiative calling for the demolition of the contemporary Central Avenue Village neighborhood and its historic school (Meacham Elementary), all three of the historic urban renewal projects disproportionately affected Tampa’s African American population. For nearly fifty years these redevelopment initiatives have targeted areas historically occupied by African Americans in Tampa. This land has been sought after by City planners and developers since the mid twentieth century. Kerstein (2001:135) explains that Tampa “…selected its first project site the Maryland Avenue area between downtown and Ybor City, close to the former Scrub neighborhood where Central Park Village public housing had been built” (Kerstein 2001:135). This project represented the eastern expansion of the City into formerly segregated areas of Tampa once occupied by African Americans. Likewise, this study demonstrated that the next two urban renewal projects consolidated the downtown business district and the tourist district (Ybor City) as development expanded to the east and north by eliminating pockets of residential space historically occupied by African Americans in Tampa. Contemporary redevelopment efforts complete this cycle by
moving further north eradicating the last residential space historically associated with African Americans which happens to be situated between the interstate and Ybor City. This analysis indicates that this process has not been arbitrary, rather the prioritization of economic viability through the consolidation of business districts and increasing the City’s tax base has been a clear strategy embraced by City planners for nearly five decades. In 2001 Kerstein noted that “The cost of Tampa’s Urban Renewal projects were borne disproportionately by low and moderate income African Americans…Planners, the mayors, the majority of the city council, and Tampa’s most influential business leaders were in consensus that the potential economic viability of Tampa’s downtown and Ybor City areas were more important than the costs imposed upon a significant sector of the population” (Kerstein 2001:145). Therefore, this study suggests that in Tampa socioeconomic factors and ethnic affiliation have been correlated with the process of urban landscape change. I assert that processes initiating and perpetuating urban change are currently and have been historically aligned with the business interests of Tampa’s elite who sought out the “path of least resistance” as they eradicated landscapes they disapproved of in the name of economic improvement. This practice serves as an indicator of racist policy and its effect on power and place in urban contexts in the U.S.

The changes in Tampa’s urban landscape over the last fifty years illustrate the residual affects of urban landscape alteration on preservation policy and practice. This analysis found that within the City of Tampa, African Americans account for 26% of the contemporary population; however, only 11% of the structures currently designated as historic at the local level are affiliated with African American cultural heritage. As explained in chapter three, this contemporary comparison is appropriate for the Tampa
case because historic and contemporary African American population statistics are comparable. For example, between 1900 and 1930 the African American population in Tampa fluctuated between 28% (1900) and 21% (1930) (Howard et al. 1994:2, Mohlman 1995). These population statistics demonstrate that African Americans have consistently been a representative component of Tampa’s history.

This study further qualifies the appropriate use of population statistics as a means of comparison by asserting that it is also significant that the same urban space has been occupied by African Americans since before the start of the twentieth century. For example, if this population had been transient without a prolonged occupation of the same space, this comparison might not accurately account for representative cultural heritage in urban space. Additionally, the lone National Register site within the City limits of Tampa is currently Meacham Elementary (which is slated for demolition). Likewise, this analysis accounted for acreage dedicated to historic districts. It was found that less than 1% of urban space (~1 acre vs. 2000 acres) assigned to historic districts in Tampa is dedicated to African American history associated with the City.

The Tampa case study demonstrates that Urban Renewal is one cause for this pattern. This research indicates buildings that once catered to segregated African American populations have largely been destroyed by the expansion of the City’s downtown business district. The spaces where these structures once stood have been ascribed new identities as urban landscapes have evolved over time and their historical association with African American history is not represented by this generic disjointed built environment. The last vestiges of the historic Central Avenue enclave in Tampa will soon fall victim to this trend as it is demolished to make way for what contemporary
urban planners refer to as Tampa’s “new town square” which will replace the 483 public housing units that have surrounded Meacham Elementary for over 50 years with nearly 2000 residential units and an accompanying shopping district. Ironically, media coverage from June of 2007 indicates the surprise of Tampa City Council member Doretha Edgecomb at the fate of Meacham Elementary (Froelich 2007). This is ironic because at the March 8, 2006 City Council meeting in Tampa I made it clear that the school would be in imminent danger if the City Council voted to allow the 2007 Central Park Village Community Redevelopment Area Plan to move forward without accounting for the school.

Researching urban places and spaces initiated my collaboration with African Americans working to preserve Meacham Elementary as a symbol of African American cultural heritage in Tampa. This decision led to my work as an anthropological advocate (discussed in detail in chapter four) who chose to support others prioritizing a category of material evidence symbolizing African American cultural heritage in Tampa. My work as an advocate supporting the preservation of Meacham Elementary has been arduous and was met with resistance from the beginning. Since 2003 entities engaged in this conflict of interest over the historic status and the future treatment of the school have included myself, the community surrounding the school and supportive African American residents of Tampa such as Dorris Scott, Marie Sheehy, Mary Sheffied, Sara Sims, Karen Sanders, Ortha Wright, Yolanda Lane, Helen Taylor, Gloria Philmore and Rutha Harper (also noted in chapter four). Collaborators also included the family of the namesake of the school Christina Meacham (Ardreeta Harris, Jason Harris, and Sara Sims Arndreeta’s sister). Together we stood on one side of this issue versus various county and city
entities on the other including Hillsborough County Schools, the City of Tampa Preservation Office, the Tampa Historic Preservation Commission, and the Tampa Housing Authority. This advocacy and associated archival research demonstrated that while historic designation affords recognition in the present and documentation for the future, it does not ensure physical preservation. Likewise, my anthropological advocacy work demonstrates that anthropologists have the opportunity to apply historic preservation legislation initiatives as a tool to highlight the significance of symbols of cultural heritage. Experience drawn from this research demonstrates that knowledge preservation is better than no preservation at all.

This research context and my decisions as an ethical researcher have led me to pursue three associated research agendas. First, I served as an urban archaeologist. Next this context and personal insight led me to archival research investigating gaps in racial equity of historic designation. Third, I made the decision to take action as an anthropological advocate engaging a dynamic process that has resulted in multiple successes and at least one failure (the planned demolition of Meacham Elementary). This work has been successful because it has resulted in a change in the historic status and historic documentation of Meacham Elementary. Extensive documentation of this school and its association with African American educational opportunity in Tampa is now on record. Likewise, this research is successful because it is connected with an urban archaeology project that produced evidence that predated the first round of urban renewal affecting this urban landscape. Further, the mitigation plan set in motion by efforts to preserve the school (detailed below) clarifies protocol that serves to enhance representation of African American cultural heritage in Tampa that must accompany the
current redevelopment initiative. It is my hope that some time after the school is
demolished, urban archaeology might someday have the opportunity to be applied as a
method to provide tangible evidence complementing the documentation provided by this
research. While urban archaeology might potentially be applied to recover material
evidence of Meacham Elementary in the future, and documentary evidence has been
generated that might complement this investigation, it is disappointing that fragments of
this building and the associated cultural behavior that transpired there are all that will
endure Tampa’s latest large-scale demolition project. Knowledge preservation and
potential archaeological evidence might serve to symbolically represent this structure;
however, I assert that physical preservation of the school as an intact structure that could
be viewed by future generations. There are degrees of success with all research
initiatives, and this project would have been more successful if the school had been left
standing.

An Urban Model of Applied Preservation

This study represents a research model that enhances the anthropological study of
urban landscapes by clarifying a set of associated research agendas that might be applied
by anthropologists investigating the dynamic relationship between urban places/spaces
and associated cultural behavior. The application of these lines of evidence toward this
urban anthropological research study has manifested as what I propose as An Urban
Model of Applied Preservation (UMAP). Whether evaluating historical trends or
contemporary processes, it is my hope that this study will augment the work of
anthropologists investigating the places and events associated with cultural behavior
across time in urban space.
This model demonstrates that urban archaeological research can be applied to interpret cultural behavior associated with historical and contemporary urban landscapes. This component of the model emerged as I pursued a specific research question tied to the overall research agenda. I sought to answer: How might an anthropologist demonstrate historical continuity as a means to correlate urban space with a cultural group through time and what justification exists for this research? For this study this research question was engaged by applying urban archaeological methods to investigate an urban landscape associated with a historically segregated neighborhood in Tampa. As mentioned in chapter two, this urban space (Perry Harvey Park) is devoid of standing structures. Therefore, urban archaeology is particularly significant to UMAP because it can provide evidence of behavior associated with urban landscapes lacking standing structures. The spatial and historical context of the material evidence generated by this research (a product of the historic use of this landscape circa 1880 – 1970) was applied to validate the cultural significance of Meacham Elementary (a component of the contemporary landscape prioritized by this study). Therefore, urban archaeology represents a method that might be applied toward the collection of data (material evidence) associated with cultural behavior that can no longer be observed above the surface of the urban landscape. Even though the buildings located along Tampa’s historic Central Avenue Business District that once served as a focal point of cultural behavior were demolished under the auspices of urban renewal (discussed in chapter three), archaeology has produced evidence of those structures and of cultural behavior associated with the spaces they occupied.
Therefore, archaeological research represents the component of this model that might be applied to evaluate changes in an urban landscape after they have transpired. As is often the case with scientific inquiry, answering one question associated with this study led to the generation of more. Therefore, this discovery led to the formulation of a related research question: What other sources of evidence might be applied by anthropologists investigating the historical or contemporary process of urban landscape change? Further, how might these data sources complement archaeological data by demonstrating historical and contemporary processes associated with that change?

Consequently, urban structures were identified by this study as an appropriate source of data to engage these related questions. Data generated by this study was applied to evaluate historical and contemporary processes associated with the historical designation and preservation (or a lack thereof) of urban structures. This resulted in the recognition of a significant discrepancy between ethnicity and representative population versus the buildings that are preserved and their associated ethnic affiliations. Findings indicate a lack of preservation equity between ethnic/racial and socioeconomic groups whose urban space has been differentially affected by historic and contemporary demolition justified by government sponsored initiatives such as Urban Renewal. This analysis clearly indicates a lack of preservation equity based on ethnic affiliation at the city, county, and state levels and demonstrates that urban planning directly affects the application of historic preservation legislation. This analysis indicates that the results of urban planning can be measured by evaluating trends in historic designation established by local, state, and federal entities. The current research demonstrated that urban planning and urban change are not disconnected from the socioeconomic structure of
cities and of societies where they transpire. The Tampa case study indicates a strategy
designed to eradicate “substandard” African American residential and commercial spaces
and replace them with consolidated business districts augmented by direct Interstate
access and a prosperous tourist district. It would seem that development supposedly
aligned with improving the economic viability of urban space is prioritized over cultural
heritage; especially if you are poor and especially if you are not white.

The third related research question aimed at assessing urban landscape change
and cultural behavior associated with urban space focuses on those who may have
memory of that behavior. After recognizing the potential significance of urban space
with or without standing buildings this study sought to identify how those who participate
in cultural behavior might augment the anthropological study of urban space? Further,
this study sought to identify how anthropologists might work with community members
to engage the process of urban change that might affect their communities? For this
study, this question was pursued as a method to collect data to mobilize support toward
the preservation of Meacham Elementary school. As chapters three and four explain, this
school has stood as a symbol of African American cultural heritage in Tampa for over
eighty years and this study indicated that many of those who had a historical association
with the school prioritized its significance in the history of their community thereby
standing as a symbol of cultural heritage. This qualitative research culminated in
Participatory Action Research (discussed in chapter four) wherein family members of the
namesake of the school (Christina Meacham), members of the surrounding community,
and I worked together to preserve the school’s place in the history of the community.
Initially, this goal focused on physical preservation; after it was discovered that
preserving the school was not possible due to the economic interests of the City of Tampa, this goal shifted toward maximizing knowledge preservation of the school (a goal which has been met). This component of the model demonstrates that community members can serve as significant research partners who can provide valuable information based on first hand experience associated with urban landscapes and specific buildings. Likewise, when anthropologists work alongside community members to advocate preservation, historic inequities can be confronted (even if they can’t be resolved).

Therefore, the Applied Model of Urban Preservation has engaged a set of interrelated research questions and these questions led to the identification and investigation of several potential data sources that might be applied toward the anthropological study of urban landscapes and associated cultural behavior. Consequently, the investigation of previously standing structures and their historical cultural affiliation prioritized by this study highlighted the significance of this residual data. Likewise extant data sources such as standing structures and community members are recognized as sources of data that potentially clarify historical and contemporary processes affecting the cycle of urban landscape change.

Summarizing the Proposed Model

The Urban Model of Applied Preservation (UMAP) is designed as one potential framework for the anthropological investigation of historical and contemporary urban landscape change. This model consolidates a set of methods into an urban research framework generated from the investigation of the process of past, present, and emergent urban landscape change in the City of Tampa demonstrating that the model as applied in this study is intended to examine cities as research contexts. However, as explained in
chapter three an initial assessment of the State of Florida was also conducted to look for
trends in statewide data that might be utilized for future research at a statewide scale.
Therefore, chapter three clarifies that this model might be modified to account for
variation in the scale of inquiry and be applied toward the investigation of states, regions,
nations, or at a multi-national scale. The international nature of twentieth century
policies leading to dramatic urban landscape alteration has had a major impact on the
urban landscape of many cities around the world and continues to do so in the present
day. Examples of international cities demonstrating this process that might serve as
appropriate contexts for the future application of UMAP include: Beijing, China
bilbao.net/nuevobilbao/jsp/bilbao/homeModulosjsp?idioma=l&color=rojo), London,
England (2007:http://www.1ddchistory.org.uk/beforelddc/index.html), Melbourne,

Regardless of where it is applied and at what scale, this model represents a
framework for urban anthropological research designed to augment the retention (i.e.
preservation) of cultural heritage in urban space. It is recognized that this retention may
manifest as the documentation of cultural heritage before it is forgotten or as the
preservation of the built environment before it is altered or destroyed by future urban
change. The steps of this proposed model are outlined as follows.

I. Research the historical trajectory of the built environment of a given urban context.
A) Investigate the inception of that urban context and evaluate the geographic layout of the city making sure to note the presence or absence of historic “ethnic” enclaves such as the African American section of Tampa investigated by this study.

B) Identify historical processes that affected changes over time in the urban landscape. Two related processes identified by this study include state sponsored segregation and Urban Renewal.

II. Interrogate the processes that have resulted in urban landscape change. Compare historical urban landscape use with contemporary trends and prioritize factors such as socioeconomic and ethnic associations with urban space through time.

A) Incorporate data from step I to evaluate whether historically segregated urban spaces allocated to non-white urban populations (especially African Americans since they have been the largest minority population in the vast majority of U.S. cities including Tampa) have been differentially affected by large scale redevelopment projects such as those promoted by urban renewal policy.

B) Consider economic implications. Investigate whether large scale construction projects altering the landscape have disproportionately affected urban spaces historically and or currently occupied by groups with low socioeconomic status.

C) Likewise make sure to consider the potential affects of local politics on the process of urban change. This study demonstrated the profound affect of local politics on the preservation of Meacham Elementary.

III. Determine whether preservation equity exists in your urban study area. This can be achieved by investigating the practice of historic preservation in a given urban context.

Determine what has been designated as historically significant in your urban study area.
and evaluate ethnic affiliation and the spatial orientation of designated sites. For Tampa, a measure of equity was established relative to population through time. As clarified above and in chapter three, the relatively stable African American population that has persisted since the onset of the twentieth century accompanied by continuous occupation of a formerly segregated urban space by this distinct ethnic group justified this strategy.

A) Recognize that if a historically significant space is located in a formerly segregated urban space that catered primarily to non-black populations it is not likely to be associated culturally (by historic preservation offices) with African Americans. This is not to suggest that African American cultural activities (such as work) should be overlooked in these areas. In fact it points to the significance of these behaviors because they are typically overlooked. In this model I propose that anthropologists endeavor to investigate historical cultural associations of urban space themselves rather than relying on descriptions provided by historical designation forms.

IV. Take Action. If preservation inequity exists between socioeconomic and or ethnic groups, this model calls for action (if preservation is equitable your analysis will demonstrate this to be the case).

A) Apply data collected thus far to confront inequality if it is discovered. Additionally, a research design should be formulated clarifying specific methods designed to generate data that will engage this inequity. Research agendas might include: urban archaeology, the application of historic preservation legislation facilitating either physical preservation or knowledge preservation, and or accompanying anthropological advocacy. These methods were successfully applied to engage preservation inequity in
Tampa and this project demonstrates that contemporary research cannot change the past, however, it can make a difference for the future.

As outlined above, the first component of the UMAP framework requires an investigation of the historic context of the urban study area. This step is essential to the overall model which proposes that the analysis of historical events associated with urban landscape change provides a starting point for contemporary research investigating this process. Two historical trends identified by UMAP that had a profound affect on Tampa’s historic and contemporary urban landscape were the process of Urban Renewal and state sponsored segregation. In Tampa and in other cities across the U.S. state sponsored segregation (circa 1870-1970) was designed to require the collective use of specific components of the urban landscape by either white or black U.S. citizens; it thereby delineated the social use of urban space in U.S. cities. Therefore, this policy accounts for differential historic use of urban landscape by two distinct groups of urban residents. This approach accounts for this prescribed landscape use by prioritizing the affects of this policy which limited or outlawed the use of certain urban spaces by African Americans.

The Tampa case study demonstrated that since the late 1950’s formerly segregated areas of the city historically associated with African Americans have been systematically targeted by large-scale urban redevelopment projects. Research indicates that for nearly fifty years the same City has disproportionately designated buildings associated with non black populations as historically significant while at the same time carrying out policies to systematically eliminate buildings and spaces defined by the historic government segregation policy as exclusively African American urban spaces.
This study has shown that representative historic buildings associated with the white urban population have been preserved in Tampa and buildings associated with black populations have been devalued and destroyed. It is clear that urban spaces in Tampa that were historically segregated and specifically allocated to the historic African American population have been disproportionately demolished. For example, all three of the urban renewal projects carried out in Tampa were consistent with this pattern. Likewise, the current redevelopment initiative that will result in the demolition of Meacham Elementary is consistent with this pattern. Therefore, UMAP proposes that when engaging causes and effects of contemporary redevelopment projects, background research should set the stage for a basis of comparison across time in urban space. The historic approach investigating specific urban contexts advocated by this model clarifies that comprehensive landscape change has a residual affect on cultural heritage representation in urban space. Consequently, when urban landscapes are subject to demolition and subsequent redevelopment UMAP recognizes that symbols of cultural heritage can be replaced by new structures that may or may not be consistent with the historical use of urban space.

It follows that background research undertaken as a component of UMAP should identify the most potentially productive category or categories of evidence to collect and apply toward the anthropological investigation of how, and why urban landscape change occurred. Variation in urban history will clarify that some urban contexts require urban archaeological research and others may justify anthropological advocacy. However, this model ensures that the goal of preserving cultural heritage is facilitated (knowledge preservation or the preservation of material symbols).
For example, background research assessing historical trends associated with broad scale urban change in the Tampa study area demonstrated that direct access to business and tourist districts has served to justify unjust urban planning protocol which has in-turn affected the practice of historic preservation in Tampa. Therefore, UMAP proposes that anthropologists assess this affect in a given urban context by evaluating what has been designated as historically significant and prioritizing the historic ethnic affiliation of designated properties. Next this model proposes that these associations be compared with contemporary population estimates as a means to gauge historic preservation equity in a given urban context.

Fundamental to the application of this model to Tampa is the notion that equitable preservation should be comparable to relative population size of ethnic groups categorized as black or white by the U.S. census. When preservation is found to be less than equitable, UMAP calls for research investigating underlying causes. It is significant to note that a measure of equity must be defined by research context. For example, in Tampa equity was measured based on representative preservation for an ethnic group; however this may not be appropriate in all contexts. Therefore, researching the historical processes and cultural variation particular to a given context should serve to clarify appropriate measures that might be utilized to evaluate equity.

Next, this model calls for action. If an anthropologist chooses to apply his or her skills to engage this lack of preservation equity across urban space this research agenda might lead to anthropological advocacy (as it did with this study). Whether or not urban anthropologists act as advocates or empower others to advocate for themselves, the steps outlined in this model will facilitate urban preservation of cultural heritage as either
preserved knowledge or symbolic material evidence. UMAP proposes that anthropologists engage preservation inequity by working with community members to facilitate the historic designation of buildings they consider historically significant to their own cultural heritage (such as the historic association of Meacham Elementary with African American history in Tampa).

Researching the equity of preservation practice through the course of this study indicates that historic designation does not always equate to physical preservation, however it does facilitate knowledge preservation in the form of documentary evidence. The application of this model to Tampa demonstrates its potential success as a means to facilitate knowledge preservation in the form of comprehensive documentary evidence and I am grateful to have worked with others to have affected Meacham Elementary’s place in history. Likewise, I am hopeful that the model generated by this study will aid the contemporary and future anthropological engagement of the myriad processes of urban landscape change.
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Appendices
Appendix A: Summary Descriptions of Historic Districts in Tampa

Hyde Park (8HI1050)
“Hyde Park is significant as the oldest and best preserved of Tampa’s early residential neighborhoods. With structures dating from the late 1800s through the 1920s, the houses in Hyde Park are representative of the various architectural styles favored by Americans prior to World War II. Housing types range from wood frame shotgun houses to high style masonry mansions. The area is marked by a variety of other structures as well: apartment buildings, churches, commercial buildings, and even light industrial structures—all from the historic period. Established as a neighborhood for Tampa’s wealthier citizens, the area eventually attracted persons of all economic backgrounds. The area is also associated with the pioneer settlement of the Tampa Bay region and its early economic development. In addition to the majority of its older houses, Hyde Park has retained much of its original ambience and streetscape” (National Register Nomination Form: Hyde Park, Tampa, Florida 1985 Section 8:1).

West Tampa (8HI1076)
“West Tampa Historic District contains a variety of residential, commercial, social, and industrial buildings in an area located north and west of downtown Tampa. Established in 1893, West Tampa grew an as independent city until 1925. Building continued in West Tampa until the depression of the early 1930s. The building stock remaining includes excellent examples of frame vernacular and bungalow style housing from the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The district also contains brick vernacular commercial buildings and the elaborate Social Clubs from the early 20th century. The most important buildings in the district are the 11 three-story brick cigar factories. The area has traditionally housed low to middle income minority working families and continues to do so. The major intrusion in the area is the interstate highway” (National Register Nomination Form: West Tampa Historic District, Tampa, Florida 1983:Section 7:1).

Ybor City (8HI1313)
“Founded in 1886, Ybor City is significant in Spanish- and Cuban-American immigration history. The district is also of importance in American industrial history, for it contains the largest collection of buildings related to the cigar industry in America and probably the world. In addition to factories, the district’s buildings include workers’ housing; the ethnic clubs organized by Ybor City’s immigrants, who included Italians and Germans as well as Cubans and Spaniards; and the commercial buildings that served the community. Most buildings date to the first two decades of the 20th century. Historically, Ybor City was a rare multi-ethnic and multi-racial industrial community in the Deep South and is highly illustrative of manifold aspects of the history of ethnic and race relations” (National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form: Ybor City Historic District, Tampa, Florida 1990:1).

Seminole Heights (8HG3294)
“The Seminole Heights Residential District is an approximately 170 acre residential neighborhood located about three miles from downtown Tampa. The district contains mainly single family dwellings dating from c. 1912 to 1939. In addition, the area contains a school, several churches and other buildings associated with non-commercial functions. The houses in the district are mainly bungalows, but a wide variety of architectural styles—typical of those that were popular in the first half of the 20th century in the United States—are represented in the neighborhood. The district comprises 438 structures, of which 325 are contributing and 113 are noncontributing. Noncontributing buildings include those erected after 1942 or those constructed prior to that date that have been severely altered” (National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form: Seminole Heights Historic District, Tampa, Florida 1993:Section 7:1).
Tampa Heights (8HI5688)
“The Tampa Heights Historic District comprises approximately 200 acres and contains 427 buildings, the majority of which are single family dwellings. The district also features several churches, a school, a fire station, and a handful of commercial buildings. There are 289 structures (68 percent) that contribute to the historic character of the neighborhood, while 138 (32 percent) are considered noncontributing. The historic buildings date from c. 1980 to 1945 and represent a wide variety of architectural styles. Most of the houses in the district are bungalows or wood frame vernacular residences erected between circa 1910 and 1925; however the district also features examples of such formal styles as Colonial Revival, Queen Anne, Tudor Revival, and Mediterranean Revival” (National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form: Tampa Heights Historic District, Tampa, Florida 1995:Section 7:1).

Hampton Terrace (8HI6821)
“The Hampton Terrace Historic District is an approximately 115 acre residential neighborhood located about three miles north of downtown Tampa, Florida. The neighborhood is dominated by single family dwellings dating from the 1920s to the present. A variety of architectural styles, typical of those that were popular in the United States during the first half of the 20th century, are represented in the neighborhood. Most of the homes in the district are small and have little ornamental detailing. All of the buildings in the district are either single family or multiple family dwellings. The district contains 421 buildings, of which 304 are contributing and 117 are noncontributing. This is a ratio of 72 percent contributing to 28 percent noncontributing. The noncontributing buildings include those erected after 1948 and those constructed prior to that date that have been severely altered within the last 50 years” (National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form ‘Form 10-900’: Hampton Terrace Historic District, Tampa, Florida 1998:Section 7:1).
## Appendix B: City of Tampa Local Historic Landmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landmark Name</th>
<th>Landmark Address</th>
<th>Date of Construction</th>
<th>Designation Criteria</th>
<th>Landmark Use: Residential, Commercial, Public, Religion, Public Education, Social Club, Public Transportation</th>
<th>Historic Affiliation/Significance: Personal, Public, Ethnicity/Cultural?</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>NR Site</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beach Park Gateway</td>
<td>4200 Block of W. Swann Ave.</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berriman-Morgan Cigar Factory</td>
<td>1403 N. Howard Ave.</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>A, C</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Tampa Cigar Industry</td>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biglow-Helms House</td>
<td>4807 Bayshore Blvd.</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>B, C</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Personal: S. Lus Biglow, Jack Wilson (developers &amp; businessmen)</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel District Warehouse</td>
<td>204 N. 12th Street</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Bank Building</td>
<td>4902 Commerce Street</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>A, C</td>
<td>Commercial Bank</td>
<td>Architectural Style (Neoclassical Revival)</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuscaden Park &amp; Pool</td>
<td>2900 N. 15th Street</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>A, B, C</td>
<td>Public Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David L. Tippen Water Treatment Facility</td>
<td>7125 N. 30th Street</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>A, C</td>
<td>Public Water Treatment</td>
<td>Public: Tampa Waterworks Treatment Facility</td>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro Espanol de West Tampa</td>
<td>2306 N. Howard Ave.</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>A, C</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Ethnicity: Spanish</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station No. 1</td>
<td>720 E. Zack St.</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>A, C</td>
<td>Public Fire Station</td>
<td>Public: Museum</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floridian Hotel</td>
<td>905 N. Florida Ave.</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Homer Hesterly Armory</td>
<td>522 N. Howard Ave.</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Public School</td>
<td>3610 E. 10th Ave.</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>A, C</td>
<td>Public Education</td>
<td>Non-black segregated school</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Mt. Moriah Primitive Baptist Church</td>
<td>1225 N. Nebraska Ave.</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>A, C</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guida House</td>
<td>1516 Renfrew St.</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Personal: George Guida Sr. (Italian businessman &amp; civic leader) Mediterranean Style</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmark Name</td>
<td>Landmark Address</td>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>Designation Criteria</td>
<td>Landmark Use: Residential, Commercial, Public, Religion, Public Education, Social Club, Public Transportation</td>
<td>Historic Affiliation/ Significance: Personal, Public, Ethnicity/Cultural?</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Cass Street Bridge</td>
<td>Cass Street</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>Bridge over Hillsborough River</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Columbus Drive Bridge</td>
<td>Michigan Ave.</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>Bridge over Hillsborough River</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic T.N. Henderson Bridge</td>
<td>Hillsborough Ave.</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>Bridge over Hillsborough River</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Kennedy Blvd. Bridge</td>
<td>Lafayette Street</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>Bridge over Hillsborough River</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Laurel Street Bridge</td>
<td>Fortune Street</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>Bridge over Hillsborough River</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Platt Street Bridge</td>
<td>Platt Street</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>Bridge over Hillsborough River</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough County High School/D.W. Waters Center</td>
<td>2704 N. Highland Ave</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>A, C</td>
<td>Public Education</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Lodge #25 F &amp; M</td>
<td>508 E. Kennedy Blvd.</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>Social Club</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kid Mason Center</td>
<td>1101 N. Jefferson St.</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>Store/Social Services</td>
<td>Personal: Kid Mason Fendall (black businessman)</td>
<td>Ethnicity/Cultural Affiliation: African American</td>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Kiley Garden</td>
<td>400 N. Ashley Dr.</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter O. Knight Cottage/Tampa Historic Social Building</td>
<td>245 S. Hyde Parke Ave</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>B, C</td>
<td>Residential/Social Club</td>
<td>Personal: Peter Knight (Pioneering Industrialist and community leader)</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacFarlane Park</td>
<td>1801 N. Lincoln Ave</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Peoples Home/The Home</td>
<td>1202 E. 22nd Ave.</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Tampa Waterworks Pumping Station</td>
<td>1810 N. Highland Ave.</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Public Water</td>
<td>Public Water Pumping Station</td>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palace of Florence</td>
<td>45 Davis Blvd.</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>A, B, C</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Residential Appartment Bldg: Davis Island (mediterranian style)</td>
<td>Personal: D.P. Davis (developer)</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmerin Hotel</td>
<td>115 E. Davis Blvd.</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Public Hotel</td>
<td>Public: Upper Scale Hotel: Davis Island</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Missionary Baptist Church</td>
<td>1112 Scott Street</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant-Hatton House</td>
<td>4505 W. Beachway Drive</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Residential Dwelling</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landmark Name</th>
<th>Landmark Address</th>
<th>Date of Construction</th>
<th>Designation Criteria</th>
<th>Landmark Use: Residential, Commercial, Public, Religion, Public Education, Social Club, Public Transportation</th>
<th>Historic Affiliation/Significance: Personal, Public, Ethnicity/Cultural?</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Site Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seybold Bakery</td>
<td>420 S. Dakota Ave</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Commercial Bakery</td>
<td>Bakery</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicilian Club</td>
<td>2001 N. Howard Ave.</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Social Club</td>
<td>Ethnicity/Cultural: Sicilian/Italian American (mediterranean style)</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souder's Building</td>
<td>115 S. Fielding St.</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>A, C</td>
<td>Residential Dwelling</td>
<td>Private Residence: currently used as office</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter Claver School</td>
<td>1401 N. Governor Street</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Private Education</td>
<td>Not in folder in preservation office; Private Catholic School that catered to African Americans</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulphur Springs Tower</td>
<td>8105 N. Fl Ave</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay Hotel/Plant Hall</td>
<td>401 W. Kennedy Boulevard</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>A, C</td>
<td>Public Hotel</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa’s Cigar Factories/Multiple Properties Group</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Cigar Factories</td>
<td>Cigar Industry of Tampa</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa City Hall</td>
<td>315 Kennedy Ave.</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>A, C</td>
<td>Public City Hall</td>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Free Library/Old Tampa Free Library</td>
<td>102 E. 7th Ave.</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Theatre and Office Building</td>
<td>707 thru 711 N. Franklin Street</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Mediterranean Revival Style</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Union Station</td>
<td>601 N. Nebraska Ave.</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Public Railroad current: storage</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tecco Trolley Barn/Tampa Armature Works</td>
<td>1910 N. Ola Ave.</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>A, C, D</td>
<td>Transportation/Industry</td>
<td>Development of Tampa as a Port City: 1911-1946</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toles-Comb</td>
<td>1822 E. Park St.</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Depot Hotel</td>
<td>862 E. Zack Street</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>A, C</td>
<td>Public Hotel</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Tampa Public Library</td>
<td>1718 N. Howard</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jacob White/Dr. Jacob White Sr. House</td>
<td>3321 N. 22nd Street</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>A, B, C</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Ethnicity: African American</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bebe Zaharias Golf Course</td>
<td>11412 N. Forest Hills Dr.</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>Personal: Mildred “Bebe” Didrikson Zaharias 1949-2006 (helped found the LPGA)</td>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zion Evangelical Lutheran Church</td>
<td>2901 N. Highland Ave.</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>A, C</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Gothic Revival Style</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix C: City of Tampa Local Historic Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>Period of Historical Significance</th>
<th>Year of Local District Designation</th>
<th>National Register District Y/N, Year of Designation?</th>
<th>Overall Acreage</th>
<th>Number of Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>1886-1933</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Y, 1985</td>
<td>860 +/-</td>
<td>839 contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>561 non contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135 non-contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Heights</td>
<td>1890-1945</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Y, 1995</td>
<td>200 +/-</td>
<td>304 contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>187 non-contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ybor City</td>
<td>1886-1940</td>
<td>1975; expanded in 2002</td>
<td>Y, 1974</td>
<td>601 +/-</td>
<td>1,180 contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>546 non-contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hapton Terrace</td>
<td>1913-1955</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>140 +/-</td>
<td>Not yet defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Harbor View Avenue</td>
<td>1913-1926</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Not yet defined</td>
<td>27 contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 non-contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Tampa</td>
<td>1894-1955</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Not yet defined</td>
<td>Not yet defined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes: A contributing building is consistent with the theme(s) and or date range prioritized by the historic district nomination. A non-contributing building has either been significantly altered or was built after the significant historic period the district represents.
## Appendix D: National Register of Historic Places Sites in Tampa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Register Site Name</th>
<th>NR Site Address</th>
<th>Date of Construction</th>
<th>Date of Designation</th>
<th>Designation Criteria</th>
<th>Landmark Use: Residential, Commercial, Public, Religion, Private Social Club</th>
<th>Historic Affiliation/Significance: Personal, Public, Ethnicity/Cultural Affiliation</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>City of Tampa Local ? Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson-Frank House</td>
<td>341 S. Plant Ave.</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>C (Architecture)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Colonial Revival Style Arch.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berriman-Morgan Cigar Factory</td>
<td>1403 N. Howard Ave.</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>A, C (local)</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Tampa Cigar Industry</td>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciculo Cubano (Cuban Club)</td>
<td>2010 N. Avenida Republica De Cuba-(10th ave and 14th Street)</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Political Social/Humanitarian</td>
<td>Social Club (for men)</td>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis House</td>
<td>808 E. Curtis Street</td>
<td>1905-06</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuscaden Park &amp; Pool</td>
<td>2900 N. 15th Street</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>A, B, C (local)</td>
<td>Public Park</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro Espanol De West Tampa</td>
<td>2306 N. Howard Ave.</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>A, C</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Ethnicity: Spanish</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro Espanol De Tampa</td>
<td>1526-1536 7th Ave./Currently 1532 7th Ave</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Ethnic History</td>
<td>Social Club</td>
<td>Ethnicity: Spanish</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Pasaje</td>
<td>1318 9th Ave.</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floridian Hotel</td>
<td>905 N. Florida Ave.</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>C (Architecture)</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Public Hotel</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register Site Name</td>
<td>NR Site Address</td>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>Date of Designation</td>
<td>Designation Criteria</td>
<td>Landmark Use: Residential, Commercial, Public, Religion, Private Social Club</td>
<td>Historic Affiliation/Significance: Personal, Public, Ethnicity/ Cultural Affiliation</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>City of Tampa Local? Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Homer Hesterly Armory</td>
<td>522 N. Howard Ave.</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Pending 2005</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Public Armory</td>
<td>U.S. Military</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gardner House</td>
<td>209 W. Palm Ave.</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Lodge #25 F &amp; AM</td>
<td>508 E. Kennedy Blvd.</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Community members &amp; architecture</td>
<td>Social Club</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson House</td>
<td>304 Plant Ave.</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Second Empire Style</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson-Wolff House</td>
<td>6823 S. De Soto Street</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Architecture Social/Humanitarian</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Occupied Residence</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leiman House</td>
<td>716 S. Newport Ave.</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>C (Architecture)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Occupied Residence</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Peoples Home/The Home Association</td>
<td>1203 E. 22nd Ave.</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>A (Social History, Health/Medicine) C (Architecture)</td>
<td>Nursing Home, Colonial Revival</td>
<td>Health Care, Residential</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old School House</td>
<td>University of South Florida Campus - Lafayette Street</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>C (Architecture) A (Education)</td>
<td>Private School (relocated)</td>
<td>Private School for Girls</td>
<td>Private: Daughters of the American Revolution</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Tampa Children’s Home</td>
<td>3302-3306 N. Florida Ave.</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmerin Hotel</td>
<td>115 E. Davis Blvd.</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>C (Architecture)</td>
<td>Public Hotel</td>
<td>Davis Island/Upper Scale: Mediterranean Style</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Register Site Name</th>
<th>NR Site Address</th>
<th>Date of Construction</th>
<th>Date of Designation</th>
<th>Designation Criteria</th>
<th>Landmark Use: Residential, Commercial, Public, Religion, Private Social Club</th>
<th>Historic Affiliation/ Significance: Personal, Public, Ethnicity/ Cultural Affiliation</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>City of Tampa Local ? Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robles House</td>
<td>2604 E. Hanna</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>A,B,C (local)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Personal: Robles Family (pioneers)</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seybold Bakery</td>
<td>420 S. Dakota</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>C (local)</td>
<td>Commercial Bakery</td>
<td>Bakery</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.H. Kress Bldg.</td>
<td>811 N. Franklin Street</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souder’s Building</td>
<td>115 S. Fielding Ave.</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>A,C (local)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Residential (currently office)</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS America Victory</td>
<td>705 Channelside Dr.-Berth 271</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stovall House</td>
<td>4621 Bayshore Blvd.</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Occupied Residence</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taliaferro House</td>
<td>305 S. Hyde Park Ave.</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay Hotel/Plant Hall</td>
<td>401 W. Kennedy Blvd.</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Architecture Literature Military</td>
<td>Public Hotel</td>
<td>Public Hotel</td>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa City Hall</td>
<td>315 E. Kennedy Blvd.</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Free Library</td>
<td>102 E. 7th Ave.</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>A,C</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Theatre &amp; Office Bldg.</td>
<td>703-711 N. Franklin Street</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Architecture Theatre</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Union Station</td>
<td>601 N. Nebraska Ave.</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Public Railroad</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampania House</td>
<td>4611 W. North A Street</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>C (Architecture) A (Community Planning)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Residential (currently commercial)</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Depot Hotel</td>
<td>862 E. Zack Street</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>A,C (local)</td>
<td>Public Hotel</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Tampa Public Library</td>
<td>1718 N. Howard Ave.</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ybor Factory Bldg.</td>
<td>Currently 1901 N. 13th Street</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Cigar Factory</td>
<td>Cigar Industry</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Included in Tampa’s Cigar Factories/Multiple Properties Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Name And Florida Site #</th>
<th>Year of Designation</th>
<th>Designation Criteria</th>
<th>Period of Historical Significance</th>
<th>Number of Contributing Structures</th>
<th>Historic Affiliation</th>
<th>Function/Use</th>
<th>Acreage +/-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Tampa (8HI1076)</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>A,B,C</td>
<td>1893-1933</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>Architecture, Commerce</td>
<td>Domestic, Commercial, Religion, Domestic</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole Heights (8HI3294)</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>A,C</td>
<td>1912 - 1939</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Architecture, Community Planning and Development</td>
<td>Education, Religion, Domestic</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Heights (8HI5688)</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>A,C</td>
<td>1890 - 1945</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>Architecture, Community Planning and Development</td>
<td>Education, Religion, Domestic</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Terrace (8HI6821)</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>A,C</td>
<td>1920 – 1948</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>Architecture, Community Planning and Development</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Franklin Street (8HI8536)</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>A,C</td>
<td>1903 – 1921</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Architecture, Commerce</td>
<td>Commerce, Domestic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean Revival Style Buildings of Davis Island (8HI3633)</td>
<td></td>
<td>A,C</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Architecture, Community Planning and Development</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(National Register of Historic Places National Register Information System: [http://www.nr.nps.gov/nr/research/nris.htm](http://www.nr.nps.gov/nr/research/nris.htm))
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