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Endangered heritage lists are important for the preservation of monuments and other threatened sites of historical and cultural significance. In addition to the international list of World Heritage in Danger, many countries – and even state governments in the U.S. – have established national endangered heritage lists. This includes Florida’s 11 to Save list, established by the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation. This study focuses on sites which appeared on the list one or more times from 2005 to 2017.

Using case studies and mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative analyses), the researcher reports clearly positive impacts that have resulted for sites that have appeared on Florida’s 11 to Save list. Inclusion on the list seems to have brought awareness of – and responsibility for – Florida’s endangered sites. Thus far, 21 of the 58 endangered sites have been saved (while four have been demolished). Some unchanged sites do have plans for future restoration. Further, the 21 “saved” sites are now designated as “protected.” Much of the preservation efforts occurred as a result of a site’s inclusion on the endangered list.
Although Florida’s 11 to Save list can positively impact plans and funds, the list does not directly determine preservation. Note that the list does not have any legal impact. Nonetheless, it is believed that an appearance on the endangered list is an important step toward preservation and funding.

The research suggests that increased publicity for the endangered list would encourage more people to get involved in saving sites and reducing threats. And these efforts should not be limited to Florida. The Florida Trust for Historic Preservation may want to work with other conservation organizations throughout the U.S. – or even the world.

This study is important for the organization of historic preservation. The survey used can provide organizations with advice on future work – especially in regard to protecting endangered heritages. Furthermore, it demonstrates the role of the list and provides inspiration for how to protect the endangered sites.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Endangered heritage lists have become a very important part of historic preservation. In particular, the establishment of endangered heritage lists is crucial when many monuments are faced with increasing threats and difficult circumstances. Thus endangered lists have become a widely used tool by historic preservation specialists and communities in their efforts to save and preserve threatened historic places and cultural resources.

In fact, endangered heritage list has gradually attracted the attention of people from all over the world. Especially, many organizations of historic preservation have established various endangered lists to protect various sites, including buildings, historic districts, cultural relics, and so on. At present, in addition to the international list of “world heritage in danger,” many countries have established national endangered heritage lists. In the United States, even many state governments have created endangered heritage lists. Therefore, when there are an increasing number of heritages which have become endangered heritages for a variety of reasons, it is imperative to research the role and influence of endangered heritage lists. Not only can we provide more and more endangered heritages with rescue measures, but also avoid heritages from being damaged.

Historic preservation is a protecting activity of upper-class antiquarians, architects, who tried to save many kinds of historic relics, including antiques, architectures, sites, districts, even streets, towns, and cities. When the scale and complexity of the work of preservationists expands, more and more people can join this
work and more and more sites need to be protected.¹ In the Western world, historic preservation is an independent discipline with origins in the early 19th century. Humankind’s exploration of aesthetics and interest in history and culture – among other pursuits – has helped grow the discipline. Historic preservation started in the exploration phase: European scholars from different countries put forward a strategy for protecting ancient buildings. Since then, the establishment of the World Heritage Convention in 1972 has greatly promoted the development of historic preservation and has helped cultural heritage conservation globally. ²

Nowadays, while the scale and complexity of preservation has expanded today, Millennials are leading the charge, and research shows that they are more interested in history than any previous generation.³ As the result, more and more people are interested in preservation and express their opinions although they are not even preservationists. Until now, the United States, China, and many other countries have established various kinds of historic preservation laws, public agencies and national organizations. For example, Americans have established National Trust for Historic Preservation (1949); Chinese have established Chinese National Committee for International Council on Monuments and Sites (1993). With the rapid development of historical preservation, many related lists have been created in different periods,

² Jokilehto, Jukka. A history of architectural conservation. Routledge, Taylor et Francis Group, 2018
³ Stephanie Meeks. Past Forward 2014 Opening Remarks, National Trust for Historic Preservation Conference, Nov. 12, 2014
including heritage list and endangered heritages list, which have been put together for many different reasons.

Although historic preservation has received attention and support, international organizations and governments at all levels have issued guidelines and laws to protect historic sites. But some heritages are still missing for various reasons. Under these circumstances, the researcher noticed that many organizations of historic preservation have established lists of endangered heritages. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) set up the “World Heritage List” (1978) and the list of “World Heritage in Danger” (1982) respectively after establishment of the “World Heritage Convention” (1972). 4 “The National Trust for Historic Preservation” (1949) of the United States established the list of “America’s 11 Most Endangered Places” (1988). 5 And, among the various state-government organizations of historic preservation, more than half of the committees have established statewide lists for endangered sites. However, the researcher found in the surveys and in previous research that no relevant articles discussed the role of the endangered heritage list. There are also no data and tests to show whether endangered heritage list is helpful for the selected endangered sites. As a result, the researcher decided to ascertain whether

---


5 @Saving Places | National Trust for Historic Preservation.” @SavingPlaces | National Trust for Historic Preservation, savingplaces.org/.
the list had a positive effect on the selected relics by examining the “Florida’s 11 to Save” established by the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation (1978).  

This study focuses on “Florida’s 11 to Save” list and its effects on selected heritages in Florida. The study will be presented in six sections: an introduction; a literature review; a section on methodology; a section on outcomes; and a section with conclusions and suggestions.

In this introduction, the researcher presents a rational for this study and questions that are to be answered by this study. In the literature review, the researcher describes various lists appearing at different stages in history of historic preservation, the importance of the endangered heritage list for preservation – focusing on several endangered heritage lists (the list of “World Heritage in Danger,” the list of “America’s 11 Most Endangered Places” and the list of “Florida’s 11 to Save”), exploring the causes, levels, types, significance and necessity. In the section on methodology, the researcher focuses on two methodologies – case study and mixed methods (including survey and data analysis). In the outcomes section, the researcher details the research process and a series of findings. In the conclusions, the researcher explains what the data and information mean and offers opinions and makes suggestions in regard to the list of “Florida’s 11 to Save” established by the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation.

This study on the impact on selected heritages as a result of being listed on Florida’s 11 to Save provides an analysis of the endangered heritage list and also provides references and opinions for other historic protection organizations which have established lists of their own.

---

CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Much of the work of historic preservation specialists, public agencies and private organizations has addressed threats to heritage sites and cultural resources. These threats range from material decay due to natural weathering and human impact to destruction caused by benign neglect or deliberate demolition. Many historic preservation organizations have endangered lists and programs to raise public awareness and advocate saving endangered buildings.

An endangered heritage list is not only a demonstration of people's determination to protect endangered sites, but also a popular way to protect endangered sites. This approach has been accepted by many countries. From this investigation, the researcher found a variety of threats to the historical sites, but also found a variety of endangered heritage lists. This method of protecting the monuments has become more commonplace than before.

Definition of Endangered Heritage List

Endangered can be seen as a situation which is in danger of being harmed, lost, unsuccessful. Heritage is the history, traditions and qualities that a country or society has had for many years and that are considered an important part of its character.¹ So endangered heritage is a quite important thing, full of historic or cultural values, but it is also being harmed by different threats. According to contents of endangered heritage list, endangered heritages are described as important and rare sites which could reflect the activities of humankind in the past. They are important

certifications in archeology research and they can also provide irreplaceable and irreproducible information about the development of area and social life. By exploring endangered heritages, people can realize the physical characteristics, ancient culture and customs, which are signs and symbols of human civilization, universal regulation.

According to the list of World Heritage in Danger (1982) and America’s 11 Most Endangered Places (1988), the endangered heritage list is designed to inform the international community of conditions which threaten the very characteristics for which a property was inscribed and to encourage corrective action. America’s 11 Most Endangered Places (1988) definite endangered heritage list as a list, which has identified more than 270 sites to date and it could raise awareness about the threats facing some of the nation's greatest treasures.

After browsing through many endangered heritage lists, the researcher defines endangered heritage list for historic preservation as a formal document which records threats and significances of endangered historic sites. The list provides information on historic sites in danger. Several aspects for each heritage can be found on the list, such as age, location, history, significance, integrity, photos and so on. In particular, threats are the highlight of the endangered heritage list.

In addition to providing basic information on endangered historic sites, endangered heritage lists also could manage archeological resources at dangerous status. The list provides an assessment of endangered resources to preserve

---


3 “National Trust for Historic Preservation: Return to home page.” America’s Most Endangered Historic Places | National Trust for Historic Preservation, savingplaces.org/
archeological resources in an effort to manage and curtail existing threats to these resources.

**Movement of Historic Preservation and Heritage List**

With development of the concept of historic preservation, the French, Italians and British and many others of different nationalities have established various lists related to historic preservation in all periods, including lists of monuments, of buildings, of endangered buildings, etc. These lists are the result of phased development of historic preservation as well as sites or architecture on lists that reflect the development of the theory in historic preservation.

In this essay, the development of historic preservation and heritage list have been grouped into three stages: the exploration phase (the French School, the British School, the Italian School); the formation of international historic preservation (the Athens Charter, the Venice Charter, the World Heritage Convention) and the improvement of national historic preservation (U.S. National Preservation Act). In the three stages of the development of historic preservation, many lists of historic preservation have been set up for different reasons and purposes. Continuously updated lists not only reflect doctrine changes, but also reflect different problems which happened in different periods.  

**Exploration Phase of Historic Preservation and Ancient Heritage Lists**

In Western world, historic preservation originated in Europe. The Italians have enjoyed a cult of Classical culture since the fourteenth century.  

---

4 Jokilehto, Jukka. *A history of architectural conservation*. Routledge, Taylor et Francis Group, 2018

texts and collecting ancient coins, among other activities, Italians developed a deep interest in ancient history and historic relics. Not only did Europeans begin to collect ancient Greek and Roman artifacts, they were also interested in the historic sites of Palestine, Egypt, and other countries with significant remains from ancient cultures. During the European Renaissance (the Fourteenth through Sixteenth centuries), humanists developed philosophy from ancient literature, and artists found inspiration from ancient sculptures and paintings. Ancient Greece and historical relics from ancient Rome including sculptures, paintings, architecture and urban areas became irreplaceable treasures. Just as Frederick Engels said in the “Dialectics of Nature”:

In the manuscripts saved from the fall of Byzantium, in the antique statues dug out of the ruins of Rome, a new world was revealed to astonish West, that of ancient Greece: the ghosts of the Middle Ages vanished before its shining forms.

Until the eighteenth century, although people were increasingly interested in historic relics, historic preservation remained largely in a stage of antiques collections displayed in aristocratic houses and museums.

However, in the middle and late nineteenth century in Europe, historic preservation began to develop as an independent discipline. Scholars differ in their recommended approaches to safeguarding ancient buildings. For example: John Ruskin (1819-1900) preferred protection than restoration. He founded the Association for the Protection of Ancient Buildings. Eugéne Emmanuel Viollet-Le-Duc (1814-1879)

---


8 Nolen, Jeannette L. “Historic Preservation: Safeguarding Treasures of the Past.” 7 Jan. 2013,

9 Jokilehto, Jukka. *A history of architectural conservation*. Routledge, Taylor et Francis Group, 2018
thought that every building – including every part of the building – should be restored to its original style, including its internal structure; he joined in efforts to restore Notre Dame de Paris. However, these differences have really enabled the development of historic preservation.

After a century of development, in the 1960s and 1970s, international conventions and national legislation was put in place to identify and officially designate historic buildings and cultural resources and to put in place measures for protecting them. The researcher found several lists related to historic preservation from this early period.

**French school: architectural restoration and relic list**

In the early days of French history, the French proposed the Architectural Restoration due to a gradual emphasis on historic buildings. The first classification list of historic buildings and the first European Heritage Conservation list were established in the nineteenth century.

In 1772, during the French Revolution, some scholars realized that the goal of historic preservation should not be confined to artifacts of ancient Greece and Rome. The local architecture was among the best in history. Scholars began to pay attention to the value of buildings. They believed that ancient buildings should be protected in the name of protecting history and art, and that historic architecture should be shared in common as a public commodity and resource.  

---


11 Jokilehto, Jukka. *A history of architectural conservation*. Routledge, Taylor et Francis Group, 2018
In 1776, Alexandre Lenoir (1761-1839)\(^{12}\) founded the “Musée national des Monuments Français” \(^{13}\) - The museum included 6,000 sculptures from different countries and periods, and most of the sculptures belonged to the French Romanesque and Gothic period. In addition, the museum owned a large number of architectural models, including French churches.\(^{14}\)

In 1810, the French government conducted the first inventory of cultural relics. The Ministry of the Interior set up a heritage protection committee and completed the protection of the first batch of cultural relics. In 1830, France set up a special institution for the study of historic buildings, which, after five years, established the first Classification List of Historic Buildings. This list recorded more than 500 buildings which needed to be protected.\(^{15}\)

In 1835, Prosper Merimee (1803-1870) became the first French director of heritage. Two years later, he set up the National Council of Historical Relics. From 1830 onward, Prosper Merimee started the registration of ancient buildings and completed the first European Heritage Conservation list.\(^{16}\)

\(^{12}\) See Figure 2-1

\(^{13}\) See Figure 2-2


\(^{16}\) Jokilehto, Jukka. A history of architectural conservation. Routledge, Taylor et Francis Group, 2018
Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc (1814-1879) put forward the concept of ‘restoration’ when he participated in the competition of preservation of the Notre Dame of Paris in 1843 and he formed a complete theoretical system. He defined both restoration and that which is to be restored as modern. To restore a building is not to preserve it, to repair it or to rebuild it. Instead it is to reinstate it in a condition of completeness that could have never have existed in any given time. This view guides people in how to protect historic sites, especially those which are endangered. Besides, the main purpose of the modern endangered heritage list is to protect these endangered sites.

Before restoration, Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc thought that an architect should realize age and style and use them as the basis for a detailed plan. In the process of restoration, original materials should be replaced with better, more robust materials. In the ensuing 100 years, this theory spread throughout Europe and became the main method of repairing historic relics in various European countries. The restoration proposed by Viollet Le Duc was a proposition and technique of historical preservation. It also promoted the establishment of heritage lists. Restoration is usually targeted at damaged historic buildings. In order to facilitate the management or registration of endangered sites, people often created lists to manage historic buildings.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{17} See Figure 2-3.
\textsuperscript{18} See Figure 2-4
British school: protection versus restoration

The formation of a series of laws on the protection of ancient buildings and new doctrines laid foundations for the subsequent establishment of organizations and heritage lists for the modern century.

By the eighteenth century, ancient buildings were regarded as a source of building materials in Britain. The protection of castles and churches was only for reasons of residence and religious activities. The abandoned ancient Roman walls were demolished and stones were used as materials for houses and buildings. In the late 18th century, British attitudes toward ancient architecture began to change. They began to focus on ancient buildings, and the media also emphasized the importance of protecting ancient buildings.\(^{20}\)

In 1887, two aestheticians - William Morris (1834-1896)\(^{21}\) and John Ruskin (1819-1900)\(^{22}\) - founded the Association for the Protection of Ancient Buildings. The purpose of establishing an association was to protect ancient buildings and prevent the incorrect use of modern technology. John Ruskin fiercely criticized restoration which he defined as the most complete destruction which a building can suffer – a destruction out of which no remnants can be gathered; a destruction accompanied with a false description of the thing destroyed. He preferred protection to restoration. He also believed that restoration meant that architecture has been completely destroyed. Besides, Ruskin


\(^{21}\) See Figure 2-5

\(^{22}\) See Figure 2-6
thought that buildings should be maintained and not altered in order to preserve their material authenticity.  

The authenticity of the building was far more important than the architectural style. Restoration would undermine the historic value of the building. If maintenance were required, people should be allowed to discern any changes which had been made. No matter what kind of measures, maintenance could not change the body and decoration of ancient buildings. The British School advocated that protection was more important than restoration. Through ordinary maintenance and management, architects should focus on preserving authenticity of buildings.  

**Italian school: preservation rely on history and old architecture lists**

The historic preservation of Italy was evident during the reign of King Julius Caesar. A series of ancient lists of “Roman Architecture Epitaphs,” etc., emerged with the development of historic preservation. Along with the European Renaissance, new doctrines and new protected lists appeared.  

In 1517, Jacopo Mazocchi has written a list for recording antiques of architecture. This ancient book included many epitaphs for architectures and introduced many kinds of architectures in the Caesar period. Ancient people had realized that a list is a method to record architecture. On April 1820, a Cardinal promulgated the first decree which was “Protection of Antiquities and Excavation.” This decree laid the foundation for future legislation on protection of cultural heritage. During the European Renaissance, there

---

23 Jokilehto, Jukka. *A history of architectural conservation*. Routledge, Taylor et Francis Group, 2018  
24 Ibid  
was the chief conservator to protect relics. Many Catholic Popes have been devoted to setting up scientific protection organizations and searching for the most suitable ways to protect the material and cultural heritage of various eras.  

In 1880, Italy’s architectural experts, L. Beltrami (1854-1933) and C. Boito (1836-1914) put forward a new concept of protection. They thought that protection of ancient buildings should rely on history. Not only should architects realize ancient buildings, they also should know history, archeology, and even literature. Repairs should be based on exact facts and histories, not personal guesses and inferences. The value of architecture was not limited to the architecture itself, but also included historical value, literary value and artistic value. Therefore, the purposes of repairs were to protect the building and to protect changes over time. Historic preservation cannot be limited to maintaining style and building protection, but should protect the historic environment of building. The material used to repair the building must be different from the original to ensure that new material was easily identifiable and easy to remove. It was necessary to mark the date at each patch. Italians inscribed the building and then completely documented the maintenance. The building components should be displayed nearby the building, and people need to promote ongoing maintenance.

---

26 Ibid

27 See Figure 2-7

28 See Figure 2-8

29 Jokilehto, Jukka. A history of architectural conservation. Routledge, Taylor et Francis Group, 2018
The exploration phase finally laid the scientific basis for the theory of modern historic preservation. It also affected the creation of modern heritage lists and endangered heritage lists. The concepts and theories from several countries influenced the international historic preservation. Historians and conservationists, through continuous thinking and argument, have made theories more perfect, providing a basic theoretical system for modern historic preservation. Besides, several theories have developed techniques for protection of ancient buildings.

Then people began to realize that some heritages needed protection rather than documentation. Many lists of buildings, relics and culture were used mainly for recording architecture and providing information to scholars. For example, the Classification List of Historic Buildings, Roman Architecture Epitaphs, etc. were used for the administration of architecture. The lists in that period looked more like a database. Although these lists served as a mere database, people have come to view registering buildings in this way. This is a huge improvement, because people found that the list can be used to record architecture. However, a few threats and problems were highlighted by the lists. Nevertheless, these lists provided samples and experiences on heritage lists or endangered heritage lists in twentieth century and beyond.

And in the twentieth century, some other lists were used to record protected buildings, such as “Protected Architecture List,” established by the Ministry of the Environment and Artistic Assets in 1982\(^\text{32}\) and “Building Conservation list”, established by Prosper Merimee in 1835. People were no longer attaching importance to historic
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sites and their historic, artistic and religious values. Instead, they were more concerned with how to protect the historic buildings to get rid of more and more threats. This is a major theme of modern historic preservation.33

**Formation of International Historic Preservation and Heritage Lists**

The formation of international heritage lists (the World Heritage List and the World Heritage in Danger) and international historic preservation derive from two charters and one convention: Athens Charter (1933), Venice Charter (1964), and World Heritage Convention (1972). The charters and the convention played an important role in the development of the World Heritage List, the World Heritage in Danger and historic preservation in general.

The development of international historic preservation brought about several landmark charters and conventions. It also played a decisive role in establishing global lists of endangered properties and heritages. The Athens Charter (1933) and Venice Charter (1964) provided the outline and direction for the “World Heritage Convention.” The establishment of the “World Heritage Convention” led to the establishment of the famous “World Heritage List” and the list of “World Heritage in Danger.”

**Athens Charter (1933)**

The introduction of a series of international conventions, charters, and laws provided the guiding significance for the development of historic preservation. In 1933, at the International Congress for Modern Architecture (CIAM), the city planners proposed the Athens Charter to address expanding urban areas, chaotic traffic,
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population explosion and deteriorating living conditions. Although the Charter of Athens mainly reflects how people have completed modern urban planning and urban design, the entire E Section still emphasizes the importance of protecting historic sites. This section not only motivates people to pay more attention to historic preservation in urban planning, but also promotes the establishment of the heritage list and endangered heritage list to protect the value of the Athens charter.

The Athens Charter, through section E, presented basic principles of historic preservation and those principles were still used as criteria in the “World Heritage List” and “World Heritage in Danger.” This section is consistent with the subsequent lists (“World Heritage List” and “World Heritage in Danger”) in regard to protecting historic sites. As part of the process of urban planning, the historic sites of all countries should be respected and protected. Recognizing historic, educational, artistic and other values, historic buildings, districts and cities deserved better protection.

**Venice Charter (1964)**

The Venice Charter detailed the responsibility and significance of historic preservation. Like the Athens Charter, it provided guidance and direction for the “World Heritage List” and “World Heritage in Danger.”

This is the first charter of international historic preservation. Through the summation experience and methods of historic preservation in European countries, the system of historic preservation was formed.

---
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The Athens Charter had a vital and catalytic effect on the birth of the Venice Charter in 1964. The principles of historic preservation put forth in the Athens Charter was implemented in various nations’ legislation and legal frameworks for preserving historic sites and cultural resources. It was also used by international organizations such as the International Council of Museums (ICOM) and International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM). However, it was increasingly noticed that problems continued to become more complex and principles of the Charter of Athens did not solve the ever-increasing problems.

Architecture was originally a work of art like painting and sculpture in the ancient period. With the development of modern society, architecture became more closely associated with construction. Because of large-scale demolition of the historic area and old buildings, architecture has become very functional and modern. Then it was necessary to expand the scope and contents of the Athens Charter into a new document. Therefore, in 1964, at the second International Congress for Modern Architecture (CIAM), the Charter of Venice (International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites) was officially launched. 36

The Charter was divided into six sections: definition, aim, conservation, restoration, historic sites, excavation and publication. Sixteen articles clarified concepts of historic buildings. There was an emphasis on modern technology to protect and repair cultural heritages. Restoration was a highly specialized technique. People must respect history and literature. The purpose of the restoration was to completely protect the construction and re-display historic values and artistic values of historic buildings.

The charter also emphasized the need for accurate records, illustrations and photographs of protections, restorations and excavations.

**World Heritage Convention (1972)**

The World Heritage Convention protected the world’s monuments with articles and regulations of a similar legal nature, bringing directly to the list of two important international monuments: World Heritage List and World Heritage in Danger.

Historic preservation became increasingly more difficult throughout the twentieth century. The twentieth century was a century of destruction. People rapidly destroyed the urban architectural culture. More than a million tons of bombs were thrown at the center of ancient cities during the two world wars and many regional conflicts. Urban renewal, caused by development of cities, resulted in a wide-range, rapid destruction in historic heritages – which was even more devastating than war. 37

In 1972, at the seventeenth session, held in Paris from October to November, members of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) noticed increasing demolitions of cultural and natural heritages.

Considering harmful effects or loss of cultural or natural heritage, the protection of heritage at the national level was not enough. Preservation required substantial support, but some countries did not have sufficient funds or the expertise and technology to preserve their historic buildings. Rare and irreplaceable world heritages belonged not only to local residents but also to all people in the world. With more and more threats, all nations should have responsibility to provide assistance to protect
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cultural and natural heritage of outstanding value. Such mutual assistance, while not a substitute for preservation taken by countries, provided additional support. Thus UNESCO organized a convention to promote historic preservation.  

The international convention linked – within a single document – the concepts of natural conservation and the preservation of cultural properties. It defined the kind of natural and cultural sites which could be considered for inclusion on the World Heritage List. The “World Heritage Convention” took place on November 16, 1972.  

This convention contained a total of eight sections. Within 38 treaties, eight definitions of heritage were provided. In addition, historic protection, commission, the World Heritage Fund, aid provisions, education plan, application reports and supplementary reports were described in detail. The convention defined cultural heritage, natural heritage and measures of preservation. The Convention provided that each state party should maintain a tentative list that identifies cultural and natural heritage sites; official reports and documents should be developed and submitted to the World Heritage Committee for review and approval for inscription. Any site included on the World Heritage List would be strictly protected by its country in accordance with that country’s laws. Since the Convention began being implementing these rules in 1975, a total of 180 countries and territories have joined the convention in protecting world

---
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heritages. Until July 2005, the Committee had registered a total of 812 World Heritage Sites in 137 countries.  40

Significance of Charters and Convention

The establishment of the International Convention and Charter for historic preservation showed that historic preservation was a global topic as well as a global problem. Instead of targeting theories and genres, these conventions and charters protected many historic sites. Not only that, the formation of international historic preservation principles also showed that people were paying more attention to historic relics. This can protect the relics as well as preserve their historic, artistic and architectural value.

The Athens Charter, through section E, presented basic principles of historic preservation and heritage or endangered heritage list. As part of the process of urban planning, the historic sites of all countries should be respected and protected. Recognizing historic, educational, artistic and other values, historic buildings, districts, and cities deserved better protection. The Athens Charter highlighted the importance of historic preservation and emphasized the unparalleled value of historic preservation in urban planning.  41

The significance of the Venice Charter was no longer a choice of protection or restoration, but only the need to keep old architecture safe. The Charter emphasized the historic and artistic value of architecture. Through a summation of the experience


and methods of historic preservation in European countries, a system was formed. The Charter led to the birth of the “World Heritage List” and “World Heritage in Danger.” The methods of protection, resource types and public participation under the Venice Charter are all reflected on the lists. For example, the “World Heritage List” and “World Heritage in Danger” defined every resource type for each selected heritage, providing a protection process which may exist or not. One of purposes of creating lists is the hope that more people will be able to help heritages. 42

The World Heritage Convention conducted the “World Heritage List” and “World Heritage in Danger.” 43 It could help countries which did not have enough money or advanced technology. People can be made aware of any historic sites and cultures in each region, and they can be introduced to people from other parts of the world. The World Heritage Convention was the first international convention on historic preservation. Therefore, the establishment of the World Heritage Convention has helped preserve relics worldwide. And it has changed the focus of historic preservation from a national level to an international level. Besides, the World Heritage Convention set basic standards for subsequent historic preservation and provided a perfect example for subsequent declarations and charters. It also laid a solid foundation for other charters of historic preservation such as the Charter of Machu Picchu (1977), the Charter of Florence (1982) and the Charter of Washington (1987), among others. 44


World Heritage List and World Heritage in Danger

With the Athens Charter, the Venice Charter, the World Heritage Convention and the list of world relics, the establishment of the World Heritage List and the list of World Heritage in Danger were important outcomes of the development of international historic preservation.

In 1976, the UNESCO World Heritage Committee established a World Heritage List. In 1978, the World Heritage Committee identified the first batch of 12 sites for the world heritage list. The Commission selected monuments from the applications submitted by various countries as world heritages. The committee submitted the application to the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) for review. After rigorous selection, the committee decides whether a site is listed as a World Heritage Site. At the end of 2017, there were 1,037 sites listed worldwide.45

As world heritage was faced with danger – particularly in 1982 – these dangers changed world heritages to world endangered heritages. Thus ICOMOS included a portion of the heritage on the list of World Heritage in Danger and requested the World Heritage Committee, in consultation with the States Parties, to develop and adopt the correct plan and to monitor the endangered heritage site.

The list of “World Heritage in Danger” focused on the world heritages listed in the “World Heritage List,” including natural heritages, cultural heritages and mixed heritages.

The main purpose of the list is to show characteristics – and threats – of endangered sites. Until 2018, there were 57 sites on the list of World Heritage in Danger.\footnote{Centre, UNESCO World Heritage. “World Heritage in Danger.” UNESCO World Heritage Centre, whc.unesco.org/en/158/.


**National Historic Preservation in the United States**

The United States has established many national historic preservation lists which are closely linked with many Acts. The establishment of these lists originated from the various acts. The private or official organizations are committed to protecting sites such as heritages, national parks, antiquities and other types of sites. They have established special laws that give these sites legal protection as well as access to a wide variety of lists. So the establishment of international conventions has not only promoted the development of world historic preservation, but also promoted the development of historic preservation within the United States.

The historic preservation in the United States originated from the exploration of Indian civilization. Historic preservation in the United States began with the spontaneous protection by common people. In 1816, the successful protection of the Independence Hall in Philadelphia is considered to be the beginning of historic preservation. It also encouraged people to develop an interest in relics.\footnote{Centre, UNESCO World Heritage. “World Heritage in Danger.” UNESCO World Heritage Centre, whc.unesco.org/en/158/.

consciousness and civil society promoted preservation, which quickly gained broad support. Many groups still focus on historic preservation and can provide more help and advice than ever.⁴⁸

Due to the increasing emphasis on historic preservation, governments – including the national, state and local governments – have made tremendous contributions to the protection of heritages. Through the establishment of a series of acts, government has provided comprehensive and powerful legal support for the preservation.⁴⁹

The Antiquities Act and antiquities list

After six years of controversy, The Antiquities Act was signed into law in 1906 by President Theodore Roosevelt. The Antiquities Act granted presidential power: The President had the power to announce historic buildings that belonged to the federal government as state-level historic sites and to provide management and restoration. Selected historic sites could receive legal protection.

The National Resources Defense Council (NRDC) established an antiquities list which included all national monuments designated under the Antiquities Act. This list was established in 2017. It introduces every site – selected in every term of office of each president, from Theodore Roosevelt (1901-1909) to Barack Obama (2009-2017), but with Donald Trump (2017-present) seeming less supportive. Every president –


except for Trump thus far – has used his Antiquities Act authority to create monuments. A total of 155 sites were selected as federal governmental historic sites.  

**National Park Service (1916) and national park list**

National Park Service (NPS) was established in 1916 and belongs to the Ministry of the Interior. Its main mission is to protect natural monuments, parks and wildlife. It also manages national parks. Through a series of provisions, the National Park Service guides people to protect historical relics and natural land, and it helps non-governmental organizations.

In 1872, the first national park – Yellowstone National Park – was selected for the list of National Parks, marking the birth of this list. The National Park Service established this list using criteria which included natural beauty, unique geological features, unusual ecosystems and recreational opportunities. Currently, there are 58 National Parks in the United States. Not all states have one, but some larger states have more than one. There are more National Parks in California and Alaska – eight each – than in any of the other states.

---


National Trust for Historic Preservation (1966) and America’s 11 Most Endangered Places (1988)

In 1965, the National Trust submitted a report entitled "With Heritage So Rich." The report raised awareness of the needs for more historic preservation. It directly led to the birth of the National Historic Preservation Act. In 1966, Congress published the most important historic heritage protection act ever: the National Historic Preservation Act. The act has been revised many times, but it still is in use today. The law provides that the Advisory Committee of Historic Preservation should be established to give suggestions to Congress about preservation. Further, the law requires that state governments need to establish organizations for historic preservation to protect heritages within the state. This act not only involves historic sites, but also protects historic values and historic areas. Preservation became an integral part of society. Therefore, people’s attention to – and participation in – preservation became very important.  

In 1988, the first endangered heritage list (America’s 11 Most Endangered Places) was produced under the auspices of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. The sites, nominated by the public, were eventually selected after discussion by members of the Committee. The selection is based on a number of factors, including importance, protection, threats, and potential solutions.

In the United States, an important characteristic of historic preservation is diversity – historic preservation is a public-private endeavor. It does not belong only to

---
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the government or to citizens only. Various groups and governments work together and support each other which have led to extraordinary success. Since 1966, many states have formed organizations and published related acts. Currently, more than 3,000 organizations are engaged in various activities related to historic preservation. 

A complete legal system can protect heritages as much as possible and heritage can get better treatment. Similarly, public participation is equally important. Preservation cannot be separated from public participation because citizens can present crucial views.

Advocacy of Endangered Heritage List

The researcher found that at various times in the development of historic preservation, there have been a variety of lists related to historic preservation. In the initial stage, these lists included lists of buildings, epitaphs, cultural conservation and more. Those lists primarily served as a database for recording architectural or other cultural relics, including age, style, etc. A few people have created a list of building protections to record protected buildings. This is the beginning of endangered heritage list. In the development of international historic preservation, historic sites were under pressure to survive as the environment worsened. As a result, a series of charters and conventions have prompted the birth of the World Heritage List and the list of World Heritage in Danger. People need to record historic sites around the world and establish criteria to select historic sites and endangered historic sites.

As people place increasing emphasis on the growing multiple threats, more and more lists of endangered heritages have been established. These lists record threats and appeal to people to save endangered heritages.\textsuperscript{56}

**Advocacy**

The emergence of “World Heritage in Danger” means that the list of historic sites cannot show growing threats, and modern historic preservation has a new theme: threats and how to deal with them.\textsuperscript{57} Therefore, the list of World Heritage in Danger was established in 1982. Many other countries have established a list of endangered sites.\textsuperscript{58} For example, there is the list of America’s 11 Most Endangered Places in the United States and the Chinese Heritage list in China.\textsuperscript{59} The endangered heritage list urges people or organizations to help endangered sites as much as possible and to help restore and protect them. It also reminds people that some of the cultural heritage is being threatened. Due to the neglect of heritage by many people, the list also promotes historic preservation, popularizes knowledge and arouses awareness of historic preservation. Therefore, endangered heritage lists are extremely important to modern historic preservation.

Many organizations established endangered heritage lists because of several reasons: Simple introduction system; responsibility of protecting heritages; risking awareness and encouraging cooperation on preservation.


\textsuperscript{59} (ICOMOS CHINA). *ICOMOS China*, www.icomoschina.org.cn/.
The endangered heritage list establishes an effective system of protection for outstanding and universal values of cultural and natural heritage. Endangered historic sites include endangered buildings (ancient tombs, ancient buildings and cave temples), historical areas, stone carvings, mural paintings, immovable cultural relics of ancient and contemporary history, movable objects such as works of art, literature, manuscripts, books and materials. The system no longer has a complex structure, but introduces the protected objects in several aspects. All endangered historic relics are shown by pictures, age, location, significance, integrity and threats. This simple system can minimize the difficulty of classification of cultural relics, and it can effectively introduce heritage to ordinary people. Introduction on the list is simple but comprehensive. It details basic information of endangered sites and highlights important threats. The endangered lists showcase the value of the endangered sites and point out the unavoidable threats. Through this simple system, people can fully understand the historic sites as well as the reasons for their endangerment. Ordinary people can keep up to date with annual changes to the list. Such a system enables people to intuitively understand the importance and necessity of historic preservation. Furthermore, the list can inspire people’s interest in historic preservation. Moreover, this simple system does not introduce boring theories of historic preservation. With a short description of each


site on the list, people can realize the plan process and the preliminary purpose, need, objectives and alternatives.

Heritage is included in the endangered list which also reminds people of responsibility to protect historic sites. The “List of World Heritage in Danger,” the “World Heritage Committee” has strengthened the monitoring of world heritage since 1994. Monitoring is conducted to strengthen inspections, reviews and assessments on the status of protection of all world heritages on the list. Through the assessments, the “World Heritage Committee” could begin an aid program for preservation, including briefings, proposals for international assistance or cooperation, protections and maintenance. By keeping endangered historic sites on the list, it is possible to ensure that an historic site is protected continuously and permanently.

Establishment of the list not only emphasizes various crises related to historic sites, but also reminds people not to delay their actions to protect historic sites. Historic heritage is a non-renewable, precious resource. With the trends of economic globalization and acceleration of modernization, historic heritage and its living environment are seriously threatened. Many historical and cultural sites (neighborhoods, towns and villages), ancient buildings, ancient heritages and scenic spots have been destroyed. Illegal trades, theft of ancient tombs, human-made damages, redevelopment of areas, worsening climates, the redevelopment of transportation and criminal activities (e.g., smuggling historic relics) have not been effectively checked in some areas. Large
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quantities of precious historic heritage have been lost. Many important historic heritages have vanished or lost their lives due to over-exploitation and irrational use. Due to the changes in people’s living environment and conditions, ethnic or regional cultural features have been exacerbated in ethnic minority areas where cultural relics are relatively rich.

Thus people should not wait for damage to occur at historic sites. Instead, they need to prevent historic sites from facing these aforementioned crises. Crisis awareness can make people realize the importance of historic preservation and help them update the endangered list each year. The sense of crisis has a tremendous role in historic preservation. Through the list, people can develop a process to prioritize archeological sites based on importance and the level of risk to make management decisions.

With more and more endangered heritage lists, governments at all levels and relevant officials or private organizations should, from the perspective of being responsible for history, fully understand the importance of historic heritage and work together for preservation. They also need to further enhance their sense of responsibility and earnestly do a good job in cultural heritage protection. 64 Cooperation is necessary because the majority of endangered archeological sites on the list are affected by one or more threats. Historic preservation not only requires advanced technology, adequate funding and adequate staff, but also requires people to guard against future crises together. The cooperation raises further comments and suggestions on historic preservation, such as the renovation of ancient buildings, the

protection of historic areas, the maintenance of endangered national parks and so on. By expressing more suggestions and comments, people could protect historic sites better and solve more problems.  

**Significance of Endangered Heritage List**

The importance of the endangered heritage list for historic preservation lies in two aspects: historic value and important criteria.

Endangered heritage selected for inclusion on endangered lists should be irreplaceable and non-replicable. The list records endangered heritages as well records the historic value of these endangered buildings. These irreplaceable and unique historic values are what historic preservation scientists need to protect. Historic sites record ancient human activities. Any historical site or relic is a product of a human in a particular period. It was created based on the current political, economic, military and cultural needs, using the materials and the technologies available at that time. The information can reflect politics, economics, the military, science, technology, art, religion and customs.

Because heritages contain many stories, through the exploration of historic sites, people can realize changes in the process of social development. Historical sites can help people restore the original appearance of history. For example, in order to study the history of Paleolithic society, people must rely on Paleolithic relics. The original social history, in addition to the ancient legends contained in the literature and
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ethnographic materials for reference, can be found in historic relics which can help people realize history in a particular period. 66

Though an endangered heritage list is a document that displays historic relics, criteria for inclusion on the list represents historic preservation theories. Because endangered heritage lists in different regions vary, many sets of criteria represent regional culture, achievements and development of historic preservation in this region. For example, on the list of World Heritage in Danger, there will be detailed reasons for each selected relic on the list. The committee usually considers whether the site is representative of world history, human civilization or geographical changes. If there is an historic site which can represent a period of history, a culture or a process of geographical change, this site will probably be selected. 67

Take criterion of Everglades National Park as example:

Criterion (viii): The Everglades is a vast, nearly flat, seabed that was submerged at the end of the last Ice Age. Its limestone substrate is one of the most active areas of modern carbonate sedimentation.

Criterion (ix): The Everglades contains vast subtropical wetlands and coastal/marine ecosystems including freshwater marshes, tropical hardwood hammocks, pine rocklands, extensive mangrove forests, saltwater marshes, and seagrass ecosystems important to commercial and recreational fisheries. Complex biological processes range from basic algal associations through progressively higher species and
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ultimately to primary predators such as the alligator, crocodile, and Florida panther; the food chain is superbly evident and unbroken. The mixture of subtropical and temperate wildlife species is found nowhere else in the United States.

Criterion (x): Everglades National Park is a noteworthy example of viable biological processes. The exceptional variety of its water habitats has made it a sanctuary for a large number of birds and reptiles and it provides refuge for over 20 rare, endangered, and threatened species. These include the Florida panther, snail kite, alligator, crocodile, and manatee. It provides important foraging and breeding habitat for more than 400 species of birds, includes the most significant breeding grounds for wading birds in North America and is a major corridor for migration. 68

The committee selected the Everglades because of three criteria: 1) It was formed by an ancient seabed was submerged at the end of last Ice Age; 2) It is typical of wetlands and coastal ecosystems in Florida; and 3) There is certification of viable biological processes. The World Heritage Committee believes that this site has great value in terms of geography. It shows how ecosystems changed and how rainforests were formed. 69

---
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**World Heritage in Danger**

List of “World Heritage in Danger” focuses on the world heritages listed on the “World Heritage List,” including natural heritages, cultural heritages, mixed heritages. The main purpose of the list is to show threats and characteristics of endangered sites.

Since 1994, the World Heritage Committee has strengthened monitoring of world heritage. Under the World Heritage preservation of its guidelines, it regularly monitors, reviews and assesses conservation in regard to various world heritages. Finally, an exhaustive report was submitted to the World Heritage Committee. According to the report, the World Heritage Committee assessed the state of conservation of the sites, including affirmation and encouragement, briefings and proposals of international assistance or cooperation. Based on the results of the test, once the site meets the following criteria, it can be considered an endangered World Heritage Site: 1) The site belongs to World Heritage, which itself is a world heritage; 2) A danger is destroying sites such as war, redevelopment or natural threats; 3) International cooperation on the protection of the heritage has become necessary; and 4) The legacy requires aid from the national committee. 70

Once a heritage is included in the List of “World Heritage in Danger,” – after a series of efforts and if danger and threats are lifted – it can be removed from the list of “World Heritage in Danger” by the World Heritage Committee. However, if governments cannot guarantee necessary measures and effective protection of the property in a
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certain period, the site cannot be designated as a “World Heritage,” and it may also be removed from the World Heritage List.71

Until 2018, a total of 54 sites were included on the list of World Heritage in Danger. Among them, there were 38 cultural heritage sites, 16 natural heritage sites and no sites of mixed heritage. These heritage sites were located all over the world. Fifteen endangered sites were in Africa (four cultural heritage sites and 11 natural heritage sites), accounting for 15% of all endangered heritages; 22 endangered cultural sites were in Arab States, accounting for 41% of all endangered heritages; six endangered sites were in Asia and the Pacific (four cultural heritage sites and two natural heritage sites), accounting for 11% of all endangered heritages; four endangered sites were in Europe and North America (three cultural heritage sites and one natural heritage), accounting for 7% of all endangered heritages; seven endangered sites were in Latin America and the Caribbean (five cultural heritage sites and two natural heritage sites), accounting for 13% of all endangered heritages.72

Contents

Each site on the list has a detailed document. It includes a series of photos, basic information, criteria, significance, integrity, protection, management and even videos. In addition to this, there will be an activity section, an event section and a news section to

---


record what happened on the site. The Ancient Villages of Northern Syria is a good example: 73

It was abandoned in the eighth through the tenth centuries, many landscapes and the architectural remains of dwellings, pagan temples, churches, and cisterns still exist. This historic site located in a vast Limestone Massif is in the northwest of Syria. Those buildings are grouped in eight archaeological parks. The ensemble forms a series of unique cultural landscapes. 74

Three criterions make this building an endangered heritage: rural cultures were developed in the Middle East; rural houses and religious community buildings were built in the Byzantine Period; a sustainable rural settlement from the 1st to the 7th centuries. 75

A large number of villages, places of worship, and monumental and archaeological testimonies have showed the outstanding historic value. The number and quality of the relict landscapes are also adequate certifications. 76 This site needs Antiquities Law to improve and protect landscape values. Management for this property will include several parks. 77
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Significance

World endangered heritage is the most precious asset left to us by our ancestors and nature. One of important features is that once destroyed, it cannot be replaced and regenerated. The final purpose of the list of World Heritage in Danger is to protect our precious wealth. The ratification of the list of the World Heritage in danger is only the start for the protection of a heritage. Endangered sites already on the list are worthy of more concerns – and many of them are under serious threats. The endangered list is not a punishment, but rather it encourages international communities to work together to save endangered heritages. 78

Those sites need special oversight and more protections. The World Heritage Committee has declared that the endangered list aims to draw the attention of the international community through this document. Some cultural and natural heritages with very high universal values are being threatened by natural forces and human actions. Therefore, urgent protection should be started so that heritages can escape from this dangerous state as soon as possible.

America’s Endangered Heritage List

The United States’ National Trust for Historic Preservation is a national organization dedicated to the preservation of historic buildings and cultural resources. Until now, many countries or states have set up this organization, including the National Trust of Australia; the National Trust of Guernsey; the National Trust for Jersey; the

---

National Trust for Scotland; and the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States.  

Formation of National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States

National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States is dedicated to protecting the historic and cultural heritage within the United States. It is a privately funded, nonprofit organization.

In 1940s, leaders of American historic preservation hoped to build a national organization to preservation efforts on the national, state and local levels. In 1946, some people came together to discuss whether there is a need to set up such an organization. In 1947, a large group of artists, architects and architectural historians founded an organization known as the National Council for Historic Sites and Buildings. The first headquarters were in downtown Washington, D.C. The Council decided to set up a national trust, modeled on the British National Trust. This trust would be committed to the discovery of historic buildings, historic preservation and restoration. The creation of the National Trust was proposed as an act to Congress (H.R. 5170, introduced by Congressman J. Hardin Peterson of Florida). The National Trust for Historic Preservation was formally established through the Act of Congress when President Harry S. Truman signed the legislation on October 26, 1949. The charter provided that the Trust should acquire and preserve historic sites and objects of national importance.

---
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significance and provide annual reports to Congress on its activities. Finley served as the National Trust’s first chairman of the board, remaining in the position for 12 years.\textsuperscript{83} By protecting historic sites, the organization showed residents about American history, Native American culture and local customs. The National Trust also showed what is worth protecting. The organization advocates for the protection of local, state and federal historic sites by proposing effective policies.\textsuperscript{85}

\textbf{Formation of List of ‘America’s 11 Most Endangered Places’}

In 1988, the first list was produced under the auspices of National Trust for Historic Preservation. The sites, nominated by the public, were eventually selected after discussion by members of a Committee. The selection was based on a number of factors, including importance, protection, threats and potential solutions.\textsuperscript{86}

Little Havana \textsuperscript{87} is a good example. It was included on America’s 11 Most Endangered Places list in 2016:

\begin{quote}
Little Havana, from the earliest residential island, has turned into a haven for Cuban Americans. Due to a series of threats such as redevelopment and the demolition of old buildings, unique Cuban culture in Miami is gradually disappearing. Although there are many threats, Little Havana also has many opportunities. The National Trust
\end{quote}
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\textsuperscript{86} “National Trust for Historic Preservation: Return to home page.” Americas Most Endangered Historic Places | National Trust for Historic Preservation, savingplaces.org/americas-most-endangered-historic-places#.Wp8nDFOOz_g.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{87} See Figure 2-10
\end{flushleft}
proposes to preserve Cuban-American culture by maintaining the original Cuban communities and ancient buildings.\textsuperscript{88}

So far, the list has included more than 270 endangered sites in the United States. The list makes people aware that many endangered spots urgently need help. Thanks to the unrelenting efforts of the National Trust, dozens of sites have been rescued. In addition to saving a series of endangered buildings, the list inspires people’s interest in historical preservation and makes people more aware of crises. It also reminds people of their responsibility to protect history. At present, the National Trust is embarking on an activity which aimed at young people. By propagating endangered historic buildings and visiting endangered heritage list, the organization tries to pass on the responsibility of historic preservation to a new generation.\textsuperscript{89}

Endangered Heritage Lists in Other States

Not only does historic preservation in the United States exist at the national level, but many state governments also have set up organizations and published state-wide endangered heritage lists.

The organizations, established in each state, are responsible for the formulation and management of state ordinances. A series of laws have been developed by states under the U.S. National Preservation act (1966). Local laws often provide higher standards of preservation than the federal guidelines. Among all states, 32 states'  

\textsuperscript{88} “National Trust for Historic Preservation: Return to home page.” \textit{Little Havana / National Trust for Historic Preservation}, savingplaces.org/places/little-havana#.Wp9rF0OZ_g.

\textsuperscript{89} National Trust for Historic Preservation: Return to home page.” \textit{Americas Most Endangered Historic Places / National Trust for Historic Preservation}, savingplaces.org/americas-most-endangered-historic-places.
organizations of historic preservation have established endangered lists, accounting for 61%.  

Take the “most endangered places” of the “Washington Trust for Historic Preservation” as an example:

Many historic sites have been destroyed for various reasons in Washington. Some buildings are threatened by redevelopment and demolition. What is interesting is that most of the buildings – houses, bars, restaurants, etc. – are still enjoyed by people. If these buildings continue to disappear, the whole state will lose its character. Since 1992, the Washington Trust for Historic Preservation has maintained a list of Most Endangered Places, bringing attention to threatened buildings, sites and historic places in Washington State. The Washington Trust announced its list of Most Endangered Places in Washington State on May 20, 2017. The list contained six endangered sites, and each endangered site had a few photos and a brief text description.

The Beverly Railroad Bridge is another example:

Status: Current List; Year Listed: 2017

Beverly Railroad Bridge is listed in 2017. The Columbia River is a defining feature of Washington State, but it also serves as a challenging barrier for cross-state travel. The construction of the Beverly Railroad Bridge, completed in 1909, was part of the westward expansion of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad and a major

---

90 See Table 2-1


92 See Figure 2-11
engineering feat of its day. By 1980, the route was closed, but due to its significance, the Beverly Bridge was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1982. Today, the Milwaukee Railroad route has been converted to the John Wayne Pioneer Trail – part of an effort by conservation, recreation and preservation advocates to create a statewide greenway trail system. The Beverly Bridge is the pivotal missing piece that would connect east and west. Advocates would like to see the bridge transferred from the Washington State Department of Natural Resources to Washington State Parks and rehabilitated to complete the cross-state recreational trail.93

**Florida Trust for Historic Preservation and ‘Florida’s 11 to Save’**

The Florida Trust for Historic Preservation is only statewide preservation organization in Florida. This organization was established in 1978. The organization is headquartered in Tallahassee. It is also the Preservation Center for the State of Florida.94 The mission of the organization is to improve the preservation of the architectural, historical and archaeological heritage of Florida through advocacy, education and historic property stewardship. 95

The Trust represents Florida’s preservation community through public and media outreach. It works to empower and support local preservationists by publicizing an annual list of Florida’s Eleven Most Endangered Historic Sites, and recognizing outstanding efforts in historic preservation through its annual preservation awards.


94 Home | Florida Trust For Historic Preservation, www.floridatrust.org/about.

program. The Trust offers extensive education and training opportunities, including local workshops, webinars, and an annual conference during the month of May each year. While working to educate the public on the benefits of historic preservation, the Trust also provides resources to preservationists, homeowners, preservation professionals, and media representatives. 96

Florida Trust has five programs. They are: establishment of list-'Florida’s 11 to save’; issuing preservation awards; easement program; education and training and Florida Historic passport (Assessment of historic sites).

Preservation awards have been issued since 2002. Each year, the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation recognizes significant contributions of individuals, societies, businesses or government entities that have demonstrated outstanding achievement in the field of historic preservation through its Statewide Annual Preservation Awards Program.97

An easement is a partial interest or limited right in the use of a property which an owner legally grants to another person or organization. Granting a neighbor access or right-of-way across one’s land by means of a road or driveway is probably the most familiar type of easement. Conservation easements protect buildings and associated land areas from demolition or alteration which would damage their historic and architectural integrity. Owners can secure the preservation of their properties by donating a conservation easement to the Florida Trust, which then acts as a steward of these rights.


The Florida Trust exercises its stewardship by ensuring the preservation of significant elements of the exterior, and at times, the interior of a building. An owner retains title and can sell, will, or live on the property. Alterations are permitted; however, they must meet preservation standards and be reviewed by the Florida Trust prior to initiation of work as per the easement agreement.98

A cornerstone of the Florida Trust’s mission is to provide education and training programs designed to give in-depth knowledge for preservation professionals, leaders and advocates alike, and it is carried out through a number of programs: Annual conference (Florida Preservation Conference); workshops and education (Workshops are designed to address a variety of historic preservation topics and support the mission of the Florida Trust).99

Florida’s Historic Passport entitles people to discounts and other benefits at approximately 70 historical sites, museums, and parks across Florida. When people become Florida Trust members, they qualify to receive a passport which offers free or discounted admissions and purchases to participating Florida properties, parks and shops. The Florida Trust works closely with its members including our historic sites, museums and parks, to increase awareness and attendance, and to promote an understanding and appreciation for the need to preserve and restore these unique treasures. The Historic Passport program is designed to encourage the public to visit these sites and museums, while offering a unique benefit to members of the Florida Trust. Our Passports allow members to take advantage of special offers including free


or discounted admissions, store purchases, guided tours. There is no fee for historic sites to participate in the Passport program other than becoming a member.\textsuperscript{100}

List of ‘Florida’s 11 to Save’ records eleven endangered sites which need to be protected in Florida. Florida Trust for Historic Preservation saved a total of 13 lists from 2005 to 2017. Each list details the history, development, and threats of each endangered site. All of endangered sites are vital, not only representing the local culture and customs in Florida, but some sites are even included in the list of national level- ‘America’s 11 Most Endangered Places’.

Figure 2-1. Portrait of Alexandre Lenoir (1761-1839) by Jacques-Louis David (1748-1825).\textsuperscript{101}

\textsuperscript{100} Home / Florida Trust For Historic Preservation, www.floridatrust.org/passport-participants.

Figure 2-2. Photo of Musée national des Monuments Français by Haguard DuNord 102

Figure 2-3. Photograph of Viollet Le Duc (1814-1879) 103


Figure 2-4. Photo of Paris Notre Dame cathedral by Tattva

Figure 2-5. Photograph of William Morris (1834-1896) by Frederick Hollyer (1838–1933)

104 ibid

Figure 2-6. Photograph of John Ruskin (1819-1900) by William Downey (1829-1915)  

Figure 2-7. Photograph of L. Beltrami (1854-1933)  


Figure 2-8. Photograph of C. Boito (1836-1914) by Varischi, Artico e C

Figure 2-9. Photograph of Everglades National Park by David Geldhof


Figure 2-10. Photograph of Little Havana by Steven Brooks Studio ¹¹⁰

Figure 2-11. Photograph of Beverly Railroad Bridge by Washington Trust for Historic preservation ¹¹¹

¹¹⁰ “National Trust for Historic Preservation: Return to Home Page.” Little Havana | National Trust for Historic Preservation, savingplaces.org/places/little-havana#.Wr6Tf1OOz_g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>state</th>
<th>organization</th>
<th>Endangered heritage list</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Alabama Heritage</td>
<td>list of Endangered Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Alaska Association for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>Ten Most Endangered Historic Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Arizona Preservation Foundation</td>
<td>Arizona’s Most Endangered Historic Places List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Preserve Arkansas</td>
<td>list of the Endangered Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Colorado Preservation, Inc</td>
<td>list of Colorado’s Most Endangered Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Connecticut Trust For Historic Preservation</td>
<td>list of Demolition Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Florida Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>Endangered Properties List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Landmarks Illinois</td>
<td>Most Endangered Historic Places in Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Indiana Landmarks</td>
<td>10 Most Endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Preservation Iowa</td>
<td>Iowa’s Most Endangered Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Historic Kansas City</td>
<td>Most Endangered List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Kentucky Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>Properties Available For Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Louisiana Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>Louisiana’s Most Endangered Places List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Maine Preservation</td>
<td>Maine’s Most Endangered Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Preservation Maryland</td>
<td>Six-to-Fix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Preservation Massachusetts</td>
<td>Massachusetts’ Most Endangered Historic Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Mississippi Trust Heritage</td>
<td>10 Most Endangered Historic Places in Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Missouri Preservation</td>
<td>Missouri’s Historic Places in Peril</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Classic Las Vegas</td>
<td>11 Most Endangered Historic Sites in Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Preservation New Jersey</td>
<td>10 Most Endangered Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Office</td>
<td>7 at-risk historic sites in New York state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Preservation Ohio</td>
<td>Ohio’s Most Endangered Historic Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Preservation Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oklahoma’s Most Endangered Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Restore Oregon</td>
<td>Oregon’s Most Endangered Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Preservation Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Pennsylvania at Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Preservation South Carolina</td>
<td>Places at Risk List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Tennessee Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>Ten In Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Preservation Texas</td>
<td>Texas’ Most Endangered Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Preservation Virginia</td>
<td>Virginia’s Most Endangered Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Washington Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>Most Endangered Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Division of Culture and History’s State Historic Preservation</td>
<td>West Virginia’s Most Endangered Historic Places</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

There are many endangered heritage lists in the world. The researcher found that in order to protect the world’s endangered heritage, ICOMOS has established the list of “World Heritage in Danger”; in order to protect the national endangered heritages, the United States has established “America’s 11 Most Endangered Places” and has been updating the list annually since 1988; private or official preservation organizations in many states create lists of state-wide endangered sites such as the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation created “Florida’s 11 to Save.” However, the researcher did not find relevant papers or documentations which could prove that: endangered heritage list is helpful to selected endangered heritages.

Thus the researcher chose “Florida’s 11 to Save” created by the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation as a research subject. The question which the researcher hoped to answer – through a series of studies and surveys -- was: Does the list of “Florida’s 11 to Save” help endangered heritages?

In response to this question, researchers explore the answer through two methodologies and a series of research methods. Besides, the researcher also wants to realize effects and the role of Florida Trust for Historic Preservation.

Case Study

Case studies are scenarios of a particular individual, unit, phenomenon or topic. Such research extensively collects relevant information and understands, collates and analyzes – in detail – the process of development of research objects, internal and external factors and their interrelationships. This methodology helps researcher forming
an in-depth and comprehensive understanding of a situation and then develop conclusions on related issues.¹

The historic preservation organization chosen by the investigator was the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation, and the object of study was the list of “Florida’s 11 to Save” from 2005 to 2017. In this case, the researcher hoped that through in-depth study of the 13 lists and dozens of heritages from 2005 to 2017 so that researcher could understand every heritage, including age, resource type, ownership, threats, status, the process of preservation, etc.

**Mixed Methods**

Mixed Methods is another methodology in which combines various types of research. In this study, the researcher used qualitative research and quantitative research to explore Florida’s endangered heritage lists.²

**Qualitative Research**

Qualitative research is based on social phenomena or things that experience changes or problems. A researcher studies a phenomena or a thing from the inside. He or she describes and interprets what happened to objects through generally accepted axioms, logical reasoning and a host of historical facts.³

In this research, based on literatures, documents, survey, the investigator wanted to discover if an endangered heritage on the “Florida’s 11 to Save” were impacted – positively or negatively – from its presence on the list.

³ Ibid
Quantitative Research

Quantitative research includes the analysis of relevant numbers and ratios. Using on statistical data, a scholar can establishment of mathematical models. Quantitative analysis is a method which can calculate indicators and offer their numerical meaning. The data can be used by the researcher to measure the degree of impact.\(^4\)

In this research, based on a self-built database, statistical analyses and ratios were used by the investigator. The resulting data can show the degree of the effects, which then are further probed by qualitative research.

Research Methods

The researcher proposed a case study, qualitative research and quantitative research using a survey, interview and analysis of data relative to the “Florida’s 11 to Save”.

Survey

In this research, through a survey of documents, literature, individuals and organization, additional information about each heritage on the list on “Florida’s 11 to Save” can be ascertained. Variables such as age, resource type, ownership, threat and status are important in fully understanding this topic. In addition, to complete the qualitative analysis, through an in-depth survey, the researcher learned more about donations and the process of protection from official documents provided by the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation. Detailed information helped researcher with the

\(^4\) Ibid
qualitative analysis; it also helped him determine the effectiveness of the endangered heritage list and provided detailed data for later quantitative analysis.

Using data and information from the survey, the researcher built a database of investigators (as a Microsoft’s Excel spreadsheet). The spreadsheet stored detailed information regarding the heritages on the list from 2005 to 2017. The researcher used academic literature, web pages and newspaper articles to obtain detailed information on endangered relics. The researcher organized information – including location, period of significance, ownership, threats and status. Moreover, the investigator wanted to learn how a heritage’s presence on the “Florida’s 11 to Save” impacted the site.

**Interview**

Interviews are an important part of qualitative research. Researchers can directly evaluate the endangered heritage list by visiting staff and members of the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation. Using a checklist, a researcher can get accurate information which will affect final results. Explaining the purpose of the study, talking with members, looking through important documents, the researcher could assemble key information. Data will be collected and examined by organizational documents and members. The interviews can also help completing survey and database. Obtaining information about heritages from interviews complements the survey results. It can make the evaluation more accurate and scientific. Through the two methods of investigation and interviewing, researchers can determine the impact of the list.

---

Data Analysis From List

The researcher selected documents from the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation and collected data using administrative reports, applications, news clippings and interview reports for each site. Data were collected and used to determine in-depth research through five categories: threat, status, resource type, protection process and period of significance.

The researcher used Excel as a third data analysis tool in addition to within-case analysis and statistical analysis. Specific data (ratios, numbers) can confirm the results as well as explain if the results were positive or negative.⁶

As mentioned, within-case analysis was used in this study. The researcher thoroughly studied every heritage and organized all of them into several groups. Then, researcher selected a representative heritage from each group as an example to illustrate or explain the findings. After finishing the data collection, researcher analyzed the success and failure of each relic in preservation and fully realized the development of the heritage – paying particular attention to any specific help and or effect that resulted from its presence on “Florida’s 11 to Save”.

Statistical analysis can be used to show the degree of impact taken from the endangered heritage lists in Florida. Using specific data (ratios, numbers), statistics can prove the results as well as explain if the results were positive or negative. Statistical analysis can further explain the role of list in protecting endangered heritages.

Using this entire process, the researcher can find if there have been positive effects, negative effects or no effects on the heritage sites listed on Florida’s 11 to Save. The research also can determine the degree of impact.
CHAPTER 4
OUTCOMES

Introduction

Endangered lists are an advocacy tool widely used by historic preservation agencies and organizations in their efforts to save and preserve threatened historic, architectural and cultural resources. The efficacy of these lists, however, has not been adequately studied and understood. As an essential step toward establishing metrics for gauging success, this chapter presents the outcomes of the assessment of the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation 11 to Save List. A total of 58 listed sites were examined. The assessment included a content analysis of the listing aided by the creation of a database with basic information about each site – and its threats – and a more in-depth analysis of several case studies.

Database and Analysis of Basic Information for Endangered Sites

This database included all endangered heritages from the Florida endangered heritage lists from 2005 to 2017. To aid in the content analysis of the sites listed on the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation (FTHP) endangered list (2005 to 2017), an Excel database was created to organize the information into categories: the period of significance, the resource type, the location, ownership, the threats at the time of listing and the current status.1

Amount of Heritages

There were 143 sites in the Florida endangered heritage lists (11 endangered sites were selected each year from 2005 to 2017). In fact, the researcher found that the

1 See Table 4-1
Florida Trust for Historic Preservation had a total of 58 unique, endangered sites through the 13 years of data.²

There were 22 heritages which appeared once during the 13-year period, accounting for 38% of the total. The rest of the 36 heritages were on the list two to nine times, accounting for 62% of the total.³

Among repeated listed sites, there were 16 properties that were listed twice (29.82%). Eight heritages appeared on lists three times (14.04%). Five heritages appeared four times (8.77%) and seven heritages appeared five or more times (29.82%). For example, the Coconut Grove Playhouse occurred on the list nine times – making it the most frequent heritage to appear during this timeframe.⁴

**Period of Significance of Sites**

In 58 endangered heritages, 50 sites are built in nineteenth century and twentieth century. Most sites are kept over several decades. According to the period, the researchers divided these heritages into four groups: 1800-1860 (Date of American Civil war), 1860-1900, 1900-1945 (End of World War II), and after 1945.⁵

After research, more than 90% of the relics belonged to the 19th century and 20th century, which means that most of Florida's endangered relics have been established for more than several decades. Only a few endangered relics could be

---

² Ibid
³ See Figure 4-1
⁴ See Figure 4-2
⁵ See Table 4-2
preserved for more than 200 years. Only one site was built less than 20 years and it is threatened.\textsuperscript{6}

There are two sites which were built before 19\textsuperscript{th} century, accounting for about 3\% of the total. There are four sites which were built from 1800 to 1860, accounting for about 7\% of the total. There are 11 sites which were built from 1860 to 1900, accounting for about 18\% of the total. There are 35 sites which were built from 1900 to 1945, accounting for about 59\% of the total. After 1945, there are only eight sites which were built, accounting for about 8\% of the total. Some sites are historic districts, there are many buildings belong to different periods, so researcher considered those districts into different periods.\textsuperscript{7}

**Cultural Type**

The researcher categorized 58 sites into three categories: Building, Landscape/Cultural Landscape and Archaeological. There are 28 buildings, accounting for about 48\% of the total; there are 29 landscapes or cultural landscapes, accounting for about 50\% of the total; there is only one archaeological site which is Florida’s Sybmerged Native American Sites, accounting for about 2\% of the total.\textsuperscript{8}

Among 28 buildings, the researcher categorized these sites into seven categories: residential, governmental, commercial, industry, educational, Tourism, and Religious. There are seven residential sites such as: Houses museums, accounting for about 25\% of the total; there are two governmental buildings such as: jail, fire station,

---

\textsuperscript{6} Ibid

\textsuperscript{7} See Figure 4-3

\textsuperscript{8} See Figure 4-4
accounting for about 7% of the total; there are seven commercial sites such as: company, post office, accounting for about 25% of the total; there are three industrial buildings such as: cigar factory, light house, accounting for about 11% of the total; six are educational schools such as: grammar school, middle school and college, accounting for about 21% of the total; there are two tourism sites such as: club, theater, accounting for about 7% of the total; there is only one religious site which is Central Christian Church, accounting for about 4% of the total. 9

Location

58 heritages located in many counties and cities in Florida. The researchers categorized these sites into five categories: Panhandle area (Tallahassee, Pensacola); North Central area (Jacksonville, Orlando, both coasts); Southeast area (Miami, Fort Lauderdale, Palm Beach); Southwest area (Tampa, Sarasota, Naples) and other. There are eight sites in Panhandle area, accounting for about 13% of the total. There are 15 sites in North Central area, accounting for about 26% of the total. There are 20 sites in Southeast area, accounting for about 33% of the total. There are 11 sites in Southwest area, accounting for about 23% of the total. And there are three sites in state-side area, including Old Roads, Lighthouses, accounting for about 5% of the total. 10

Ownership

58 heritages belong to many owners. Among ownerships, the researcher categorized them into four categories: Public agency; private organization; non-profit organization; individual and no-owner. 28 sites are public, including station, parks,
accounting for about 48% of the total. Three sites belong to private organizations, including clubs, houses, accounting for about 5% of the total. Eight sites belong to private, accounting for about 31% of the total and only one building is no-owner. According to data, some sites have multiple owners. Those historic districts, streets have many old buildings which belong to private or public organizations. ¹¹

**Primary Threats**

According to research, most resources receive multiple threats and require a wide range of assistance. Especially redevelopment and lack of funds are main threats to most heritages. Most of them have two threats, and some of them even have three threats. Data shows that most endangered sites receive multiple threats. Natural threats are hurricane, erosion by sea, higher level of sea and worse weather conditions. Lack of protection is mainly because of the following aspects: lack of maintenance, lack of funds, structure problems and vacant. Area renewal is mainly because of the following aspects: redevelopment, new buildings, new planning and human activities. ¹²

The researcher categorized these threats into two categories: Natural threat, and Human threats. Ten of them are facing natural threats and 58 of them are facing human threats.

Among natural threats, the researcher categorized them into three categories: Standard decay; Erosion; Hurricanes and storms. Four sites are decay, accounting for about 40% of the total. Five sites are corroded by many reasons: bad weather, sea, hurricane, erosion by sea, higher level of sea and worse weather conditions.

---

¹¹ See Figure 4-7
¹² See Table 4-2
accounting for about 50% of the total. Only one site is corroded by storms and hurricanes, accounting for about 10% of the total.\textsuperscript{13} 

Among human threats, the researcher categorized them into four categories: Lack of funds (protecting Plan without financial resources); demolition by neglect; down and lack of political or human protection. 13 sites have plan but they are lack of money, accounting for about 21% of the total. 33 sites are demolition by neglect: new buildings, area renew, accounting for about 21% of the total. Three sites are down already, accounting for about 21% of the total and 19 sites are lack of protection such as: policies, management, accounting for about 21% of the total.\textsuperscript{14} 

\textbf{Database and Analysis of Preservation} 

The researchers investigated the protection of each relic and made a summary of the results. The researchers divided the results of conservation into three categories: saved sites, unsaved but survived sites and demolished sites. After investigation, research and interview, the researcher found that in the list of Florida’s 11 to save (2005-2007), 58 monuments are in different situations.\textsuperscript{15} 21 sites have been successfully protected, 32 sites have survived until now but they are unsaved for a variety of reasons, and they may be saved in future. In last, five sites are totally down. So, of the 58 endangered sites, sites that were successfully protected accounted for about 36%, survived but unsaved sites accounted for about 55%, and failed protected sites for about 9%.\textsuperscript{16} 

\textsuperscript{13} See Figure 4-8  
\textsuperscript{14} See Figure 4-9  
\textsuperscript{15} See Table 4-3  
\textsuperscript{16} See Figure 4-10
Single and Multiple Times

Among the 21 sites that were saved, all sites are saved before or in 2015. In saved sites, there are 8 sites occurred once on the list, accounting for 36%. A total of four sites appeared twice on the list, occupying 18%. There are five sites appeared three times on the list, accounting for 23%. The remaining three sites appear on the list more than three times, accounting for 23%: two of these sites appear on the list four times, and another appears five times on the list.\(^{17}\)

Among the 33 sites that were survived but unsaved, there are 13 sites occurred once on the list, but all of them occurred in 2015, 2016 and 2017. They are accounting for 40%. A total of nine sites appeared twice on the list, occupying 27%. There are two sites which appeared three times on the list, accounting for 6%. Three sites appeared on the list four times, accounting for 9% and another six appears five times or more, accounting for 18%.\(^{18}\)

Among the four sites that were demolished, there are two sites occurred once on the list, they were down in 2005. They are accounting for 50%. One site appeared twice on the list, occupying 25%. Another one site appeared three times on the list, accounting for 25%.\(^ {19}\)

Single-time sites

A total of 22 appeared once in the list, seven sites have been saved, accounting for 32%. Those sites were appearing in the list from 2009 to 2015. 13 sites have survived but still unsaved until now. They are listed in Florida’s 11 to save from 2015 to

\(^{17}\) See Figure 4-11

\(^{18}\) See Figure 4-12

\(^{19}\) See Figure 4-13
2017, which happened recent two years and they accounted for 59%. And two sites are demolished, which happened in 2005 and 2009. They accounted for 12%.\(^{20}\)

**Double-times sites**

Of the 16 sites that appeared twice, there are six saved sites, occupying 38%. These sites appeared in the list for two consecutive years, from 2005 to 2012. And then they were withdrawn from the list. Nine sites survived but unsaved, accounting for 56%. They are listed from 2006 to 2017, only two sites are listed before 2010, and seven sites are listed after 2010. In the last, there is one site which was demolished, listed in 2008 and 2009.\(^{21}\)

**Third-times sites**

Of the eight sites that appeared three times, there are five saved sites, occupying 62%. These sites appeared in the list from 2005 to 2015. Two sites survived but unsaved, accounting for 25%. They are listed from 2006 to 2017. Only one site was demolished, which was listed in 2006, 2007 and 2008.\(^{22}\)

**Forth-times sites**

Of the five sites that appeared four times, there are two saved sites, occupying 40%. These sites appeared in the list before 2015. Three sites survived but unsaved, accounting for 60%. They are listed from 2005 to 2014.\(^{23}\)

---

\(^{20}\) See Figure 4-14

\(^{21}\) See Figure 4-15

\(^{22}\) See Figure 4-16

\(^{23}\) See Figure 4-17
Sites listed fifth or more times

Of the seven sites that appeared five or more than five times, only one site is saved, occupying 40%. The remaining six sites survived but unsaved for many years, they are accounting for 60%.  

Ownership

58 monuments have different owners. In 29 sites which belong to public agencies, seven of them are saved, 20 are survived but unsaved until now, and two sites are down. In 22 sites which belong to private organizations and individual, 10 sites have been have been successfully protected, 10 sites have survived until now but they are unsaved for a variety of reasons, two sites are totally down also. There are six sites which belong to non-profit organizations and four of them are saved and two of them are unsaved now. Besides, there are three sites have no owners.

Among the 21 sites that were saved, seven of them are public, accounting for 34%; three of them belong to private or private organizations, accounting for 14%; seven of them belong to personal properties, accounting for 33%, and four sites belong to non-profit organizations, accounting for 19%.

Among the 33 sites that were saved, 20 of them are public, accounting for 57%; ten of them belong to individual or private organizations, accounting for 28%; two sites belong to non-profit organizations, accounting for 6%, and three sites have no owners, accounting for 9.

\[ \text{Equation} \]

---

24 See Figure 4-18
25 See Table 4-3
26 See Figure 4-19
27 See Figure 4-20
Among the four sites that were demolished, two of them are public, accounting for 50%; other two sites belong to individual, accounting for 50%.28

**Threats**

Every site has multiple threats. 22 of them need funds to finish preservation; 22 of them were demolished by neglect and 10 of them are facing natural threats: erosion by sea, hurricane, bad weather; Another three sites are lack of owner. Besides, 31 of them do not have any solutions.29

Among the 21 sites that were saved, all threats belong to human threats. Four sites are because of lack of funds, accounting for 15%; 10 sites were demolished by neglect, accounting for 39%; and 12 of them needed management and protection, accounting for 46%. Those threats are solved by solutions and funds.30

Among the 33 sites that were saved, most threats belong to human threats and ten sites are also threatened by natural threats. 18 sites are not saved because of lack of funds, accounting for 15%; 12 sites were demolished by neglect, accounting for 39%; two sites may demolished by owners, accounting for 20%. Eight of them needed management and protection, accounting for 46%. And three sites need owners. Those threats can be solved by right solutions and enough funds.31

Among four sites that were demolished, four sites were demolished by different reasons: rebuilding, business purpose or lack of management.32

---

28 See Figure 4-21
29 See Table 4-2, Table 4-3
30 See Figure 4-22
31 See Figure 4-23
32 See Table 4-3
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Period of Significance</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date of Listing</th>
<th>Threat 1</th>
<th>Threat 2</th>
<th>Threat 3</th>
<th>Previous Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William J. Howey House</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>Howey-in-the-Hills</td>
<td>no one</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td>lack of maintenance</td>
<td>safed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Camp House</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Ocala</td>
<td>no one</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td>will be down without new owner</td>
<td>safed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tent House Field</td>
<td>1930s</td>
<td>cultural landscape sports area</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>area renewal</td>
<td>threatened by new facilities</td>
<td>safed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson &amp; Company Cigar Factory</td>
<td>1900s</td>
<td>Industrial Facility</td>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>Bartow</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>lack of property</td>
<td></td>
<td>safed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Munroe House</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>LeMoyne Art Foundation</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td>demolition</td>
<td>abandoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strahan Tranding Post and Camp Sites</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>area renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td>safed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne Bar &amp; Meribon Hotel</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>Miami Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>safed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford Grammar School</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Seminole</td>
<td>Sanford</td>
<td>Sanford High School</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>area renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td>threatened by redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Poinciana Playhouse and Plaza</td>
<td>1950s</td>
<td>Residential and Commercial</td>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>area renewal</td>
<td>demolition and alterations</td>
<td>threatened by proposed safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview High School</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>area renewal</td>
<td>building of a museum</td>
<td>safed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensacola Naval Air Station Historic District</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Escambia</td>
<td>Pensacola</td>
<td>US Navy</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Natural threat</td>
<td>demolished</td>
<td>Historic buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange City Historic District</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Residential and Commercial</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One North Orange Building</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Public/Owner-User</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>abandoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Melbourne High School</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>nonprofit Brevard Regional Arts Group</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>area renewal</td>
<td>new apartments</td>
<td>threatened by commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old iron County Jail/Feasthouse Building</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Governmental</td>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>namesake club</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>area renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td>threatened by redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old City Waterworks</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Governmental</td>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NationsBank Park Plaza</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>area renewal</td>
<td>lack of management</td>
<td>deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosesky plantation</td>
<td>1926-1926</td>
<td>Cultural landscape public club</td>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Marine Station</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Cultural landscape</td>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>key biscayne</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>area renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td>abandoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Spring House</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>bank</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Natural threat</td>
<td></td>
<td>limited funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Street Trio</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Residential and Commercial</td>
<td>Duval</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td>buildings deteriorate</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Riding Jackson House</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Duval</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>out of use for support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson House</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Duval</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>out of money and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic YMCA Building</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Cultural landscape</td>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>threatened by redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Neighborhoods surrounding UF</td>
<td>1880-1890s</td>
<td>Residential and Commercial</td>
<td>Alachua</td>
<td>Gainesville</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>area renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td>threatened by redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Civic Facilities of Tampa</td>
<td>1904-1912</td>
<td>Industrial Facility</td>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>threatened by encroaching development property rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic African American schools</td>
<td>1969-1971</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>big amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halahaw Park Race Course</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Cultural landscape Gym</td>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>Hialeah</td>
<td>John Brunetti</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>area renewal</td>
<td>Proposed development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Gables</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Miami Woman's Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Southern Hotel</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>Golden Coast Florida Regional Center</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>non-profit to acquire the property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Zachary Taylor</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>key west</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida's Syrneraged Native American Sites</td>
<td>1800-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Historic Antellum Roads</td>
<td>1765-1767</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Keys Reef Lighthouses</td>
<td>1852-1880</td>
<td>Industrial Facility</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station # 5</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Governmental</td>
<td>Duval</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernandina Post Office</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>Fernandina</td>
<td>U.S. Post Office</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>area renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td>abandoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliot Plantation</td>
<td>1760s</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Merritt Island</td>
<td>William Eliott</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>area renewal</td>
<td>threatened by redevelopment (new zoo)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egnatia Key</td>
<td>1940s</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna Pearce Lockett Homestead</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Duval</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Little Havana</td>
<td>1930s</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Cuban-owned and state</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>area renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td>no legal mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Henry Nehring's Palm Cottage Gardens</td>
<td>1850s</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Gotha</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>area renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td>lack of vegetation management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Palatka</td>
<td>1850s</td>
<td>Residential and Commercial</td>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>Palatka</td>
<td>public/private</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>abandoned(down economic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconut Grove playhouse</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corkscrew Bottling Plant</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chart Structures in UF related neighborhoods</td>
<td>1900-2000</td>
<td>Residential and Commercial</td>
<td>Alachua</td>
<td>Gainesville</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>abandoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman School</td>
<td>1929-1934</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>Lakeland</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>of fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Christian Church</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Seminole</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Cathcart LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>central Avenue - St.Peterburg</td>
<td>20th century</td>
<td>Residential and Commercial</td>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>St.Peterburg</td>
<td>district and state</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>area renewal</td>
<td>demolition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capeis Lake</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>public/private</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>lack of protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>lack of money</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**82**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-1. continued.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camp Pinchot Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boynton Beach High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnell House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleview Biltmore Resort and Spa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avery Smith House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-2. Preservation of saved sites, survived but unsaved sites and demolished sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saved sites</th>
<th>Listed year(s)</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Preservation process</th>
<th>Future plans</th>
<th>Effect of Florida’s 11 to Save</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NationsBank Park Plaza</td>
<td>2005, 2006</td>
<td>Maintenance issues, including problems with water leaking from the rooftop planters into the garage.</td>
<td>Efforts were begun to restore the landscape. This has resulted in the successful rehabilitation of the groundplane and resolution of drainage issues at a cost of $4.3 million. Trees were removed and this plaza is used as usual. (Work started in 2006.)</td>
<td>Replanting plan is argued.</td>
<td>The dramatic deterioration and destruction of the landscape resulted in The Cultural Landscape Foundation’s Landslide program listing the site as &quot;Lost&quot; in 2006; it is also on Florida’s 11 to Save.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avery Smith house</td>
<td>2005, 2006, 2007</td>
<td>This heritage was composed of several pillars. In 2007, an overzealous developer began to build on the property. Local preservationists waged a war against it.</td>
<td>The house was rebuilt using the rare coral that made up the original home. The new property also will be linked to a retail store. The building is rebuilt by Mosteel company from several pillars to a new complete house.</td>
<td>It is used as a shop.</td>
<td>After it was listed from 2005 to 2007, this house was kept and was successfully rebuilt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Pinchot Eglin AFB</td>
<td>2005, 2006, 2007</td>
<td>The U.S. Air Force originally proposed to demolish the entire Camp Pinchot Historic District at Eglin Air Force Base. This was to accommodate construction of a new senior officer housing under the Military Family Privatization Program at this military facility located near Fort Walton Beach in the Florida Panhandle.</td>
<td>CRM incorporated historic preservation plans for Camp Pinchot and the Eglin Field Historic District into the Housing Privatization programmatic agreement. Camp Pinchot will be conveyed to a private developer with restrictions requiring development of a reuse plan. They have given developers specific instructions to manage these properties until the developer returns them to the Air Force for adaptive reuse. CRM also reviewed all housing and real estate materials generated during the environmental impact process to ensure every other historic property was safeguarded. The Housing Privatization programmatic agreement will be signed by the Florida SHPO by late spring 2011.</td>
<td>Houses would be returned to the military after preservation for their reuse.</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places and Florida’s 11 to save.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old City Waterworks</td>
<td>2005, 2006</td>
<td>After the city ceased to use the site as a waterworks, it used the structure for storage. Overtime, however, it fell into despair. In the early 1980s, the city and state allocated funds that supported a stabilization project. Once stabilized, the city hoped to use the facility for other office space or to be leased to a community organization.</td>
<td>With funding assistance from the Department of State, Division of Historical Resources, project work included selective demolition, underpinning, foundation repair and regrading, extensive masonry repair and tuck pointing, roof framing repair (including the distinctive well hoistways), installation of new roof decking and metal shingle roofing matching the original treatment. Exterior stucco was patched and repainted, and a limited number of wood windows were restored. Significant as a remnant of &quot;modern&quot; engineering civil engineering improvements implemented in Tallahassee during the last quarter of the 19th century, the Old City Waterworks is individually listed in the National Register of Historic Places. It also has been designated a Civil Engineering Landmark. This project, which met the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, ensured the future. (2010)</td>
<td>This building was restored after it was listed.</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places and Florida’s 11 to save.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hialeah Park Race Course</td>
<td>2007 2008 2009 2010 2011</td>
<td>The place is shuttered, hurricane-damaged and was dying in 2008. Now buildings were built in plan.</td>
<td>Brunetti, who has owned the racetrack since 1977, reopened it in 2010 after nearly a decade-long hiatus. New state legislation allowed him to host quarter horse racing, and though he considered the sport only a &quot;minor league attraction,&quot; the law provided quite an enticement: If he held meets for two consecutive years, he would then be entitled to open a casino on the property. Now the race course has reopened and there is a gambling house as well.</td>
<td>This building was restored after it was listed. If reopened for gamblers every year, although new buildings were built.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal Land Company</td>
<td>2008 2009</td>
<td>Traffic pressure and a new highway was built.</td>
<td>A new arrangement of traffic and protecting historic area - Flagler Medal Land Co. Mobility Workshop reported by the Neighborhood Council of St. Augustine.</td>
<td>New organization of traffic and protection of historic buildings.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Nehrling's Palm Cottage Gardens</td>
<td>2008, 2009</td>
<td>Lack of management.</td>
<td>In 2009, Henry Nehrling Society, Inc., a non-profit 501(c)(3) corporation, acquired the six-acre parcel with the hope of restoring and operating the site as the Nehrling Gardens. Within the parcel exists Nehrling’s towering, four-story tall bunya pine (Araucaria bidwillii), magnolia tree collection, oaks, palms, bamboos and the 225-year-old grandfather cycad which predated the garden. Nehrling personally moved to the site.</td>
<td>While the Society was able to raise sufficient funds from individuals and private foundations for a substantial initial payment and first year operating funds and were generously supported by volunteers’ time and in-kind contributions, much work remains.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2. Continued
| Sanford Grammar School | 2009, 2010 | Redevelopment pressure and lack of management. | The building housed the Margaret K. Reynolds Student Museum. Seminole County's Student Museum, was on the list last year, too, and remains a focus of fund-raising and concern. In 2012, the University of Central Florida operated the building as the Public History Center, where students could hone their history skills. | The building was forced to close in 2015 when UCF terminated its lease. Without the university, the city could no longer afford to keep the building open. As of April 2017, the status of the building was unclear. | Florida's 11 to Save and National Register of Historic Places (“The Sanford Grammar School” a 2009 and 2010 Florida Trust for Historic Preservation 11 Most Endangered Sites.) |
| Fernandina Port Office | 2009 | Abandoned due to lack of management | In 2009, U.S. Sen. Bill Nelson (D-FL) lamented the House’s unwillingness to fund the restoration after the Senate had approved funding. Now it’s moisture-sealed, has a new air-conditioning unit and is close to its original look from a century ago, said Bill Bishop, vice president of the Akel, Logan and Shafer architecture firm, which completed the project. “We did a lot of terra-cotta work, which was decaying and cracking. We replaced all that,” Bishop said. He said his company was able to find large-scale original diagrams of the exterior details to ensure the pieces were recreated accurately. That all led the Florida State Department this month to award the project what’s called a Main-Street award for rehabilitation. | Over its hundred years, it’s also served as a customs office and federal courthouse. Kurtz nominated it for the award from the Florida State Department. “It’s not one of those buildings that people will go in and buy a T-shirt in to add to the economic vitality, but it is a place that when you put it in the context of this downtown, it’s one of the big landmarks that people will remember,” he said. | Florida’s 11 to Save |
| Fort Zachary Taylor | 2010 | Deterioration in some parts of the Fort became so severe that parts of several structures are closed to the public for safety reasons. A lack of funding has placed additional stress on the structure. The threat will continue unless funding is identified to address these issues. | People did some restoration for old houses and interior decoration. | It is saved, but help is still needed for protection. | Florida’s 11 to Save |
| Central Christian Church | 2010, 2011, 2012 | The Central Christian Church was listed on the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation’s 11 Most Endangered Sites in 2012 after an application to demolish the building was withdrawn. | In June 2014, the building was sold to Cathcart, LLC by the Diocese of Orlando and has since been renovated into townhomes which the developer calls Samsara. | It is saved, but help is still needed for protection. | Florida’s 11 to Save |
| Orange City Historic District | 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014 | Over the last few decades, commercialism has been encroaching on the old hotel and other structures in the historic district, some of which have fallen into disrepair. For that reason, the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation has added the district to its list of the 11 Most Endangered Historic Sites in the state. | The organization works with local preservationists, giving them tools and resources to help save the buildings. After watching traffic zip by on 17-92, much of the battle will be awareness and educating locals and visitors alike that an Orange City historic district even exists. | It is saved, but help is still needed for protection – especially for traffic way and some old houses. | Florida’s 11 to Save |
| Coca Cola Bottling Plant | 2011, 2012 | Increased traffic | Broward County challenged PGAL to create a much-needed, 1,000-space parking garage while preserving the integrity of a historic community treasure: a two-story Coca-Cola bottling plant from 1938 located on a prominent corner of the 1.9-acre site. The solution: a six-level, 410,000-square-foot complex that embraces the county-owned Coca-Cola building on two sides. PGAL repaired and restored the plant’s exterior façade, which was previously named one of the most endangered structures in the state by the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation. (2014) | It is well protected. | Florida’s 11 to Save |
| Thompson Company | 2011 | It was almost demolished by a wrecking ball in 2011. | In 2012, the city invested about $34,000, including nearly $6,000 in community donations, to seal the building and put a chain-link fence around it as protection while administrators searched for a developer to restore it. The citizens group collected another $6,000, which paid for the preparation of the request for development proposals. Since then, Bartow has secured a federal grant totaling about $115,000 to rid the factory of the environmental contaminants, including lead paint, arsenic and animal droppings. That work should be under way within the next few months and completed in the summer, Long said. | It is saved but needs more concerns about future. | Florida’s 11 to Save |
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Lewis Spring House  
Extensive cosmetic damage and bad weather. The Spring House Institute is working to acquire, restore and complete the Lewis Spring House in 2012. In 2015, a project recommended by Jeff Baker and Mat Daow that has been sitting in the wings for about 1.5 years has been safely accomplished. Patching the roof is scheduled for April 2017. It is saved, but there are concerns for the future. Preservation will continue.  
National Register of Historic Places and Florida's 11 to Save

Laura Street Trio  
2012  
Building details are deteriorated and lack of management. Construction begins in October 2017 in downtown Jacksonville on the first phase of the Historic Barnett National Bank Building and Laura Street Trio project — announced today by developers SouthEast Development Group of Jacksonville and The Molasky Group of Companies of Las Vegas, Nevada. The $90 million adaptive reuse program will address the rehabilitation of the historic properties that are considered by many as the most significant group of historic structures yet to be preserved in the southern United States. Much of the initial work will not be visible to the public, as the construction team will begin by performing interior structural remediation and improvements, including enhancements to the window systems, environmental clean-up and bringing the building to compliance with current energy codes. The Laura Street Trio will become a 145-room Courtyard by Marriott boutique-style hotel. Work has started.  
Florida’s 11 to Save

Chapman School  
2013  
Lack of management and money for restoration. In 2014, the Florida Legislature has allocated in the states FY 2014-15 budget, $497,000 to the City of Apalachicola for the adaptive reuse of the 80-year-old Chapman School into a Municipal Library. The appropriation comes under the Florida Department of State, Division of Library and Information Services Public Library Construction Grant, which has been applied for by the city over the last several years beginning in 2008 when Cindi Giaretta, the city’s former grants manager wrote and submitted the initial grant application. This project is complete.  
Florida’s 11 to Save

Tinker Field  
2014  
The threat of demolishing the field for a parking lot did not sit well for many in the community. Through public pressure and support of local Orlando and state officials and staff via many public meetings, the idea of the Tinker Field History Center was born. The City of Orlando District 5 Commissioner Regina Hill gathered today to thank all involved and to turn dirt to begin the construction. This place was saved from demolition and restoration has begun.  
Florida’s 11 to Save / The preservation of Tinker Field / Orange Preservation Trust

Green Gables  
2015  
It was almost demolished by a wrecking ball in 2015 and the organization tried to buy it. It was saved by Saving Melbourne's Bridge to the Past, and it tries to buy this property. But it still needs $250,000 dollars or it will be demolished in 2018. This place was saved from demolished temporary.  
Florida’s 11 to Save

Miami Woman’s Club  
The current condition of the interior renders the building unusable. Two years after signing a deal with the Heafey Group to restore the Miami Woman’s Club to its original luster, club leaders are moving forward with their renovation plans to turn the historic waterfront property into a restaurant and lounge space. Miami’s Historic and Environmental Preservation Board on Tuesday unanimously approved MVC Development’s request for several waivers needed for the restoration, according to the property owner’s attorney Vicky Leiva. The board had previously approved plans for the restaurant and lounge use on Sept. 9, 2016. It was saved and decorated.  
Florida’s 11 to Save

Downtown Palatka  
Several buildings downtown are on the point of collapse, and many have severe roofing or structural problems associated with years of neglect. The economic downturn coupled with a growing vacancy rate downtown is having a dire impact on this historic city. Some buildings has been redeveloped. Help is still needed for the buildings.  
Florida’s 11 to Save
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survived but Unsaved sites</th>
<th>Listed year(s)</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Preservation process</th>
<th>Future plans</th>
<th>Effect of Florida’s 11 to save</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Southern Hotel</td>
<td>2005, 2006, 2007, 2008</td>
<td>Vacant and no management</td>
<td>It was sold to Gold Coast Florida Regional Center but it is still empty.</td>
<td>It will be demolished and a new apartment complex will be built in its place.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida’s Historic Antebellum Roads</td>
<td>2006, 2007</td>
<td>Roads were built 200 years ago, and they need protection and restoration.</td>
<td>Roads are still used as normal.</td>
<td>No changes.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Cigar Factories</td>
<td>2006, 2007</td>
<td>The of the 15 factories do not have protection.</td>
<td>West Tampa Community Development Corporation (WTCDC) and West Tampa Neighborhood Association also expressed apprehension and wished to protect old factories in 2005. But there are fights for ownerships, reversing the misconception that rehabilitating these factories will be unecomonial and far too costly to be worth it – especially in a coastal environment prone to harsh inclement weather. In 2011, Nine of the former factories are located within the locally designated Ybor City Historic District – a National Register landmark district – and are regulated by the Barrio Latino Commission.</td>
<td>They are protected, but no restoration has happened.</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places and Florida’s 11 to Save.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boynton High School/Mangrove Park school</td>
<td>2008, 2009, 2010, 2014, 2015</td>
<td>In 2007, ownership was transferred to the Boynton Beach Community Redevelopment Agency, and in 2009, ownership was transferred back to the city. The building has been vacant for a number of years.</td>
<td>In 2011 RES/BI consultant team helped the City lead a community driven, community responsive planning and development process for redevelopment consistent with the City of Boynton Beach Downtown Vision and Master Plan. But the incompatible architectural design proposal may diminish historic character. In 2016, architect Rick Gonzalez had a plan to save the Boynton Beach historic high school from demolition, but it will take millions of dollars from taxpayers to make it happen. Under Gonzalez’s plan, the high school on Ocean Avenue would be developed into a cultural arts community center worth about $6 million. Gonzalez’s partner, Jeff Hardin of Stratton Construction, has $4.5 million ready to go. Gonzalez has asked the city to come up with the remaining $1.5 million to be paid over three years. The money would come from the Community Redevelopment Agency.</td>
<td>It was empty until recently, now there is planning</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save (Fitzpatrick said there are about 150 people he directly knows of who are interested in saving the school. While residents were happy after hearing the commissioners wanted to move forward in the process, Fitzpatrick warned them that it isn’t a done deal. “Be happy now, but be ready to be back here in 90 days,” he said.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Marine Stadium</td>
<td>2009, 2010</td>
<td>In the wake of Hurricane Andrew, it was declared an unsafe building under Miami-Dade County building code on September 18, 1992. It has been vacant until now.</td>
<td>In 2004, $3,000,000 was pledged in a municipal bonds by county residents for the restoration and renovation of the facilities. A group, Friends of Miami Marine Stadium, was formed in 2008 with the purpose of restoring the Marine Stadium and returning it to operation. Performer Gloria Estefan, through her charity group, is a major contributor to Friends of Miami Marine Stadium. The City of Miami granted control of the stadium property to the group in 2013, and the group returned in late 2014 with a revitalization proposal and supposed funds. And in 2017 they — the architects, engineers and other consultants hired by the city of Miami — to develop a blueprint for the Virginia Key stadium’s restoration — say they’re ready for the next step: actual construction drawings that the city can put out to bid.</td>
<td>Although it is no change and still vacant, if all goes as planned, that means the drawn-out effort to put one of Miami’s signature but long-neglected places back in working order will culminate in a re-opening in the summer of 2020.</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places and Florida’s 11 to Save.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic YMCA Building</td>
<td>2013, 2014</td>
<td>The building was purchased in 2004 by an investment group with plans to convert the building into condos. After demolishing much of the interior, the project was abandoned leaving the building empty. It was eventually put up for sale.</td>
<td>Eventually, the YMCA was sold to South Florida developer Nick Ekonomou in November 2015. He plans to convert the building into a boutique hotel and event venue and estimates the renovation to cost around $6 million. He also planned to erect a nine-story luxury apartment complex and car garage behind the building. Though according to recent interviews, those plans seem to change and grow over time.</td>
<td>There is no change to the project schedule.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to save</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Space Florida is proposing to develop and operate a commercial space launch site (the proposed Shiloh Launch Complex) on approximately 200 acres in the Shiloh area of Merritt Island NWR, within the boundaries of the Kennedy Space Center. Space Florida will be required to obtain a Launch Site Operator License from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The FAA will develop an Environmental Impact Statement to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of constructing and operating the proposed Shiloh Launch Complex. A Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register to announce this proposed project. This facility is on a plan.

**Florida's 11 to Save**

**Eliot Plantation**

2014, 2015, 2016

Space Florida is proposing to develop and operate a commercial space launch site (the proposed Shiloh Launch Complex) on approximately 200 acres in the Shiloh area of Merritt Island NWR, within the boundaries of the Kennedy Space Center. Space Florida will be required to obtain a Launch Site Operator License from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The FAA will develop an Environmental Impact Statement to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of constructing and operating the proposed Shiloh Launch Complex. A Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register to announce this proposed project. This facility is on a plan.

**One North Orange Building**

2015

The building is in need of major renovation, including updating the building infrastructure to bring it up to date. If these maintenance issues continue to be ignored, the building could become a victim of demolition by neglect, a tragedy that happens all too often with historic structures. It is vacant with no owner and no changes.

**Florida Keys Reef Lighthouses**

2015 2016

Due to budget cuts, the lights have not received basic maintenance in many years. In May 2015 the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation noted all six of the Florida Keys reef lights as being among the “Most Endangered Historic Sites” in Florida. Restoration still needs money and The Florida Keys Reef Lights Foundation has raised $77,000 toward that effort. No changes. Florida's 11 to Save

**East Little Havana**

2015 2016

Endangered scattered resources with no legal mechanism in place for the establishment of thematic multiple resource nominations. In 2017, the National Trust for Historic Preservation will sponsor a major plan to help guide the preservation and revitalization of Little Havana, the storied neighborhood where activists have been battling to stave off large-scale development from adjacent Brickell. The Trust’s announcement, scheduled for Friday morning, will come a day after the city of Miami officially scrapped a controversial two-year-old proposal that would have upzoned much of East Little Havana with the aim of encouraging redevelopment. Preservationists and activists complained the upzoning would have led to displacement of the neighborhood’s working-class residents and the destruction of an architecturally valuable collection of early 20th century homes and commercial buildings. No changes. National Register of Historic Places and Florida's 11 to save.

**Florida's Submerged Native American Sites**

2016

These artifacts and the sites they are associated with have come under threat by an effort to change the state law to allow the private collection of artifacts from state submerged lands. These artifacts would then disappear into private collections and may end up for sale on the antiquities market. These sites are protected by the Florida Public Archaeology Society. No changes. Florida Public Archaeology Society/Florida's 11 to Save

**Fire Station # 5**

2011, 2012

Threatened by redevelopment and management. This place was planned to be removed in 2009, but it is still there. The Florida Times-Union was helping keep this story of preservation alive. There has been some recent interest in the building, and we’re waiting to hear more about soil contamination at the site. Florida's 11 to Save

**William J. Howey House**

2016

Lack of management and no owner. The creepy, abandoned 28-room house has been tied up in foreclosure since 2008. A judge finally awarded the eight-bedroom home to mortgage holder Nationstar in 2015. Since then, the company has been trying up loose ends and trying to work with an historical society to buy it. However, they have had no luck. So last week, the intriguing house set behind custom iron gates went up for sale for $480,000. It is still waiting to be sold, but many people are interested in it. Florida's 11 to Save
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edna Pearce Lockett Homestead</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>The Edna Pearce Lockett Homestead is currently owned by the South Florida Water Management District. Previous attempts to sell the site have failed. With no occupant or use, the house and other buildings have fallen into a state of disrepair. The Water Management District is again moving forward with efforts to attempt to sell the house and property. Florida's 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Jackson House</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Despite volunteer efforts by the Foundation and community members, the house is currently in a state of disrepair due to a lack of resources. Public tours are now limited. It needs more help. Florida's 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messeley Plantation</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Despite the creation of a Trust by the last member of the Messeley family, the 15-acre site, house, and outbuildings are threatened by development. It needs more help. Florida's 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic African American Schools</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>When school integration was finally accomplished many African American schools were abandoned and released from public ownership. It needs more help. Florida's 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson House</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Although saved from demolition more than once, the house is in poor condition. There is a new plan for restoration. Florida's 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconut Grove Playhouse</td>
<td>2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2013, 2015, 2016, 2017</td>
<td>The building is an advanced state of deterioration due to neglect. Miami-Dade County plans to retain the façade of the Playhouse, but it plans to demolish and replace the historic theater with a new one. The process of preservation was slowed due to a lack of money. The process of preservation happened in 2011-2012, but there was a lack of money. No final plan is in place. Florida's 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firestone Building</td>
<td>2016, 2017</td>
<td>Therefore, there is no protection or review afforded to the property in the redevelopment process. The City of Tallahassee has issued a request for proposals for the redevelopment of the site. Florida's 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egmont Key</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Egmont Key was endangered by severe erosion made worse by rising sea levels. Since 1849, the island has lost some 380 acres of land. The Army Corps of Engineers dredges the shipping channel and places the sand on Egmont Key. Despite these refurbishment efforts, erosion has led to the loss of two of the five historic gun batteries. More funds are needed for more restoration. Florida's 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Historic District</td>
<td>2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2017</td>
<td>For decades the Florida Department of Transportation has consistently proposed widening Highway 90 through Milton to four lanes, necessitating the demolition of historic buildings and forever changing the character of the entire downtown. Currently, the FDOT is conducting a Project Development &amp; Environmental (PD&amp;E) Study that is set to determine the fate of Highway 90 and downtown. Florida's 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranahan Trading Post and Camp site</td>
<td>2006, 2006, 2007, 2009</td>
<td>A new 42-story condominium project was proposed. It is still there, but a 42-story condominium project was finished. The building remained, but threats were realized. The building has not changed, and preservation has failed. No changes, but the threats came true. Florida's 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bellevue Biltmore Hotel</td>
<td>2006, 2006, 2007, 2012, 2013, 2014</td>
<td>Area redevelopment. A local preservation group Friends of the Belleview Biltmore was not able to find an investor to restore the hotel, and a legal battle to prevent its demolition, led by the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation in partnership with the Friends and the National Trust, proved unsuccessful. Developer JMC Communities began demolition in 2015, and eventually the historic southern and eastern wings were deconstructed to make way for condominiums. As of press time, JMC had committed to preserving and relocating the original lobby and a group of rooms above it as a small inn and meeting space. The company said the Biltmore will become the longest continuously-operating Henry B. Plant built hotel when renovations are completed by mid 2018. Inside, you can see most of the walls have been stripped down. Most of the wood flooring will be salvaged. Fireplaces will be restored, but not operable. It will take a little more than a year for it to be completely redone. Florida's 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob White Citrus Packing House/ Strawn Historic Districts</td>
<td>2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011</td>
<td>The site has been heavily vandalized and looted over the years since it closed, in spite of no trespassing signs and a fence around the facility. In 2008, a fire destroyed the machine shop. In 2010, a fire destroyed a 40 foot by 50 foot outbuilding and damaged two others. Although many people are interested in this site but no one purchase it, and it is vacant. Vacant and looking for an owner. Florida's 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2. Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Listed year(s)</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Preservation process</th>
<th>Future plans</th>
<th>Effect of Florida’s 11 to Save</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonnet House</td>
<td>2008, 2009, 2010</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale’s Bonnet House was threatened by encroaching development. Bonnet House already has massive buildings intruding upon its views from the corridors. A developer has received permission to build an 18-story hotel less than 200 feet away.</td>
<td>The apartment is built already and the threat materialized. But Bonnet House remains.</td>
<td>It is still under protection with a huge apartment beside it, and it still needs help.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Poinciana Playhouse and Plaza</td>
<td>2010, 2011</td>
<td>Remaining “dark” for 10 years during a poor economy, this site is threatened by demolition and alterations.</td>
<td>The Sterling entity, in turn, negotiated a long-term lease with the National Arts Institute, Inc., [dba, the “Palm Beach Performing Arts Center (PBPAC)”. PBPAC goals require major upgrade renovations, including the latest technology, to become a BROADWAY-equivalent for Palm Beach. Two years after the National Arts Institute signed a lease to take over the Royal Poinciana Playhouse, the theater remains an empty shell and the landlord is looking for another tenant. The group, which does business as the Palm Beach Performing Arts Center, was forced to bow out when it failed to raise $10 million by Oct. 31 as required by its lease.</td>
<td>It is empty and looking for owner.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne High School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Area renewal because of a new apartment complex.</td>
<td>In 2015, contractors began demolishing the former Melbourne High School, just hours after police searched through the dilapidated downtown structure one last time to ensure no one was inside. Developer Sam Zimmerman, owner of Zimmerman Development LLC, plans to redevelop the site on East New Haven Avenue for a multi-use building.</td>
<td>There is a new plan for apartments.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Camp House</td>
<td>2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016</td>
<td>Lack of protection and the owners have a plan to demolish it.</td>
<td>In 2012, OHPAB denied owner Dorothy Ritterhoff’s request to demolish the house. But, under the city’s ordinances, that denial is only effective for one year. That year ended March 1, and Ritterhoff is free to take the structure down. So far, Ritterhoff has not requested a demolition permit from the city.</td>
<td>The owner can demolish it as soon as possible.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Neighborhoods surrounding UF</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>The goal of increased density is threatening historical, architectural and cultural resources in neighborhoods adjacent to the main campus. Zoning changes have resulted in the loss or planned demolition of numerous unprotected historic structures along major thoroughfares including Southwest 13th Street and West University Avenue.</td>
<td>Although they have become synonymous with cultural diversity at UF, the buildings are being razed to accommodate new facilities for various institutes.</td>
<td>New apartments and new buildings are being built.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 Block of Central Avenue</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Area renewal and vacant.</td>
<td>In 2016, a 6,500-pound wrecking ball was expected to destroy the building. The wrecking ball also was to smash the bank next to the building.</td>
<td>New buildings.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolished sites</td>
<td>Listed year(s)</td>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>Preservation process</td>
<td>Future plans</td>
<td>Effect of Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheraton Bal Harbour Hotel</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>A new building was planned.</td>
<td>The hotel was demolished in November 2007 to make way for the new St. Regis Resort &amp; Residences, which will feature three 27-story all-glass towers rising above nine acres of lushly landscaped gardens, scheduled to debut in 2011.</td>
<td>Down.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensacola Naval Air Station Historic District</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>New houses and a demolition plan.</td>
<td>The Pensacola Naval Air Station (an NHL) demolished instead of repairing 33 historic structures after Hurricane Ivan hit in 2004.</td>
<td>Down.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview High School</td>
<td>2006, 2007, 2008</td>
<td>Building a museum.</td>
<td>Despite these efforts and the development of a viable plan for preservation, the building was demolished in 2009.</td>
<td>Down.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chert Structures in University of Florida related neighborhoods</td>
<td>2008, 2009</td>
<td>Some were demolished by neglect.</td>
<td>Two of buildings are down</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

Introduction

Through careful research on selected sites, the researcher conducted a detailed assessment of Florida’s 11 to Save by organizing and analyzing data presented in chapter four. The researcher summarized the successes and failures of preservation and analyzed the causes of success or failure. In this process, the researcher can evaluate the role and influence of the endangered list and clarify exactly what the endangered list has for preservation. After extensive analysis, it seems evident that Florida’s 11 to Save list has been helpful to the listed sites.

Preservation is not a short and simple process. In general, many endangered sites that are on the far side are more protected and many endangered sites listed in 2015 and 2016 were rarely protected. In later years, these sites may be protected, as many endangered sites were many years ago. Although some sites were successfully protected after two or more years, the main factors that determined preservation were planning and funding. So when money is available and there is a good solution in place, many sites were saved in the year. However, some sites appeared on list more than five times. Important factors that affect preservation are the protection solution and funding. The researcher sought to determine whether Florida’s 11 to Save had a positive effect on listed the sites.

Preservation Needs Enough Time

In general, the less time a site was listed on Florida’s 11 to Save list, the more likely it was to have been rescued. However, the data did not fully prove this view. For those sites which were listed four times or more times, more than half of the sites still
could not be saved for a variety of reasons. But of the 22 sites that appeared once, only seven sites (32%) were successfully protected. Of the remaining 15 sites, 13 still required preservation, while two sites were completely removed. Likewise, six of the 16 sites (38%) that appeared twice were saved. Two structures from related neighborhoods at the University of Florida in Gainesville appeared on Florida’s 11 to Save in 2008 and 2009 and have since been demolished.\footnote{See Figure 4-10}

The explanation for this phenomenon is time. Among the 21 sites that were saved, all sites are saved on or before 2015. Among the 33 sites that survived but were unsaved, 13 occurred once on the list – and all of them were listed in 2015, 2016 or 2017. Excluding these 13 sites which occurred once, among the remaining nine sites, seven sites (78%) were successfully saved. Only two were removed.\footnote{See Table 4-3} So, the researcher has reason to believe that if these one-time listed sites had not been removed for some reasons, they would have been likely to have been saved in the future.

In addition, all the saved sites appear on lists two years ago. Thus the researcher thinks that successful preservation should take no less than two years. Although some sites have been saved within a year, most sites still require two or three – or more – years to complete the preservation because the solution for each site is different, the funding is different and the amount of work is different. Consider that some sites need restorations while others need rebuilding.

For example:
According to the site's information, "Nations Bank Park Plaza was listed in 2005 and 2006. It had maintenance issues, including problems with water leaking from the rooftop planters into the garage. Local government workers began to restore this plaza in 2006. Efforts were taken to remove trees and restore the landscape. The grounds were rehabilitated and the drainage issues were resolved. The entire project finished within a year. The cost of success was $4.3 million.\textsuperscript{4}

“The Avery Smith house was listed in 2005, 2006 and 2007. This heritage included several pillars – without any structures. In 2007 an overzealous developer began to bulldoze the property. Local preservationists waged a war against it. The house was rebuilt using the rare coral that made up the original home. The home was rebuilt by the Mosteel Company with just several pillars surviving from the original home. It is now used as a shop.\textsuperscript{5}

\textbf{Fund Is Important For Preservation}

Using data regarding ownership (as presented in chapter four) and the process of preservation of every site, the researcher found that public agencies did not do any better than private or non-profit organizations in saving heritages.


The researcher found that among the 33 surviving – but unsaved sites – many already had a solution, but preservation was delayed because of a lack of money. Tallahassee’s Old City Waterworks is an example of a successful preservation that required very large expenditures.

According to resources, “After the Tallahassee ceased to use the site as a waterwork, it used the structure for storage. Overtime, however, it fell into despair. In the early 1990s, the city and state allocated funds that supported a stabilization project. Once stabilized, the city hoped to use the facility for either office space or to be leased to a community organization.” 6

In 2007, an Architects Company started a campaign to save this building. According to website, “The whole project was completed in 2007 with a budget of $1,752,000. With funding assistance from the Department of State, Division of Historical Resources, project work included selective demolition, underpinning, foundation repair and extensive masonry repair and tuck pointing, roof framing repair (including the distinctive well), installation of new roof decking and metal shingle roofing matching the original treatment. Exterior stucco was patched and repainted, and a limited number of wood windows were restored. Significant as a remnant of “modern” civil engineering improvements implemented in Tallahassee during the last quarter of the 19th century, the Old City Waterworks was individually listed on the National Register of Historic

Places. It also has been designated a Civil Engineering Landmark. This project, which met the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, ensured the future.”

Many Agencies need to apply to the relevant departments for the funds to preserve sites. But this can be a challenge: preservation projects may require large budgets. Many departments are already facing budgets cuts. This is why in the 30 public sites, only eight sites were successfully protected, and 20 sites were still not preserved.

For example, the Florida Keys reef lights, constructed in the twentieth century, is listed on the Florida’s 11 to save in 2015, 2016. According to resources, “Due to budget cuts, the lights have not received basic maintenance in many years. In May 2015, the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation noted all six of the Florida Keys reef lights were among the Most Endangered Historic Sites in Florida. Restoration still requires money, and a non-profit organization – The Florida Keys Reef Lights Foundation – raised $77,000 toward that effort. But they still need more money to defend against natural threats such as erosion by sea and bad weather.”

Private organizations, individuals and non-profit organizations can finish preservation if the policy is allowed and when they also have enough money.

The Miami Woman’s Club was listed in 2005, 2013 and 2014. It belonged to a private organization. “The interior of this private club was in a condition that rendered the building unusable after 10 years. Two years after signing a deal with the Heafey

---


Group to restore the Miami Women’s Club to its original luster, club leaders moved forward with their renovation plans to turn the historic waterfront property into a restaurant and lounge space. Miami’s Historic and Environmental Preservation Board unanimously approved MWC Development’s request for several waivers needed for the restoration. The club was transformed into a large, upscale restaurant.\(^9\)

In addition to the ownerships, data from threats in Forth Chapter shows that lack of fund is also a problem encountered in preservation. 22 sites need funds to finish preservation. And most threats such as: demolition, natural threats, lack of management or protection, could be solved if there is enough money.

Hialeah Park Race Course, constructed in 1925, is listed on the National Register and Florida’s 11 to save (2007 2008 2009 2010 2011). According to the News, “The site, vacant and unused, was in imminent danger of being lost to development. This site is also hurricane-damaged. Moreover, it is dying without any management or protection.” \(^10\)

“The race track and park contains a botanical garden that is the oldest of its kind in south Florida. During its heyday, the park was a social Mecca entertaining the likes of Joseph P. Kennedy, Winston Churchill and Harry Truman. Over the years, it has hosted some of the nation’s greatest horses—Seabiscuit, Citation and Seattle Slew—and is the oldest and widest turf track course in the country. The Mediterranean Revival clubhouse has a sweeping formal staircase and broad terraces and a memorable landscape

---


marked by grand rows of trees and tropical gardens. In 1939 the Audubon Society declared Hialeah Park as a Flamingo Sanctuary. The site is an important community resource, hosting events in its ballrooms and providing green space in a crowded and growing area.”

But after several years, according to another report, “Brunetti, who has owned the racetrack since 1977, reopened it in 2010 after nearly a decade-long hiatus. New state legislation allowed him to host quarter horse racing, and though he considered the sport only a “minor league attraction,” the law provided quite an enticement: If he held meets for two consecutive years, he would then be entitled to open a casino on the property. Now Race Course is reopened for game and there is gambling house beside.”

In 2014, “Business continues to grow,” he said, citing a recent one-day simulcast handle of more than $400,000. “And it has been a very warm reception by the local community. We’re looking forward to expanding our activities.”

The park’s ambiance and history — that’s “our calling card, our ace,” he said, and is something the newcomers and other tracks can’t duplicate. The facility is open for simulcast and for casino games Wednesday through Sunday. The track carries the same racing simulcast lineup as Gulfstream Park. But if people want to see live horses

11 Ibid
13 Ibid
actually being saddled and running on the track, people have to wait until November, when the next quarter horse season opens.  

Almost every endangered site needs sufficient funds, because the adequacy of funds will determine if preservation can be completed. It also determines the status of endangered sites.

**Solution Is Pioneer to Preservation**

Before proceeding to preservation, the solution needs to be confirmed. Typically, after permitted by owners, relevant departments and laws, the solution will be used to instruct preservation and will help preservation to be finish on time. Not only that, the good solution could solve the threats as well as revitalize the endangered sites.

For example, Coca Cola Bottling Plant is listed in 2011 and 2012 because increased traffic is threatening this old building. According to the resources, "In 2014, Broward County planned to create a much-needed, 1,000-space parking garage while preserving the integrity of a historic community treasure: a two-story Coca-Cola bottling plant from 1938 located on a prominent corner of the 1.9-acre site."  

"The solution: a six-level, 410,000-square-foot complex that embraces the county-owned Coca-Cola building on two sides. PGAL repaired and restored the plant's exterior façade, which was previously named one of the most endangered structures in the state by the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation."  

14 Ibid


16 Ibid
But there are some endangered sites for which no good solution has been found. Discussions and quarrels can delay preservation efforts – sometimes for several years.

East Little Havana was listed in 2015 and 2016, and it also was listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It has endangered, scattered resources with no legal mechanism in place for the establishment of thematic multiple resource nominations. According to resources, “In 2017, the National Trust for Historic Preservation will sponsor a major plan to help guide the preservation and revitalization of Little Havana, the storied neighborhood where activists have been battling to stave off large-scale development from adjacent Brickell. The Trust’s announcement comes on the heels of a decision by the city of Miami to officially scrap a controversial two-year-old proposal that would have demolished much of East Little Havana with the aim of encouraging redevelopment. Preservationists and activists complained the upzoning would have led to displacement of the neighborhood’s working-class residents and the destruction of an architecturally valuable collection of early 20th century homes and commercial buildings. So preservation was delayed for two years, but it finally started in 2017.”

All in all, having a solution is very important for preservation. A solution will determine the effect of preservation. It brings more than just rejuvenation to preservation, but also a respect for history and architecture.

**Lack of Owner Hinder Preservation**

Several sites which are vacant or which have no owner have not been successfully protected. The harm in having no owner should be obvious. In fact, it can

---

take a great deal of time to determine that there is now owner. And when that is the case, it is especially difficult to formulate a solution, raise capital and begin preservation.

Historic Cigar Factories are listed in 2006 and 2007. Fifteen factories do not have protection and management. According to resources, “West Tampa Community Development Corporation and West Tampa Neighborhood Association also expressed apprehension and wished to protect old factories in 2005, but there are fights for ownerships, reversing the misconception that rehabilitating these factories will be uneconomical and far too costly to be worth it, especially in a coastal environment prone to harsh inclement weather. In 2011, nine of the former factories are located within the locally designated Historic District—a National Register landmark district—and are regulated by the Barrio Latino Commission.”

Sometimes having no owner not only hinders preservation efforts, but it can cause even more troubles for the sites. According to resources, “Bob White Citrus Packing House / Strawn Historic Districts was heavily vandalized and looted over the years since it closed, in spite of no trespassing signs and a fence around the facility. It was listed in 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011. Because it had no owner, there were no managers or protections. In 2008, a fire destroyed the machine shop. In 2010, a fire destroyed a 40 foot by 50 foot outbuilding and damaged two others. Although many people were interested in this site, no one has purchased it and it remains vacant.”

18 “Tampa’s Cigar Factories Part 1.” Gator Preservationist, 1 Apr. 2014, gatorpreservationist.wordpress.com/2011/05/14/tampas-cigar-factories-part-1/.


Demolition Because of Different Purposes

Data in the fourth chapter shows that four sites were down forever – with no possibility of restoring them.

According to resources, “The Sheraton Bal Harbour Hotel was listed on Florida’s 11 to Save in 2005. It was one of the best hotels in Miami Beach. When ownership changed, the new owner demolished in November 2007 it in order to build the all-new St. Regis Resort & Residences, featuring three 27-story all-glass towers rising above nine acres of lushly landscaped gardens.”  

“The Pensacola Naval Air Station Historic District was listed in 2005. The Pensacola Naval Air Station (an NHL) demolished – rather than repair – 33 historic structures after Hurricane Ivan hit in 2004.”

“Riverview High School was listed in 2006, 2007 and 2008. Despite efforts for the development of a viable plan for preservation, the building was demolished in 2009. “

“Chert houses in neighborhoods near the University of Florida in Gainesville were listed in 2008 and 2009. Some of them were demolished by neglect and two structures were demolished forever.”


In four cases, because the owner did not agree with the preservation or because of commercial reasons, the owner was willing to dismantle these buildings. Such results are very regrettable for historic preservation. Although the researcher does not agree with the demolition of buildings, he appreciates that such choices may be the best for individuals or agencies.

Owners need to be seriously considered in the preservation process. Some non-profit organizations try their best to persuade the owner to retain the old buildings though they do not own endangered sites. Or many people can protest to relevant departments to preserve an old building. This method can effectively prevent demolition of buildings as a result of personal preferences.

Effect of Florida’s 11 To Save

The positive effect of “Florida’s 11 to Save” seems clear. The list has brought much attention and support to Florida’s endangered sites. It’s the annual update of Florida’s 11 to Save, which helps and protects endangered sites one after another. To date, 21 of the 58 endangered sites have been saved. Some unchanged sites do have plans for future restoration. Importantly, these 21 sites are protected after being listed in “Florida’s 11 to Save”, which could not be a coincidence. More importantly, some of the preservation efforts discussed throughout this paper occurred because the site was included on “Florida’s 11 to Save” list. The researcher believes that a workable solution and funding are the keys to successful protection -- both of which are indispensable. According to the process for each endangered site, the researcher believes that “Florida’s 11 to Save” can help with both aspects.
Positive Effects from List – Including Policy Solutions

In the successful protection of the sites, the list greatly promotes the protection plan and policy. This effect is mainly reflected in two aspects: awareness and responsibility.

First, Florida’s 11 to Save list largely helps people realize the value of endangered sites. It also gives warnings to local governments and departments. The list undoubtedly motivates people to find new solutions and change their policies to protect listed sites. Endangered sites were listed in Florida’s 11 to Save and were somewhat exposed by this selection or announcement. However, they were not criticized by the local government or organization. But officials and others often believe it is shameful to destroy part of our history and heritage. Many believe that older, magnificent buildings deserve protection and special treatment. However, most people don’t pay attention to these situations until a site is placed on the endangered list. Thus far, 21 sites have been saved. Many public buildings remain on the list. Governments and departments must respond quickly in developing and implementing protection solution – and they must adjust policies to protect sites.

For example, according to the resources, “Sanford Grammar School, was threatened by vacant and little managements and it was listed in 2008 and 2009, in 2010, the building was housed the Margaret K. Reynolds Student Museum. In 2012, the University of Central Florida operated the building as the Public History Center, where students could hone their history skills.”

“Model Land Company Historic District was listed in 2008 and 2009 because of increased traffic. New arrangements of traffic and means for protecting the historic area were published in 2010 in a report by the Neighborhood Council of St. Augustine. This new policy helped protect the historic area. It also changed the traffic patterns. This it is important to consider issues in the area such as transportation, urban development plans and more when searching for a solution for sites on the Florida’s endangered sites.”

Second, the endangered sites listed in Florida’s 11 to Save made people more aware of their responsibilities for protecting precious buildings. It helped them realize their role in protecting history and preserving culture. Many non-profit organizations have been found a home in older buildings, as their leaders understand their role protecting history within a modern culture. This responsibility may stem from people’s instincts to protect the past or religious factors.

For example, according to the resources, “Central Christian Church was listed on the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation’s 11 Most Endangered Sites in 2010, 2011 and 2012 after an application to demolish the building was withdrawn. In June 2014, the building was sold to a Cathcart organization by the Diocese of Orlando and has since been renovated into townhomes which the developer has called, Samsara. This building is saved because of faith. Followers realized that this building is full of important religious cultures so that the Cathcart organization decided to buy and save it.”


“Lewis Spring House is one of projects by Frank lloyd Wright. This site is listed in 2012, 2013 and 2015. Those who worship or love Wright set up Spring House Institute and protect the building by donations, etc. The non-profit organization was founded not only by people’s love of the building, but by the protection of the building, more often than not, to miss Mr. Wright’s great contribution. SPRING HOUSE INSTITUTE is hold and it is working to acquire, restore and complete LEWIS SPRING HOUSE in 2012 and in 2015. A project recommended by Jeff Baker and Mat Daw that has been sitting in the wings for about 1.5 years has been safely accomplished. In 2017, patching the roof and extra drainage restoration are finished in April.”²⁶

Positive Effects from List -- Providing Funds

Florida’s 11 to Save has had a strong boost on fundraising. Although the protection of public buildings depends on governmental funding, approval from the committee nearly guarantees funds. The list emphasizes the importance and indispensability of endangered sites which arouses the attention of approvers. What’s more, the list emphasizes the threats and reminds people to protect sites. The tremendous pressure of list has forced people to value historical preservation, resulting in the preservation of success. Nations Bank Park Plaza was listed in 2005 and 2006. But it was saved in 2006 because of effects of local government. ²⁷

For private or non-profit organizations, the existence of the endangered list is more like an advertisement for endangered sites. Although publicity concerning endangered sites does not receive any financial support from the government or the


public sector, publicity of the list could get more people interested in the protection of history. The list has helped some endangered sites getting more money, which is an important step in the successful preservation of private property.

The successful protection of the Hialeah Park Race Course can be attributed to attention received from the business community (although the preservation's success was mainly due to a policy that allowed developers to build commercial buildings while protecting older buildings). According to the interview, however, the owner claimed that it was an old playground that he had heard and understood about. He was also interested in the historic site and decided to protect and use it as a business development.

**The Experience of Unsaved and Demolished Sites**

Although the Florida’s 11 to Save list can positively impact plans and funds, the list does not directly determine preservation. This is why more than half of the sites were unsaved and four sites were demolished. The list does not have legal effects. Although the list introduces people to the subject of endangered sites and important threats, these reasons do not directly guarantee preservation. The researcher proposes that an appearance on the endangered list is an important step toward preservation and also toward funding.

What’s more, some sites are demolished or being demolished because many people have no interest in historic preservation for a variety of reasons. The pursuit of maximum profits may be the main reason that some people dislike – or even hate – old buildings. They believe that rebuilding is the best choice. Of course, the endangered list is powerless to stop the development of the city and surrounding areas. Sometimes,
people need to compromise with each other -- to ensure the integrity of endangered sites. Preservation does not stop new buildings or sites.

Although the existence of the Florida’s 11 to Save list seems to have had a positive effect, it is not enough to simply rely on the list to protect these endangered sites.

**Suggestion for Future Endangered List**

The researcher believes that the future list of Florida’s 11 to Save should continue to develop its advantages and solve its disadvantages.

The endangered list should be distributed to more people. Relevant staff should update the list each year as well as publicize or explain the significance of the endangered list to public or private organizations. At the same time, they also need to encourage more people to be concerned with endangered sites and threats. Activities should not be limited to Florida. The Florida Trust for Historic Preservation may work with other conservation organizations to communicate with each other and let more people – outside the state and even outside the nation – know about endangered sites in Florida. Strengthening publicity not only awakens people’s awareness and responsibility, but it also helps raise more money. For those people who are interested in historic preservation, such information will undoubtedly provide them with a good opportunity to get involved in preservation. Although the list cannot be a law that forces people to pay for preservation, the list helps to get people to think about how to protect history and culture.

The endangered list has no legal effects, but the researcher wonders what would happen if people could reinforce the legal status of the endangered list. Perhaps the endangered list could be used as evidence to help those endangered sites get through
arbitration and receive sufficient funding? Florida’s 11 to Save list comes from a non-profit organization that is part of the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation. Since this list has no legal effect, it is difficult to determine if endangered sites will be saved. If an official organization or government can recognize the authority and correctness of the endangered list, then the endangered list could be seen as evidence of the need for financial support. This would relieve private organizations and individuals of the burden of fundraising. This approach would not prevent more people from participating in the protection, and the government will also could serve as an arbitrator to ensure that endangered sites are properly and effectively protected. And the rights of private individuals or organizations would not be affected.
APPENDIX A
REFERENCE OF TABLE 2-1 IN CHAPTER TWO


“About.” *Preservation NJ*, www.preservationnj.org/10most/.


121


“Nominations for Places at Risk List for 2018.” Preservation South Carolina, preservesc.org/places-at-risk/.


“Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation.” State Historic Preservation Office - NYS Parks, Recreation & Historic Preservation, parks.ny.gov/shpo/.


“Preservation of the historical resources and heritage of Louisiana.” Louisiana Trust for Historic Preservation, lthp.org/.


Arizona Preservation Foundation, azpreservation.org/.

Connecticut Trust For Historic Preservation, ctrtrust.org/demo-delay.


Preservationma, www.preservationmass.org/most-endangered-historic-resources.


“Boynton will have to pay millions over years to save historic school.” Mypalmbeachpost, www.mypalmbeachpost.com/news/local/boynton-will-have-pay-millions-over-years-save-historic-school/P0BMB0fFoHlaeYtrqPdqfN/.


“Help Save Old Fire Station No. 5.” *Facebook - Log In or Sign Up*, www.facebook.com/HelpSaveOldFireStationNo5/.


“History of the Royal Poinciana Playhouse.” *Palm Beach Performing Arts Center*, www.palmbeachperformingartscenter.org/playhouse/.


“Home | SaveGreenGables • Melbournes Bridge To The Past.” *Home | SaveGreenGables • Melbournes Bridge To The Past*, www.savegreengables.org/.


“Save the Orange City Florida Historic District.” *Facebook - Log In or Sign Up*, www.facebook.com/saveorangecityflhistory/.


“Strawn citrus packing house was abandoned in 1983 & has been heavily vandalized.” *The Vintage News*, 5 Nov. 2016, www.thevintagenews.com/2016/04/08/strawn-citrus-packing-house-was-abandoned-in-1983-has-been-heavily-vandalized/.


“Thriving shops key to reopening Palm Beach theater, landlord says.” *Palmbeachdailynews*, www.palmbeachdailynews.com/news/local/thriving-shops-key-reopening-palm-beach-theater-landlord-says/6Q9V4UcJFf8LgLgKo1QTiAP/.


Florida's 11 to Save

List & Sites:

Efficacy of Florida's 11 to Save for Preservation of Heritage Sites: Providing References for Other Endangered Heritage List

[Rongchanghao Zeng]
[Master of Historic Preservation]
[Thesis Defense]
[March 15, 2018]

Research Question

More Threats
"Armed conflict and war, earthquakes and other natural disasters, pollution, poaching, uncontrolled urbanization and unchecked tourist development pose major problems to World Heritage sites."—World Heritage in Danger

More Lists
World Heritage in Danger (1982)
America's 11 Most Endangered Places (1988)
Florida's 11 to save (2005)

More Effects?
If Florida's 11 to save could help saving endangered sites in Florida?
significance

1. Identify effects of Florida’s 11 to save
2. Demonstrate necessity of Florida’s 11 to save
3. Provide advice for Florida’s 11 to save in future
4. Provide reference for endangered heritage list in other states

Definition of Endangered Heritage List

Endangered
Endangered can be seen as a situation which is in danger of being harmed, lost, unsuccessful.

Heritage
Heritage is the history, traditions and qualities that a country or society has had for many years and that are considered an important part of its character.

Endangered Heritage List
The list is a collection to gather information and threats of historic sites in danger, which have historic values, traditions or customs.
Research Question (First Level)

Florida's 11 to save (2005-2017)

- Amounts
- Ownership
- Period of Significance
- Location
- Resource Type
- Single time and Multiple times
- Status
- Threats

- How many sites are listed from 2005-2017?
- When are they built?
- What types and functions do sites have?
- Whom are owners for sites?
- Where are they?
- When and how many times do endangered sites appear?
- What threats do endangered sites have?

Research Question (Second Level)

Florida's 11 to save (2005-2017)

- Saved Sites
  - How many sites are saved from 2005-2017?
  - When are they listed?
  - Whom are owners for sites?
  - How many times do endangered sites appear?
  - What threats do endangered sites have?
  - What is the detailed process of preservation for each site?

- Survived but unsaved Sites
  - How many unsaved sites from 2005-2017?
  - When are they listed?
  - Whom are owners for sites?
  - How many times do endangered sites appear?
  - What threats do endangered sites have?
  - What is reason block preservation for each site?

- Demolished sites
  - How many demolished sites from 2005-2017?
  - When are they listed?
  - Whom are owners for sites?
  - How many times do endangered sites appear?
  - What threats do endangered sites have?
  - What is the detailed reason of demolition for each site?
**Research Question (Second Level)**

Florida’s 11 to save (2005-2017)

**Saved Sites**
- How many sites are saved from 2005-2017?
- When are they listed?
- Whom are owners for sites?
- How many times do endangered sites appear?
- What threats do endangered sites have?
- What is the detailed process of preservation for each site?

**Survived but unsaved Sites**
- How many unsaved sites from 2005-2017?
- When are they listed?
- Whom are owners for sites?
- How many times do endangered sites appear?
- What threats do endangered sites have?
- What is the reason block preservation for each site?

**Demolished sites**
- How many demolished sites from 2005-2017?
- When are they listed?
- Whom are owners for sites?
- How many times do endangered sites appear?
- What threats do endangered sites have?
- What is the detailed reason of demolition for each site?

---

**Research Methods**

- **Survey**
  - survey from documents, literature, individuals or organization, websites, interview, administrative reports, applications, news clippings.
  - all information about each heritage on the list, including age, resource type, ownership, threat, process of preservation

- **Data Analysis**
  - Data are collected and used to determine in-depth research through seven categories: threat, status, resource type, process of preservation, period of significance, locations, ownership, amounts.
  - Statistics analysis can be used to show the degree of impact
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survived but Under Threat</th>
<th>Listed Year(s)</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Preservation Process</th>
<th>Future plans</th>
<th>Effect of Florida’s 11 to Save</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Southern Hotel</td>
<td>2003, 2004, 2008, 2009, 2010</td>
<td>Vacant and in disrepair</td>
<td>It was sold to Gold Coast Florida Regional Center but is to be restored.</td>
<td>It will be redeveloped and a new apartment complex will be built on the site.</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places and Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida’s Historic Avenue</td>
<td>2005, 2007</td>
<td>Roadway work 300 years ago and they need protection and restoration.</td>
<td>The roadway was re-aligned as normal.</td>
<td>No changes.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Cigar Factories</td>
<td>2006, 2007</td>
<td>The site of the 15 factories do not have protection.</td>
<td>Under Florida’s Community Development Corporation (FSCDC) and West Tampa Neighborhood Association a preservation application was submitted and the process in 2009.</td>
<td>They are protected. No restoration has happened.</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places and Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boynton High School</td>
<td>2009, 2010, 2014, 2015</td>
<td>The building was vacated in 2010 and a new apartment complex will be built.</td>
<td>It is empty and recently moved to a new location.</td>
<td>There is no change to the project schedule.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Survived but Unknown Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Year Listed</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Preservation Process</th>
<th>Future Plans</th>
<th>Effect of Florida’s 11 to Save</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miami Marine Stadium</td>
<td>2005, 2010</td>
<td>Vacant and in disrepair</td>
<td>Currently the VAGC was sold to South Florida waterfront condominiums. In 2015, they plan to tear down the existing building and build a new structure and hotel as well.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places and Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History’s YMAA Building</td>
<td>2011, 2014</td>
<td>Vacant and in disrepair</td>
<td>Currently the VAGC was sold to South Florida waterfront condominiums. In 2015, they plan to tear down the existing building and build a new structure and hotel as well.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Year Listed</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Preservation Process</th>
<th>Future Plans</th>
<th>Effect of Florida’s 11 to Save</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Southern Hotel</td>
<td>2003, 2004, 2008, 2009, 2010</td>
<td>Vacant and in disrepair</td>
<td>It was sold to Gold Coast Florida Regional Center but is to be restored.</td>
<td>It will be redeveloped and a new apartment complex will be built on the site.</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places and Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida’s Historic Avenue</td>
<td>2005, 2007</td>
<td>Roadway work 300 years ago and they need protection and restoration.</td>
<td>The roadway was re-aligned as normal.</td>
<td>No changes.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Cigar Factories</td>
<td>2006, 2007</td>
<td>The site of the 15 factories do not have protection.</td>
<td>Under Florida’s Community Development Corporation (FSCDC) and West Tampa Neighborhood Association a preservation application was submitted and the process in 2009.</td>
<td>They are protected. No restoration has happened.</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places and Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boynton High School</td>
<td>2009, 2010, 2014, 2015</td>
<td>The building was vacated in 2010 and a new apartment complex will be built.</td>
<td>It is empty and recently moved to a new location.</td>
<td>There is no change to the project schedule.</td>
<td>Florida’s 11 to Save</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

- Although there are no changes, the site is still in use.
- The building was sold to South Florida waterfront condominiums in 2015, and it will be rebuilt as a new structure and hotel as well.

---

### References:

Preservation needs enough time

*The less times site is listed in Florida’s 11 to save, the more likely it is to be rescued.*

In 22 sites that appeared once, only 7 sites were successfully protected and they accounted for 32%. Of the remaining 15 sites, 13 still require preservation, while two sites have been completely removed. Likewise, six of the 16 sites that appeared twice are saved and they accounted for 38%.

- The reason for this phenomenon should be classified as time.
- Among the 21 sites that were saved, all sites are saved before or in 2015.
- Among the 33 sites that were survived but unsaved, there are 13 sites occurred once on the list, all of them listed in 2015, 2016 and 2017.
- Excluding these 13 sites occurred once, among the remaining 9 sites, 7 sites were successfully saved, accounting for 78%.

Solution is Pioneer to preservation

**Threats for Unsaved sites**

- 19 sites, 31%
- 18 sites, 29%
- 12 sites, 19%
- 10 sites, 16%
- 3 sites, 5%

- Lack of funds
- Demolished by neglect
- Natural threats
- Vacant
- Lack of solution

Before proceeding to preservation, the solution needs to be confirmed. Typically, after permitted by owners, relevant departments and laws, the solution will be used to instruct preservation and will help preservation to be finished on time. Not only that, good solution can not only solve the threats, but also help to revitalize the endangered sites.

Successful preservation
Coca Cola Bottling Plant

Unsaved preservation
East Little Havana
No-owner hinder preservation

Several sites, vacant and no-owner, have not been successfully protected. The harm of no-owner is obvious. First, it takes time to determine owner. When the site has no owner, the solution is difficult to formulate, capital cannot be raised, preservation is more impossible to start. And sometimes, no vacant will make site worse than before.

Bob White Citrus Packing House/Strawn Historic Districts

Demolition because of different purposes

Demolition often happens because of different purposes. Some owners do not like old buildings, so they plan to demolish it and rebuild a new one which can satisfy their requests. Some owners want to rebuild a new one for commercial purpose. Some sites are too old to use it and they were demolished because of area renewal.

Demolished sites

- Sheraton Bal Harbour Hotel
- Riverview High School
Demolition because of different purposes
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Positive Effect from list to policy solution

Awareness:
The list undoubtedly motivates people to make new solutions and change their policies to protect listed sites. Endangered sites were listed in Florida’s 11 to save, and was exposed, from this selection or announcement, although not criticized the local government or organization, but officials and people will feel this is a shameful thing: valuable buildings do not get the protection and treatment they deserve, and people even do not pay attention until it is listed in the endangered list. Therefore, many of the 21 saved sites, although many public buildings are listed on the list, governments and departments respond quickly: developing and implementing protection solutions; and adjusting policies to protect sites.

Model Land Company Historic District

Responsibility:
protecting history and preserving culture. Many non-profit organizations are founded not only because of the love of old buildings, but also because of the responsibilities: people are aware of their responsibilities as protectors of history and culture in modern civilizations. Sometimes, this responsibility stems not only from people’s instinct for the protection of the past, religious factors, personal worship can also arouse people's interest in the protection of sites.

Central Christian Church
Lewis Spring House
Positive Effect from list to providing funds

'Florida’s 11 to save' has a strong boost to fundraising. Although the protection of public buildings depends on governmental funding, the approval from committee is the guarantee of funds. It is precisely because list emphasizes the importance and indispensability of endangered sites that are enough to arouse the attention of approvers. What’s more, the list emphasizes the threat is always reminded people to protect sites.

Nations Bank Park Plaza

existence of the endangered list is more like an advertisement for endangered sites. Although propaganda of endangered sites does not receive any financial support from the government or the public sector, propaganda of the list could gather more people who are interested in the protection of history because of religion, personal worship, memory and so on.

Lewis Spring House

Suggestion for future endangered list

- Endangered list should be realized by more people.
- Endangered list has no legal effects, but researcher wonders that if people could reinforce the legal status of the endangered list.
- Florida Trust for Historic Preservation co-work with other organizations.
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