1.0 Introduction and Project Description

This report documents the historic properties investigations for built resources and landscape features completed for the Illiana Corridor Tier Two Studies. The project spans Indiana and Illinois for the selected Corridor B3. This report describes the resources within Indiana. Properties in Illinois are described in the “Illinois Department of Transportation Illiana B3 Corridor – Assessment of Architectural Resources Memorandum” (May 1, 2013). Because the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) may provide funding for the proposed project and interstate access approvals and permits will be required, the project is a federal undertaking and is subject to compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended (16 USC 470 et seq.), and its implementing regulations (36 CFR 800). Specifically, Section 106 of the NHPA requires FHWA to take into account the effects of its undertakings on historic properties and afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and consulting parties a reasonable opportunity to comment on the undertaking. Historic properties are defined in 36 CFR part 800.16(1)(1) as “any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.” This report contains information on built historic properties and landscapes; archaeological investigations are described in the “Phase I Archaeological Records Review and Reconnaissance for the Illiana Corridor in Lake County, Indiana.”

1.1 Project Background

The Illiana Corridor was first envisioned as a vital link of an outer encircling highway in the Chicago region in the early 1900s, and has since been studied in a number of forms over the last 40 years. Previous studies, described in the following paragraph, have indicated possible benefits from the development of an east-west transportation corridor extending from Interstate (I) 55 in Illinois to I-65 in Indiana. These benefits include providing an alternate route for motorists travelling the I-90/94 corridor; relieving traffic on the I-80 Borman/Kingery Expressway and United States Route (US) 30; serving as a bypass for trucks around the congested metropolitan area highways; improving access to one of the largest intermodal freight areas in the United States; improving access to the proposed South Suburban Airport (SSA); supporting area economic development; and increasing the potential for substantial job creation. As traffic volumes on other highways in the region have increased, the associated congestion has resulted in travel delays with substantial economic impacts to industries that depend on the ability to efficiently move freight within and through the region.

1.2 Tier One Studies

The Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) and the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) initiated a “tiered” National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) study of the proposed corridor by issuing a Notice of Intent (NOI) in April 2011. The NOI announced that a Tier One Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be prepared with the anticipated project termini being “Interstate Highway 55 in Will
County, Illinois, and Interstate Highway 65 in Lake County, Indiana.” The NOI stated that the Tier One EIS would present “a broad analysis of transportation system alternative(s) in the study area and evaluate the environmental impacts at a planning level of detail….” The NOI also announced that the Tier One EIS “will conclude with a Record of Decision (ROD) identifying a Selected Corridor that can encompass one or more transportation alternatives” and that “projects with independent utility may be advanced to Tier Two NEPA documents that will focus on detailed environmental analyses.”

As stated in the NOI, the Illiana Corridor project is being conducted in two steps or “tiers” that build upon one another. The Tier One EIS involved an examination of the transportation problems in the Study Area, a study of alternate corridors to address the problems, and consideration of the environmental and social impacts of reasonable alternatives. The Tier One EIS was completed at a sufficient level of engineering and environmental detail to allow for an informed decision on the issues under consideration in Tier One, including the preferred mode or means by which mobility will be achieved, facility type and corridor location.

1.2.1 Alternatives Considered in Detail

As part of the Tier One EIS, a comprehensive alternatives identification and definition process identified numerous preliminary alternative corridors in consultation with stakeholders and the public. Over 80 initial multi-modal corridors were subsequently evaluated by the study team and eight new facility corridors and two arterial corridors that would include improvements to existing arterial roadways were developed and carried forward for evaluation. The alternatives evaluation process was a two-step process that included an initial round evaluation and a second round evaluation based on technical analysis and stakeholder input to identify, refine, and evaluate alternative corridors.

The initial round evaluation included an evaluation of individual transportation modes to meet the established project Purpose and Need, as well as a comparative analysis of the limited-access highway and arterial alternative corridors. Non-motorized, freight rail, bus and rail transit, and travel demand management strategies were eliminated as stand-alone modal alternatives due to their inability to serve the project Purpose and Need; however, they could be considered as part of a multi-modal transportation solution if warranted in Tier Two studies. Based on the initial round evaluation, seven limited access highway corridors were carried forward for a more detailed second round of evaluation.

Alternative corridors carried forward into the second round were evaluated in greater detail with respect to socioeconomic and environmental impacts and stakeholder input, and based on potential refinements to avoid or minimize impacts. Alternative corridor refinements were considered to further minimize socioeconomic and environmental impacts to the extent practical and feasible. None of the refinements to the corridors changed the travel performance or ability of the corridor to meet the Purpose and Need. The second round screening resulted in a finding that Corridor B3 had the best balance
of minimizing impact and travel performance and had the highest overall support from project stakeholders.

Based on feedback received at coordination meetings with project stakeholders, including requests for further evaluation of a northern corridor and requests to look at alignments south of Lowell, Indiana, two new corridors were developed. One new corridor essentially combined Corridor B3 west of the Illinois/Indiana state line, with Corridor C4 east of the state line in order to pass south of Lowell, Indiana. This corridor was named Corridor B4. A second northern corridor was also identified. This corridor was a combination of previously considered Corridors A3S1, B1, and A3 and remains north of the SSA. This corridor was named Corridor A3S2. Along with Corridor B3, the two additional corridors (Corridors A3S2 and B4) were carried forward in the Tier One Draft EIS (DEIS).

The Tier One EIS considered the No-Action Alternative and three alternative corridors (A3S2, B3, and B4) at a sufficient level of detail to allow for the selection of a preferred mode or means, facility type, and corridor location. Figure 1-1 shows the three alternative corridors under consideration in the Tier One EIS.

### 1.2.1.1 No-Action Alternative

The No-Action Alternative was considered as the baseline condition against which other alternatives were evaluated and consists of transportation improvements to existing transportation facilities in the Study Area that are expected to be constructed by the year 2040.

### 1.2.1.2 Corridor A3S2

Corridor A3S2 is a 51.1 mile long east-west corridor that generally traverses the north portion of the Study Area in Illinois and transitions to the central portion of the Study Area in Indiana. Corridor A3S2 starts at I-55 near Channahon, Illinois, passes north of the SSA, and connects with I-65 north of Lowell, Indiana. Corridor A3S2 includes eight potential interchanges at the following locations: I-55, US 52, US 45, I-57, IL-1, US 41, SR 55, and I-65. In addition, there are three design concepts for an additional interchange in the vicinity of IL-53. Design Concept 1 is a direct interchange connection from Corridor A3S2 to IL-53 with interchange ramps north of that road’s intersection with Manhattan Road. Design Concept 2 is a conventional diamond interchange located at South Rowell Avenue approximately 1 mile east of IL-53. Design Concept 3 provides only an overpass at IL-53 with no interchange.
Figure 1-1. Alternative Corridors Carried Forward in the Tier One DEIS
1.2.1.3 Corridor B3

Corridor B3 is a 46.8 mile long east-west corridor that generally traverses the central portion of the Study Area. Corridor B3 generally starts at I-55 north of Wilmington, Illinois, passes south of the SSA, and connects with I-65 north of Lowell, Indiana. Corridor B3 includes seven potential interchanges at the following locations: I-55, US 45/52, I-57, IL-1, US 41, SR 55, and I-65. In addition, there are three design concepts for an additional interchange in the vicinity of IL-53. Design Concept 1 is a direct interchange connection from the working alignment within Corridor B3 to IL-53 with interchange ramps at that road’s intersection with River Road. Design Concept 2 is a conventional diamond interchange located approximately 2.5 miles east of IL-53 between Phillips Road and Old Chicago Road with an overpass at IL-53. Design Concept 3 provides only an overpass at IL-53 with no interchange.

1.2.1.4 Corridor B4

Corridor B4 is a 48.8 mile long east-west corridor that generally traverses the central portion of the Study Area. Corridor B4 follows the same alignment as Corridor B3 through most of Illinois, then transitions to the southern portion of the Study Area in Indiana and connects with I-65 approximately 3 miles south of SR 2. Corridor B4 includes seven potential interchanges at the following locations: I-55, US 45/52, I-57, IL-1, US 41, SR 55, and I-65. In addition, there are three design concepts for an additional interchange in the vicinity of IL-53. Design Concept 1 is a direct interchange connection from the working alignment within Corridor B4 to IL-53 with interchange ramps at that road’s intersection with River Road. Design Concept 2 is a conventional diamond interchange located approximately 2.5 miles east of IL-53 between Phillips Road and Old Chicago Road with an overpass at IL-53. Design Concept 3 provides only an overpass at IL-53 with no interchange.

1.2.2 Environmental Impacts

At the Tier One level of analysis, environmental impacts were identified based on existing conditions in the alternate corridors and the best available data collected from regulatory and resource agencies. Environmental impacts were assessed using the 400-foot working alignment within each of the corridors. An overall comparative analysis of the potential environmental resource impacts based on existing information was completed for Corridors A3S2, B3, and B4. Corridor B3 had the overall least amount of potential environmental resource impacts.

Corridor B3’s relatively higher performance, moderate impacts, overall public acceptance, and lowest cost represent a better option than Corridor A3S2, considering Corridor A3S2’s higher costs, higher impacts in many areas, complexities for the I-55 connection, and travel performance slightly less than Corridor B3. Corridor B3 also represents a better option than Corridor B4, considering Corridor B4’s higher costs, construction in the Kankakee floodplain factors, and diminished travel performance.

For cultural resources in Tier One, the Section 106 studies were preliminary and simultaneously conducted with the NEPA studies. Separate reports were not completed
to document the presence of known historic properties and the potential effects of the project to those properties for either state in the Tier One. That information was described in the Tier One EIS and effects to known historic properties were described as “potential” pending field investigations to be completed for the Section 106 studies during the Tier Two studies. See Figure 1-2 for built historic resources/properties identified in the Tier One study area.

As part of the Tier One analysis, on behalf of FHWA, IDOT and INDOT sent over 100 consulting party invitation letters to the respective State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs), representatives of municipal and county governments, and cultural resources organizations. In addition, consulting party invitation letters were sent to 17 tribal governments. Based on the Tier One assessment, there were five cultural and nine historic resources previously identified in the area of potential effects (APE). The APE was based on the width of the 2,000-foot project corridor and extended an additional mile north and south of the corridor’s boundary to accommodate potential visual, noise, and vibration effects to historic properties. The APE’s total width for above-ground resources is approximately 2.37 miles. Additional historic properties will likely be identified when field surveys are undertaken during the Tier Two Section 106 and NEPA studies. If these properties cannot be avoided, additional consultation will be necessary to resolve any adverse effects as a result of the proposed project. During Tier Two Section 106 and NEPA studies, FHWA will consult with the SHPOs and other consulting parties to develop further measures and responsibilities to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate adverse effects to historic properties.

In consultation with IDOT, INDOT, and the respective SHPOs, FHWA developed and executed a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for inclusion in the Tier One FEIS to establish a framework for the Tier Two Section 106 studies and consultation. The PA describes the studies and consultation undertaken in Tier One. FHWA notified the ACHP that the project may adversely affect historic properties and that FHWA intended to enter into a PA prior to completion of the Tier One EIS. The ACHP responded with a letter confirming that it does not intend to participate in Section 106 consultation in Tier One.

Consultation with the Illinois and Indiana SHPOs will be conducted in Tier Two for archaeological and historic resources to resolve adverse effects. The ACHP also will have the opportunity to participate in Section 106 consultation during Tier Two.
Figure 1-2. Built Historic Resources/Properties Identified in Tier One Study Area
1.2.3 Selection of Corridor B3 in Tier One

The combined Tier One EIS and Record of Decision (ROD) were approved in January 2013. The ROD approved Corridor B3 as the selected corridor for Tier One of the Illiana Corridor study. The selected corridor is an approximately 2,000 foot wide, 47-mile long east-west oriented corridor with a western terminus at I-55 just north of the City of Wilmington in Illinois and an eastern terminus at I-65 approximately 3 miles north of State Route (SR) 2 in Indiana. In the Lake County, Indiana portion, Corridor B3 traverses approximately 12 miles of a primarily rural area through West Creek, Cedar Creek, and Eagle Creek townships, between the Town of Lowell to the south and the unincorporated area of Lake Dalecarlia to the north. The FHWA, IDOT, and INDOT determined that the selected corridor best accomplishes the project’s purpose and need, as established in Section 1 of the Tier One EIS.

The selected corridor is generally 2,000 feet in width. This corridor is narrower than 2,000 feet in three locations, in order to ensure minimization of impacts on certain sensitive resources. The Tier One ROD approved a corridor, rather than a specific alignment, for the selected Corridor B3. The specific alignment within Corridor B3, along with appropriate mitigation measures, will be analyzed in the Tier Two NEPA process.

The environmental impact calculations in the Tier One FEIS were based on working alignments. The working alignments were used in the Tier One study solely for the purpose of estimating and comparing potential impacts, benefits, and costs. Decisions regarding the specific alignment location and width will be made in Tier Two and will be further refined during the design phase following Tier Two.

The Tier One ROD also decided that the selected corridor will be used for the construction of a limited access highway.

1.3 Tier Two Studies

As part of the Tier Two level of analysis, engineering design and screening will result in the identification of a roadway alternative(s) alignment which includes interchange locations, bridge structures, and road closure locations within Corridor B3. It is anticipated that the alternative(s) will include various design options at key locations.

The selected corridor, as well as a No-Action Alternative, will be advanced into Tier Two and will include: 1) continued analysis and definition of the selected and supporting transportation modes; 2) further development of engineering plans, including potential study of alternative working alignments within the overall selected corridor and selection of a preferred alignment with a defined environmental footprint; 3) completion of more detailed environmental investigations, including field studies, that will inform the alignment studies; 4) corresponding updates to impacts to social, economic, and environmental resources; 5) identification of detailed mitigation
measures for those impacts found to be unavoidable; and 6) development of a financing plan that identifies sources of funding and the timing of their availability.

This report documents the historic properties investigations for built resources and landscape features completed for the Tier Two Section 106 studies. Additional field investigations are underway to identify these resources at a greater level of detail within the APE for Corridor B3. Based on the detailed alignment(s) and design options, impacts to environmental, historic, and archaeological resources will be assessed as part of the Tier Two Section 106 studies and summarized in the Tier Two NEPA studies.

### 2.0 Section 106 Scope of Work and Methodology

The Illiana Corridor project is subject to compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended (16 USC 470 et seq.) and its implementing regulations (36 CFR 800). Specifically, Section 106 of the NHPA requires that the responsible Federal agency consider the effects of its actions on historic properties, which are properties listed in or determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and provide the Federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) an opportunity to comment on the undertaking.

Per Section 106 requirements, the lead Federal agency, in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), develops the Area of Potential Effects (APE), identifies historic properties (i.e., NRHP-listed and NRHP-eligible) in the APE, and makes determinations of the proposed project’s effect on historic properties in the APE. Section 106 regulations require the lead Federal agency consult with the SHPO and identified parties with an interest in historic resources during planning and development of the proposed project. The ACHP may participate in the consultation or may leave such involvement to the SHPO and other consulting parties. ACHP, if participating, and SHPO are provided an opportunity to comment on the proposed project and its effects on historic properties. They participate in development of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) or Programmatic Agreement (PA) to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects, as applicable. Stipulations in a MOA or a PA must be implemented. If a National Historic Landmark (NHL) is located within the APE and would be adversely affected by the project, the Federal agency must also comply with Section 110(f) of the NHPA. Section 110(f) requires that the agency undertake, to the maximum extent possible, planning and actions to minimize harm to any adversely affected NHL and afford the ACHP an opportunity to comment. The ACHP regulations require that the National Park Service (NPS), an agency of the U.S. Department of the Interior, be notified and be invited to participate in the consultation involving NHLs.

The APE is defined in Section 106 of the NHPA as “the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties if any such properties exist. The APE is influenced by the scale and