

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

nature of an undertaking and may be different for different kinds of effects caused by the undertaking.”

Historic properties are listed in or determined eligible for listing in the NRHP by applying the NRHP Criteria for Evaluation to evaluate a property’s historic significance. The Criteria state that the quality of significance in American history, architectural, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and that:

- A. Are associated with events that have a made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- B. Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- C. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values, or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Above-ground resources are typically evaluated under Criteria A, B, and C; Criterion D applies primarily to archaeological resources.

If a property is determined to possess historic significance, its integrity is evaluated using the following seven Aspects of Integrity to determine if it conveys historic significance: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. If a property possesses historic significance under one or more Criteria and retains integrity to convey its significance, the property was determined eligible for the NRHP during the Section 106 process of this project.

In the Tier One Section 106 studies, identification of historic and archaeological resources within the project area was limited to database and records searches for known historic and archaeological properties listed in or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or previously identified as meeting the 50 year age criterion in previous surveys. No field survey was completed to identify additional cultural resources and no determinations of eligibility for resources meeting the 50 year age criterion were completed in Tier One. The 50 year age criterion is a general estimate of the time needed to develop historical perspective and to evaluate significance. This consideration guards against the listing of properties of passing contemporary interest and ensures that the NRHP is a list of truly historic places.

To establish a framework for the Tier Two Section 106 studies and consultation, FHWA prepared and executed a Programmatic Agreement (PA) in consultation with the Illinois and Indiana SHPOs, Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT), and Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) for inclusion in the Tier One FEIS and ROD

(January 2013). The PA establishes that all work will conform to established Section 106 and SHPO reporting standards and that formal NRHP determinations of eligibility will be submitted to the appropriate SHPOs for concurrence on any resources more than 45 years of age within the APE.

To comply with Section 106 of the NHPA, its implementing regulations (36 CFR 800), and the Tier One PA, this report documents the following:

1. Historic context of the Corridor B3 project area;
2. Identification and survey of above-ground resources in the APE; and
3. Determinations of eligibility for built resources and landscape features using the NRHP Criteria for Evaluation.

The Assessment of Effects will be discussed in a forthcoming separate report.

## 2.1 Area of Potential Effects

---

During the Tier One Section 106 studies, FHWA consulted with the Illinois and Indiana SHPOs to develop a consistent project APE across both states for identification of built resources, landscapes, and archaeological resources. This consistent APE was identified in the Tier One study's PA and has been carried forward into the Tier Two study.

The APE for above-ground resources in Indiana and Illinois is based on the width of the 2,000-foot project corridor for Corridor B3, which contains the working alignment, and extends 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. The project's architectural historians identified and evaluated above-ground resources within this APE.

Maps depicting the APE, the project corridor, and surveyed above-ground resources are appended to this report (Appendix A).

## 2.2 Identification of Historic Properties

---

The content of this report fulfills Section 106 studies for built resources and landscape features in Indiana. As part of this effort, INDOT consulted with staff at the Indiana SHPO to determine requirements and discuss areas of concern. All work completed as part of this effort follows established state standards, requirements, and guidelines.

### 2.2.1 Literature Review

Architectural historians who meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards conducted research to review the published literature and to identify and obtain sources of information pertinent to the history and architecture of Lake County, and specifically, West Creek, Cedar Creek, and Eagle Creek townships. Architectural historians consulted and obtained relevant documentation from the following databases and repositories:

- NRHP-listed properties in the National Park Service records;
- State-listed properties in the Indiana State Register of Historic Sites and Structures;
- Surveyed and listed properties in the Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (DHPA) State Historic Architecture and Archaeology Research Database (SHAARD);
- Historic property survey records and project files housed at DHPA; and
- Historical collections and county histories housed at the Indiana State Library and Historical Bureau, the Lowell Public Library, and the Lake County Public Library, Merrillville Branch.

The architectural historians also identified and researched a variety of sources to inform the documentation and evaluation of previously and newly surveyed properties. Current aerial imagery and property data as well as historical plat maps and aerial photography aided in determining an individual property's development and past ownership. These sources included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory (IHSSI) Lake County Interim Report (1996), including IHSSI survey forms, from Indiana Landmarks;
- Current property data, including year built dates, from the Lake County Assessor's Office;
- NRHP nomination of the Kingsbury-Doak Farmhouse acquired from SHAARD;
- Unsubmitted draft NRHP nomination of the Meyer Windmill acquired from DHPA;
- Plat maps of Lake County between 1891 and 2005;
- Published aerial photographs of Lake County farms in 1956;
- Published county histories of Lake County;
- Published histories of West Creek, Cedar Creek, and Eagle Creek townships;
- Various publications and articles concerning the formation and development of the townships and Lake Dalecarlia;
- Family histories acquired from the Lowell Public Library collections and various published histories; and
- Hoosier Homestead Award Program records acquired from Indiana State Department of Agriculture.

To supplement the information on the qualities and characteristics of specific property types in order to evaluate eligibility for inclusion in the NRHP, the architectural historians consulted the following publications:

- National Register Bulletin, *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*;
- National Register Bulletin, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes*;
- National Register Multiple Property Registration Form, *Indiana's Public Common and High Schools*;
- Minnesota Department of Transportation, *Historic Context Study of Minnesota Farms, 1820-1960*;
- Minnesota Department of Transportation, *Minnesota Statewide Historic Railroads Study*;
- Georgia Transmission Corporation, *The Ranch House in George: Guidelines for Evaluation*; and
- National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 723, *A Model for Identifying and Evaluating the Significance of Post-World War II Housing*.

The information gathered from these sources was used to develop specific historic contexts as they apply to Lake County and is presented in the Historic Context section of this report. Particular attention focused on township histories to gather information on surveyed properties and provide interpretive contexts in order to evaluate NRHP eligibility. These interpretive contexts focused on rural patterns of occupation, use, development, agricultural history, and the roles of potential historic properties in local, state, and regional history, as well as their architectural significance. These sources were also used to develop individual resource histories to evaluate a resource's historical and architectural significance for evaluation of NRHP eligibility. Specifically, the plat maps, aerial photographs, family histories, local histories, and the IHSSI survey forms for previously surveyed properties were important to establishing an individual property's historic context and significance.

See the bibliography for a complete listing of sources consulted.

### **2.2.2 Fieldwork**

Fieldwork was undertaken by two survey teams, each led by an architectural historian. Prior to survey, Notice of Survey letters were sent to all property owners in Corridor B3. Each survey team also carried copies of the letter and project business cards. For each property surveyed, the survey teams entered the property and attempted to contact property owners. If access was not obtained, the historians conducted the survey from the public right-of-way if adequate photographs and observations regarding the property's characteristics could be made.

Project architectural historians made several site visits to the project area and utilized public records to identify all properties within the APE older than forty-five years of age. Properties forty-five years of age or older (rather than the standard fifty-year age limit) were evaluated to accommodate the Illiana Corridor's project schedule and to

account for properties that may reach fifty years of age during the course of the project. The cut-off date for surveyed properties was 1967. Fieldwork commenced with an intensive-level survey, which entailed driving the entire APE to identify, photograph, and record field notes for all 45 years or older properties within the APE requiring detailed investigation. The survey teams took photographs of individual properties as well as representative viewscape and streetscape photographs. For each property, the survey teams completed a photography log and recorded any observations regarding the physical characteristics of the buildings, structures, objects, or associated landscape elements. The location of each property was later recorded within the project's geographical information system (GIS) and verified through the Lake County Assessor's GIS database.

The survey teams also sought to identify and re-document any properties previously surveyed and listed in the Tier One Section 106 study, specifically the NRHP-listed Kingsbury-Doak Farmhouse and those included in the Lake County Interim Report, which was completed in 1996. Approximately 17 years had passed since the interim report was published; the survey teams discovered that many of the previously surveyed properties in the APE were demolished or substantially altered in the intervening years.

The status of the single NRHP-listed property located within the APE was reviewed using previous NRHP documentation to determine if the property had changed to the extent that it was no longer eligible for the NRHP or that NRHP boundaries should be altered. In consultation with the SHPO and INDOT, architectural historians considered the eligibility of the Kingsbury-Doak Farmhouse's extant agricultural outbuildings and its significance as a farmstead because these were not considered in the property's original NRHP nomination. The original NRHP nomination only evaluated the property for its architectural significance as an Italianate-style farmhouse. After serious consideration, no eligibility change or boundary change is recommended for the Kingsbury-Doak Farmhouse.

For farmsteads and farms, the historians identified and photographed individual buildings, landscape features, and the overall setting of the property. For the Lake Dalecarlia area, the historians photographed the individual buildings and representative streetscapes located in the APE to investigate the possibility of a historic district. After careful consideration, no historic district is being recommended for Lake Dalecarlia.

### 2.3 Consultation with SHPO and INDOT

---

On March 4, 2013, the historians also met with the SHPO and INDOT staff to review the progress to date of the Illiana Corridor Tier Two Section 106 studies and to receive guidance on the evaluation of particular types of resources and the contents of the Historic Property Report. The historians summarized the results of the historic resources field survey in November 2012 and outlined the common resources types and styles as well as land development patterns observed in the field. Farmsteads, vernacular property types, and post-World War II housing (primarily Ranch houses)

were common resources requiring further discussion with the SHPO about the appropriate evaluation approaches.

For farmsteads, the SHPO recommended that farmsteads be considered as intact complexes representing a reasonably defined period of time and should include an evaluation of the individual merits of the main farmhouse and the farmstead's barns or outbuildings in its evaluation. Farmhouses or outbuildings that have been re-sided are not necessarily precluded from being potentially NRHP-eligible and should retain their original massing, appearance, window openings, trim, and porches in spite of the replacement siding.

For post-World War II housing, and specifically Ranch houses, the SHPO recommended several context studies for evaluation purposes. These types of resources should be architecturally significant and/or architect designed as few of these rise to a notable or significant level to be individually NRHP listed or eligible. Furthermore, they will typically be NRHP-eligible as contributing properties to planned or designed neighborhood developments.

The historians also discussed the original nomination of the NRHP-listed Kingsbury-Doak Farmhouse, which did not include its extant period outbuildings, and the Lake Dalecarlia resort community, which is partially within the APE. For the Kingsbury-Doak Farmhouse, the SHPO recommended the historians provide an eligibility recommendation, which included the outbuildings in the NRHP listing; after the meeting, the SHPO provided revised NRHP boundaries inclusive of the outbuildings to the project historians. For the Lake Dalecarlia resort community, the SHPO recommended the historians review and compare the community to other resort communities in Indiana, particularly in Lake County, and NRHP-listed resort communities in Indiana for NRHP evaluation purposes. The overall resort community district should be able to convey its original overall design intent and appearance as well as a substantial amount of properties that retain their original appearance.

The project historians incorporated the SHPO's guidance and recommendations in their evaluation of properties for listing in the NRHP.

Additional consultation will occur with the Section 106 consulting parties to provide comments on the Section 106 findings of NRHP eligibility, the assessment of effects, and the resolution of adverse effects.

## 2.4 NRHP Determinations of Eligibility

---

Following identification and research of above-ground resources 45 years of age or older, as well as the guidance provided by the SHPO and INDOT, the historians evaluated each surveyed property for NRHP eligibility. Properties were evaluated under NRHP Criteria A, B, and C for their architectural and historical significance; Criterion D was not applied as part of this assessment because the surveyed properties do not have the potential to yield significant information. It will be applied as part of the archaeological investigations that will be conducted within the project corridor and

documented in the “Phase I Archaeological Records Review and Reconnaissance for the Illiana Corridor in Lake County, Indiana.”

Given the number of farms and farmsteads in the APE, the historians considered the possibility of one or more historic rural districts; however, based on field observations, research, and integrity, no rural historic districts were identified. A potential rural historic district was considered along Sheffield Avenue between West 169<sup>th</sup> and West 151<sup>st</sup> avenues due to a cluster of six farmsteads located within close proximity to each other near West Creek and dating from approximately the same period of the mid-nineteenth to early twentieth century. However, the majority of the properties have been altered or subdivided since their establishment and no longer convey their significant historical associations that would qualify them for listing in the NRHP. Furthermore, due to the subsequent division of these farmsteads’ acreage, a large number of non-historic, recently constructed houses have been added along Sheffield Avenue. These non-historic houses outnumber the farmsteads and significantly diminish their integrity of setting, feeling, and association as well as the relationships between farmsteads. For these reasons, the architectural historians determined that no rural historic district existed in the APE.

The historians also considered a potential historic district consisting of the Lake Dalecarlia community and conducted further research of the community to establish its historic context and significance. Upon further evaluation of the community’s extant resources’ integrity, the community’s overall design and layout, and its associated history, the historians determined that Lake Dalecarlia is not eligible for listing in the NRHP.

#### **2.4.1 Individual Properties**

For individual properties, and with the exception of farms, evaluations of NRHP eligibility focused on historic significance. If significance was established, then integrity assessments determined if the property was able to convey its significance. The presence of alterations to a property did not immediately preclude them from NRHP eligibility if that property continued to convey its significance. Additionally, properties that appeared to be typical or mundane examples of their type and/or were altered by unsympathetic additions or replacement materials were considered not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. These properties are documented in the Survey Data Forms Property Table in Appendix D of this report and an individual determination of NRHP eligibility form was not completed for them.

The historians completed additional research for properties that appeared unique, exhibited moderate to high architectural significance, and/or were previously surveyed and ranked as “Contributing” or higher in the Lake County Interim Report, barring any significant alterations since they were first documented. These properties were documented in formal NRHP determinations of eligibility and are included in Appendix E of this report.



The Lake County Interim Report is a product of the IHSSI, which has been conducted by the Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (DHPA) since 1975. The IHSSI is a continuing historic properties survey and inventory program being completed for each of the 92 counties in Indiana. To date, 85 of the 92 counties in Indiana have been surveyed and an interim report with the county inventory, historic context, and methodology as well as the original survey forms, maps, and photographs was filed with the DHPA. The inventory is used to administer state and federal programs for historic preservation, particularly the environmental review process, as well as using it in the nomination process for the NRHP.

The Lake County Interim Report was completed in 1996 following approximately two years of research, field survey, and evaluation of built structures in the county. The Interim Report assigned a rating of “Non-Contributing,” “Contributing,” “Notable,” or “Outstanding” to surveyed properties based on their historical significance, architectural merit, environment, and integrity. For the purposes of the Interim Report, these ratings were based upon and measured against the NRHP Criteria for Evaluation, but were not substitutes for final NRHP eligibility determinations. Properties were assessed in terms of their historical significance, architectural merit, environment, and integrity before being placed in one of the report’s rating categories. Properties rated “Non-Contributing” were only included in the Interim Report if they were located within an existing or potential historic district and would not be considered NRHP-eligible. A “Contributing” rating was assigned to those properties that met the 50 years of age or older criterion but were not individually significant enough to be NRHP eligible; however, these resources could be considered NRHP-eligible as part of a historic district. A “Notable” rating meant the property did not merit an “Outstanding” rating but was still above-average in its historic or architectural significance and could be NRHP-eligible upon further investigation. An “Outstanding” rating meant the property retained enough historic or architectural significance that it was already listed in or should be considered for individual listing in the NRHP.

Because 17 years have passed since this report, many of the previously surveyed properties have undergone alterations that are not considered in the report’s assessments. Furthermore, in that intervening time, properties that have since attained 50 years of age and were not surveyed in the report, may now be considered for NRHP eligibility. These properties primarily include post-World War II housing, such as Minimal Traditional, Ranch, and Split-Level houses. Within the project’s APE, 29 properties were previously surveyed in the Lake County Interim Report and rated primarily “Contributing” or “Notable”; one of these properties was the NRHP-listed Kingsbury-Doak Farmhouse. These properties were surveyed as part of this project and formal NRHP determinations of eligibility were completed for 27 of the 29 properties. Two previously surveyed properties had been severely altered since they were surveyed, constituting the appearance of new construction and an almost total loss of original agricultural outbuildings. They did not retain sufficient architectural or historical integrity to be eligible for listing in the NRHP. The project historians did not complete formal NRHP determinations of eligibility for these properties; they are documented and briefly summarized in Appendix D.

The historians established the evaluated property's historical context and significance, or lack thereof, to determine the property's NRHP eligibility. Detailed architectural descriptions and historic context statements were written and the NRHP Criteria for Evaluation were applied to make a determination of eligibility for each of these properties. For properties determined to have historic or architectural significance, the historians completed integrity assessments. If the properties retained integrity, the historians determined periods of significance, and delineated historic boundaries. For each property, a survey data form was completed; each form includes current photographs and individual locator maps, regardless of its eligibility determination. These survey data forms are included in this report in Appendix E.

#### **2.4.2 Farms and Farmsteads**

The historians evaluated complexes of buildings, most commonly farms or farmsteads, in several different ways. First, each building, site, structure, or object on the farmstead was considered regarding its individual eligibility for listing in the NRHP. In most cases, farmsteads in the APE did not retain single buildings that were NRHP eligible individually. Second, the farmstead was evaluated in its entirety, which included the farmhouse, outbuildings, and any other features integral to the complex. Finally, the historians evaluated farms as a whole, considering the farmstead complex in relationship to extant field patterns or land features comprising the entire farm. The farm is a parcel of land comprised of the farmstead headquarters complex and its associated surrounding acreage while the farmstead complex served as the farm's operations headquarters, consisting of the farm buildings and work areas grouped around a farmyard accessed by a main driveway. This method of evaluation allowed the historians to evaluate the NRHP eligibility of individual elements and potential combinations of farms, buildings, and landscapes. Tax parcel boundaries were used to delineate the farm or farmstead boundaries and evaluate NRHP eligibility; in some cases, parcel boundaries or subsequent subdivisions were ignored to evaluate the remnants of farms previously located on one or more parcels. If a farmhouse was significantly altered and its integrity compromised, but the other buildings comprising the farmstead appeared to retain their integrity as a whole, then the farmstead was still considered for NRHP eligibility. Compromised integrity of one built component did not automatically preclude the farmstead complex from consideration of NRHP eligibility. Likewise, a farmstead that included modern or recently constructed outbuildings among an otherwise intact historical complex of buildings was not excluded from consideration of eligibility because it may reflect the evolution of an active farmstead. For an entire farm to be NRHP eligible, it needed to retain distinctive, recognizable historic field patterns and landscape elements. Few farms in the APE retained historic field patterns or other historic landscape features.

The historians also identified farmsteads in the APE that were previously recognized as Hoosier Homesteads by the Indiana State Department of Agriculture. However, this impressive and honorary designation does not equate to NRHP eligibility because it does not consider the historic or architectural significance or integrity of the property, which are required for NRHP-eligible properties. The Hoosier Homestead program is a separate designation process than the NRHP program and only recognizes families with

farms that have been owned by the same family for 100 years or more. It is not based upon the same criteria for evaluation and significance as the NRHP. The Hoosier Homestead Program was established in 1976 to recognize the contributions those family farms have made to the economic, cultural, and social advancement of Indiana. Indiana farms may also qualify for the Centennial Award (100 years of single family ownership), the Sesquicentennial Award (150 years of ownership), or the Bicentennial Award (200 years of ownership).

## 2.5 Conclusions

---

The project architectural historians inventoried 253 properties as part of this study. Most of the properties inventoried dated from the period 1900-1970. One property in the APE, the Kingsbury-Doak Farmhouse (IHSSI 089-352-95007) was previously listed in the NRHP. One additional property in the APE, the Cutler Farm, is recommended as eligible for listing in the NRHP for historic significance. Two hundred and fifty of the properties, including 29 properties previously surveyed in the IHSSI, are not recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP due to a lack of architectural or historical distinction and in some cases, significant alterations resulting in a lack of integrity.

A list of all surveyed properties in the APE is presented in Appendix D. The individual findings of eligibility follow in Appendix E. Maps depicting all surveyed properties, including NRHP-listed and NRHP-eligible properties, is presented in Appendix A.

## 3.0 Historic Context

---

This context focuses on the historical development of the proposed Illiana Corridor Tier Two project area from 1672 to 1970 by examining the historic patterns that have impacted the development of historical resources in Lake County, specifically the West Creek, Cedar Creek, and Eagle Creek townships.

Located in northwestern Indiana, the 497 square mile Lake County is bounded by Illinois to the west, Lake Michigan to the north, and the Kankakee River to the south (see Figure 1-1). The county shares an eastern border with neighboring Porter County. Due to Lake County's physical proximity and economic ties to Chicago, the northern third of the county is heavily industrialized, while the southern portion of the county remains primarily rural. In more recent years, suburban development has become increasingly prevalent in the center of the county. Today, Lake County is divided into ten townships, including townships are St. John, Ross, and Hobart; Hanover, Center, and Winfield; West Creek, Cedar Creek, and Eagle Creek. The three southern townships, West Creek, Cedar Creek, and Eagle Creek—the focus of the project area—are named for their geographical position and the creeks that run through them.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana, 1996, XV