



**APPENDIX G**  
**CULTURAL RESOURCES**  
**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**  
**AND**  
**PLATES 1-9**

## Route 63 EIS, Cultural Resources Appendix

### What is the purpose of this appendix?

The cultural resources section in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) briefly discusses cultural resources concerns in the project area (see Chapter X). This appendix provides supplemental information about MoDOT's investigations: applicable regulations; the nature of the study; agency consultation and public involvement; study methods; and preliminary study results. Additional information will be available at a later date when the cultural resources technical report is prepared.

### Why does MoDOT conduct cultural resources investigations?

MoDOT cares about things that are important to our local, state and even national history and strives to be a good steward of the environment, but the primary reason that MoDOT considers cultural resources is to comply with federal and state laws. Failure to comply with those laws could result in the loss of funding for a project. Although MoDOT is a state agency, many projects are funded through the Federal Highway Administration and therefore subject to federal regulations. Federal laws dealing with cultural resources began as early as the Antiquities Act in 1906; however, the primary laws that MoDOT must work with include:

- Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (1966) [*NHPA*]  
The NHPA requires that historic resources be evaluated for eligibility to the NRHP. If a resource is determined eligible for, or is formally listed on the NRHP, a further aspect of the NHPA requires an assessment of the level of effect that a proposed project would have on the resource. This process is often divided into three parts: 1) Identify – determine scope of effect, identify historic properties [i.e., a property or site that is eligible for listing on the NRHP], and evaluate historic significance; 2) Assess – assess if the project will have an adverse effect on historic properties; and 3) Resolve – avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation of the adverse effect on historic properties.
- Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act (1966) [*Section 4(f)*]  
Section 4(f) states that a transportation project requiring the use of publicly owned land of a public park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or a historic site (i.e., “historic property” as defined by Section 106) may be approved only if: 1) There is no prudent and feasible alternative to using that land; and 2) The program or project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site resulting from the use.
- National Environmental Policy Act (1969) [*NEPA*]  
According to the NEPA, it is the federal government's responsibility to preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of the nation's heritage through an interdisciplinary approach. If a federal undertaking has an effect on these resources then the federal agency is responsible for preparing Environmental Assessments (EA) and possibly Environmental

Impact Statements (EIS). Both the EA and EIS process allow for public and tribal involvement in the decision making process.

In addition, two Missouri State Laws apply to the cultural resources investigations conducted by MoDOT, both of which pertain to human remains. Missouri Revised Statute, Chapter 214 deals with cemeteries and Missouri Revised Statute Chapter 194.400-410 deals with unmarked human remains.

## **What happens at different phases of the cultural resources study?**

When MoDOT Historic Preservation (HP) staff uses a phased approach for cultural resources investigations for corridor projects like the Route 63 EIS, the level of investigation depends on the project stage and the resource type. The two investigation phases correspond with the stages of the EIS document: the draft and the final stages.

### **Draft EIS Cultural Resources Investigations**

- Preliminary cultural resources studies are performed at the draft EIS stage, when multiple alternates are under consideration, to assist in the selection of a preferred project alignment. Cultural resources surveys are conducted to fulfill NEPA requirements and simultaneously comply with Section 106 review requirements. During the draft EIS stage MoDOT HP staff utilizes existing information about previously documented cultural resources; identifies significant historical themes within the project area; and conducts reconnaissance field surveys of the various alignments. A similar level of analysis is used to evaluate cultural resources along all alignments so all alternates are equally screened.
- MoDOT HP staff consults with staff of the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) at the beginning of the preliminary cultural resources investigations. Project coordination and consultation continues throughout the study, including opportunities for interagency field consultation in the project corridor.
- The public is involved in the corridor study in a number of ways. MoDOT HP staff presented exhibits and provided brochures at public meetings in May and October 2007 to share and solicit information about cultural resources and historical themes related to the project area. MoDOT HP staff also interacts with the public when seeking permission to survey their properties, conducting on-site field visits, and sharing research results.
- A MoDOT architectural historian surveys buildings and bridges located within the footprint of each reasonable alternate in efforts to identify any that are likely to meet the minimum criteria for listing on the NRHP. The footprint or width of the alternatives vary throughout the 47-mile project corridor, ranging from 300 feet to 750 feet. Two alternates share the same footprint at the south end of

#### **What is the area of potential effects (APE)?**

The APE is the geographic area or areas within which a project may alter the character or use of historic properties. The APE is influenced by the scale and nature of the project and may be different for various kinds of effects caused by the project. Project effects may be direct or indirect, secondary, and cumulative.

the project, thus for the last 7.7 miles, the corridor width is 450 feet. At this phase of the study, the area within each reasonable alternative footprint is regarded the area of potential effects (APE) for the draft EIS architectural survey. This width easily accommodates future construction activities while allowing some flexibility for shifting the final EIS alignment within the 750 feet wide footprint.

- In compliance with the National Transportation Act, Section 4(f) Evaluations are drafted for affected historic properties that require preservation in place. An agreement document stipulating further investigations or endeavors to mitigate potential project effects to historic properties also is prepared. The agreement document and background information is circulated for acceptance among the FHWA, ACHP, SHPO, and MoDOT. If the cultural resources are located on federal property, additional federal agencies may be included. Indian tribes who have historically ceded lands with sites of religious or cultural importance in the project will be consulted.
- MoDOT archaeologists carefully review all of the known professional archaeological reports for projects in the vicinity of the proposed alignments. In addition, the previously recorded archaeological sites are plotted on the project maps to identify which sites are located near any of the alternates being considered. At this time it is also important to consider whether the known archaeological sites are potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP.
- MoDOT HP personnel review the locations for recorded cemeteries in the vicinity of all proposed alignments. That review includes cemetery locations identified in available databases, in addition to cemeteries shown on either current or available historic versions of county and topographic maps. During the course of the study, landowners or other private citizens may identify additional cemeteries. While small family cemeteries may not be identified on local maps, they are still legally protected under Missouri Revised Statute 214. MoDOT will attempt to avoid impacts to known cemeteries; however, if impacting the cemetery is necessary, MoDOT will comply with all applicable laws.

### **Final EIS Cultural Resources Investigations**

- Once the study's recommendations for a preferred alternate are reviewed by other agencies and the public, the project advances from the draft EIS to the final EIS stage (FEIS). The focus of the environmental study shifts to one alignment--the selected alternate--based on multiple factors, including minimizing impacts to historic properties. The APE is reduced and more detailed archaeological, architectural, and historic bridge surveys are conducted within the preferred alignment. Resources associated with alternates other than the preferred

#### **What is an archaeological Phase I survey?**

An archaeological Phase I survey is an intensive investigation of the area that will be directly impacted by the proposed project to identify any historic property that may be affected by that project. If there is good surface visibility (for example a recently plowed field), archaeological sites may be identified by a pedestrian survey. Archaeologists simply walk the area and examine what is exposed on the surface. If there is poor surface visibility (for example a pasture or wooded area) the archaeologists use shovel or auger tests to look for artifacts. Shovel tests are small hand-dug holes about 12 inches wide and up to 24 inches deep, while auger tests are 8-inch diameter holes up to 6 feet deep. In most survey areas, shovel tests or auger tests will be excavated at 50 or 100-foot intervals. The excavated soil is examined for artifacts and other evidence of prehistoric or early historic archaeological sites. Once completed, the shovel/auger test is backfilled, tamped down, and the sod is replaced if possible. Shovel and auger testing will be confined to the survey area and no holes will be left open.

alternate will not be affected by the study and therefore are no longer considered or included in the project.

- The final EIS stage is also the time for a full archaeological survey of the selected alignment. MoDOT will request permission from property owners to conduct an archaeological Phase I survey for each parcel that would be impacted by the future construction.
- SHPO is further consulted regarding the study methods for cultural resources associated with the selected alignment, including the new APE for the refined study area. MoDOT prepares the cultural resources technical report and submits it to the SHPO for review prior to the completion of the FEIS. Properties where access is restricted, and therefore unsurveyed, are noted.
- If the study warrants a Section 4(f) Evaluation, it is finalized for the FEIS, along with the agreement document.

### **Are there any other cultural resources concerns in the corridor study?**

The results of the literature review are reported in the cultural resources chapter of this EIS (Chapter X). As a result of reconnaissance surveys and consultation with the SHPO, MoDOT historic preservation staff identified eleven architectural resources in the current project area that fulfill eligibility criteria for listing on the NRHP. An additional historic property also was identified, but is not included in the previous cultural resources discussion because it will not be involved in the project. The Herman Fechtel Farm, located north of the project footprint, is considered eligible for the NRHP as a historic district involving many historic buildings. The two-story, brick house at the Fechtel Farm is an intact example of rural Missouri-German architecture reportedly built in two phases by a first generation German immigrant in 1860 and 1880. Besides the notable house, the large farm presents an impressive collection of outbuildings that served various purposes through the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries including four barns, a summer kitchen, woodshed, calf shed, grain bin, and more recently, four poultry barns.

During field consultation with SHPO staff on March 3, 2008, MoDOT HP staff recommended the Fechtel Farm eligible as a historic district under Criteria A and C with a proposed NRHP boundary to encompass the farm's nucleus of historic buildings and the pond they surround, but little associated acreage. SHPO concurred with MoDOT's assessment. Because recently constructed highway improvements for the Route 50 and 63 interchange north of the Fechtel Farm already provide a four-lane facility at the northern end of the Route 63 corridor study area, the study team questioned the northern terminus for the current project. There is no need for new Route 63 improvements to begin north of the Fechtel Farm and defining a terminus south of the complex would avoid impacting the historic buildings and structures at the farm. The SHPO concurred that the Fechtel Farm could be considered outside the project's APE providing the alternates did not affect the concentration of buildings that form the historic core. This determination resulted in a total of 11 identified historic architectural resources situated in the APE.

There may be additional historic properties involved in the project (such as archaeological sites), but the individual resources presented in Chapter X are those that have been identified during the preliminary, draft investigations. Other properties of historical interest are located in the corridor, but are not presented herein because it is the study team's opinion that they do not qualify for listing on the NRHP. While these properties may fulfill the 50-year old age guideline, many do not possess historical significance as defined by the NRHP or lack historic integrity. They have been physically altered during the past 50 years through construction additions; the application of contemporary siding; the installation of replacement windows; or affected by other uses of inappropriate materials or modifications (such as vinyl soffits and cornices). MoDOT has consulted with the SHPO and public during this evaluation process and will continue to provide more opportunities for project comments as the draft EIS advances to the final EIS, when further cultural resources investigations are conducted for the selected alternative.

### **How do the architectural resources presented in Chapter X fulfill the National Register Criteria?**

Eleven properties in the APE have architectural resources that fulfill NRHP Criteria A or C because they are historically or architecturally significant, and sometimes both. Other NRHP criteria and criteria exceptions have been applied, and to date, none have been determined relevant. Images, tables, and abbreviated discussions of these properties appear in Chapter X, whereas the following information addresses the NRHP eligibility criteria, the period of significance, and boundary recommendations. Anticipated project effects also are included based on available information at the time of MoDOT's consultation with the SHPO on March 3, 2008. For more information regarding this interagency consultation, please see the notes following this section.

#### *Schmitz Extended Gable Barn*

This farm is comprised of an abandoned house and two barns, one of which is considered architecturally significant. The two barns at the farm form a contrasting pair. One is a common, early to mid-20th century, gambrel roof barn with concrete foundation, but the other is an unusual, extended gable barn with a stone foundation that exhibits Missouri-German characteristics. Other barns like it have not been documented in previous architectural surveys for the county, nor were any others encountered during the present survey. Its construction date is undetermined, but it probably was built during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, perhaps ca. 1890. According to its present owner, Henry Castrop, his grandparents Gertrude and Peter Schmitz acquired the farm sometime near his mother's birth in 1892. From the exterior, it exhibits remarkable historical integrity, few window or door changes, and no siding alterations obscure its original design or materials. During field consultation on March 3, 2008, MoDOT HP staff recommended the barn eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C (Architecture) with a boundary drawn to outline its footprint. The period of significance would be its construction date. No adverse effects are anticipated providing the preferred alignment is reduced in width to avoid impacting the barn. SHPO agreed with this assessment.

### *Maries Valley Farms*

This clay tile chicken hatchery is considered eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C (Architecture) and it may also fulfill Criterion A for its role in local commerce or industry. The business, Star Chick Hatchery, was established in 1923. After a fire in 1926 destroyed the original hatchery, the new, tile hatchery was constructed in 1927. In 1929, the business was renamed Maries Valley Farms. The company's name and advertising is featured inside a brick tablet under the stepped parapet. The hatchery sold hatchlings locally and through mail orders, producing two million chicks per year at its peak. It represents a commercial building type that probably was influenced by prescriptive literature of the period. Additional research may link the building's design to industrial or agricultural standards, or a particular building pattern book. Historically, the hatchery is associated with two, older buildings—a modified, ca. 1896 Queen Anne residence and a brick summer kitchen that has been converted to a garage. Significant alterations to both buildings have affected key physical features and therefore neither building is considered eligible to the NRHP. The recommended period of significance for the hatchery under Criterion C is its construction date (1927). The NRHP boundary encompasses only the hatchery. No adverse effects are anticipated providing the preferred alignment is reduced in width to avoid impacting the hatchery.

### *Vichy Normal & Business Institute*

In 2004, the Vichy Normal & Business Institute, a prominent two and one-half story, commercial building, was determined individually eligible for listing on the NRHP under Criterion C for its architectural significance at the local level. It is situated directly abutting Route 63, with a sidewalk between the highway and the building. The design, scale, massing, form, materials, and workmanship are architectural characteristics that set the building apart from others in the Vichy community. Although it does not represent a specific architectural style, features such as the steeply pitched roof and the arched window and door openings suggest the influence of the Gothic Revival and Italianate styles popular during the mid to late nineteenth century. While most other historical buildings in the community are frame construction, the Vichy Normal & Business Institute is built of brick. Further research may support that the building is representative of traditional or vernacular building patterns and perhaps the work of Missouri-German masons. The period of significance is the estimated construction date, ca. 1880. The recommended NRHP boundary is the building footprint with no recommended contributing resources at the parcel. No adverse effects are anticipated providing the improvements to the existing alignment avoid impacting the building. SHPO concurred with this assessment.

### *Vichy Public School*

In 2004, the Vichy School was determined individually eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A, Education, for its local significance as one of three Maries County schools in operation during the early twentieth century and its important role as an institution that advanced education in the area. The period of significance is 1901-1954, representing the years the building functioned as a school. The NRHP boundary is the footprint of the building with no contributing resources at the parcel. The school is not considered eligible under Criterion C, Architecture, because of the slight modifications to the windows, exterior siding, and shed porch addition to the building. These recent physical alterations are minor and could be reversed in the future; however, they affect the present architectural significance evaluation. No adverse effects are anticipated

providing the improvements to the existing alignment avoid impacting the building. SHPO concurred with this assessment.

### *Westphalia Bridge*

Westphalia Bridge, carrying County Road 611 over the Maries River, is located at the base of the bluffs on the east side of Westphalia. It is located on the western edge of Alternate 1.

Constructed of steel and wrought iron, it is a seven panel, pin-connected Pratt through truss type with two steel three-panel and one two-panel, pin-connected Pratt half-hip pony truss approach spans. The Kansas City Bridge Company built the bridge in 1893 and the approach spans were added in 1903. The substructure consists of stone masonry abutments, concrete-filled steel cylinder piers, and steel pile bents. The main span measures 145 feet in length, giving the bridge a total length of 280 feet. The 14-foot roadway crosses the bridge on a deck composed of wooden beams on steel stringers. The Westphalia Bridge is included in the Missouri Historic Bridge List and is NRHP-eligible under Criterion C as per the 2003 historic bridge Programmatic Agreement. The period of significance is the construction date, 1893, and the construction date of the addition, 1903. No adverse effects to the bridge are anticipated because it is associated with an alternate other than the preferred. Even if Alternate 1 were chosen as the selected alternate, it could be modified to avoid the bridge. SHPO concurred with this assessment.

#### **What is a programmatic agreement (PA)?**

A PA is a document that spells out the terms of a formal, legally binding agreement between parties, such as the Missouri Department of Transportation and other state and/or federal agencies. A PA establishes a process for consultation, review, and compliance with one or more federal laws. The historic bridge PA is concerned with the NRHP-eligibility status of bridges on the statewide historic bridge inventory.

### *Luebbert Farm*

This Missouri-German farmstead is recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP for its architectural significance under Criterion C, and possibly Criterion A, in the area of settlement history or agriculture. Two stone buildings at the farm are especially important for reflecting the heritage of their Missouri-German owners and masons. Stone is used extensively at this hillside site, not only for the two stone houses, but also for retaining walls, building foundations, and even a watering trough. The complex also includes two barns (with log components), and a multipurpose outbuilding (combination privy and storage shed/smokehouse). The parcel was patented in 1837 and stone architecture at the site suggests at least two building phases, perhaps ca. 1860 and 1890. The later stonework at the site may be attributed to Henry Schlueter (ca. 1855-1931), a stonemason who built Catholic churches in Frankenstein and Wardsville, Missouri. During interagency consultation on March 3, 2008, SHPO staff viewed images of the property and was impressed with its significance and integrity. Both agencies agree that the property fulfills eligibility criteria as a historic district under one or more criteria, with the two stone buildings the focal point of the complex. Under Criterion C, the period of significance would be marked by the earliest and oldest construction dates of the contributing resources. Under Criterion A, it may be reduced or expanded depending on the importance of settlement and the role of agriculture at the farm. The NRHP boundary would include all the contributing resources at the site. It would not include two separate residential areas that are part of the Luebbert Farm located more than 0.5 mile from the stone buildings because neither is considered historic. Because Alternative 1 intersects the buildings, it would have an adverse effect to the

farm. The Luebbert Farm would not be affected by the preferred alternative. SHPO concurred with this assessment.

#### *Bauer Log House*

One building at the Bauer Property is considered eligible for the NRHP, the log I-house. The vernacular house exhibits at least two historic building phases and is architecturally significant both for its log construction and building form. Its log core suggests the house expanded from its dogtrot origin (also called turkey trot and sometimes ‘possum trot), a name derived from its characteristic central, open breezeway or “dogtrot.” This house type is comprised of two single rooms or units known as pens, situated side-by-side in a linear plan and sheltered under one, common roof, with a central opening between the two pens. The central opening provides a passage from the front to the back of the house; allows access to either pen; and promotes air circulation and ventilation, important considerations in warm climates. This form helps define the Little Dixie region in Missouri, an eight-county area rich in southern, Anglo-American heritage and bordering Osage County to the north. As common in the Little Dixie region, the breezeway between the two log units of the Bauer House was enclosed with frame construction. The two-story, dogtrot form of the Bauer House and its enclosed hall resulted in a central-hall I house, even if only temporarily. These and later construction phases are considered historic alterations that do not interfere with its architectural significance. On March 3, 2008, both SHPO and MoDOT staff agreed that this building conveys its historical significance and fulfills Criterion C for its architectural significance. The period of significance would include its construction phases, dates undetermined at this time. While other buildings are present at the parcel, no others fulfill NRHP eligibility criteria; therefore, the NRHP boundary includes only the house. Alternates 1 and 2 are likely to have an adverse effect to the Bauer log house, but it would not be affected by the preferred alternative. SHPO concurred with this assessment.

#### **What is vernacular architecture?**

Vernacular architecture is traditional architecture based on cultural and regional building patterns that are passed from one generation to the next. These folk buildings are the products of mental blueprints, local builders and materials, and time-honored construction methods. In contrast to high-style architecture designed by professional architects, vernacular buildings are typed by form. Unlike fashion or style, forms are stable over time. Vernacular buildings may be “dressed” or ornamented following architectural styles, but their type denotes their spatial arrangement, or floor plan, such as a single-pen, double-pen, hall-and-parlor, dogtrot, stack house, etc. The vernacular “I house” and its characteristic form (one room deep, two rooms in length, and two stories in height, generally with gables at either end) gets its name from the Midwestern states where it was first recognized as a folk type—Illinois, Iowa, and Indiana—as well as for its slender, vertical profile. Historic folk houses at the Luebbert, Bauer, Johannismeyer, and Bure properties are located in Route 63 alternates. See <http://missourifolkloresociety.truman.edu/marshall.html> for more information on vernacular architecture in Missouri.

#### *Johannismeyer Log House*

The Johannismeyer Farm is comprised of a residence and several outbuildings, one of which is considered eligible for the NRHP--a log stack house. The stack house represents a vernacular architectural type that is distinguished by its two-story, single-pen form. The single-pen, in essence, is “stacked” on itself to create a taller building than the basic, one-story single pen house. An eastern, one-story, frame addition to this stack house results in a “saltbox” or “cat’s slide” profile. In addition to its vernacular form, the Johannismeyer stack house is noteworthy because of its log construction. Like the nearby Bauer log house, it is indicative of early building methods that utilized locally available materials. The dates and origin of these two

neighboring “English” folk buildings are undetermined and both are worthy of further study in this traditionally German-American region. Both SHPO and MoDOT HP staff consider the stack house eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C, architecture. The period of significance would be linked to the construction date. The NRHP-recommended boundary is the building footprint. Alternates 1 and 2 are likely to have an adverse effect to the Johannesmeyer log house, but it would not be affected by the preferred alternative. SHPO concurred with this assessment.

#### *Castrop Barn*

This ca. 1850 barn with red siding is a highly visible, local landmark in Westphalia that is remembered for the dances held there during the Depression era. The Castrop house, barn, garage, sheds, and associated acreage that border Route 63 to the east comprise one of the oldest rural complexes in Westphalia. Six generations of one family have owned the property over the past 170 years or so, beginning with the construction of the house in 1840 by Martin and Anna Hoer. The barn has been in continuous use since it was built, serving general farming purposes its first 70 years. In the 1930s, owners August and Elizabeth Castrop used the second floor of the barn as a dance hall and restaurant to supplement their income and to provide a gathering place and recreational facility for the community. Weekly dances were held there for approximately a decade, while farm animals continued to occupy the first floor. In the 1940s, the barn returned to its original purpose of sheltering stock and hay and serves the same function today.

The Castrop house is not recommended eligible due to the degree of alterations it has experienced. Because the house is not considered eligible for the NRHP, it is MoDOT and SHPO’s opinion that the property does not warrant further NRHP consideration as a complex or individual historic district. The barn is recommended eligible for its value as a contributing resource to a historic district comprised of multiple properties in the Westphalia community. The barn is considered to fulfill NRHP eligibility Criteria A and C, both for its architectural significance as a mid-19<sup>th</sup> century building employing heavy framing construction methods and for its role in providing community recreation as a dancehall. The recommended period of significance is 1850 to 1940 to include the 1930-1940 decade the barn served as a dancehall. The recommended NRHP boundary is the area immediately surrounding the barn. The selection of Alternate 2 would have an adverse effect on the barn. SHPO concurred with this assessment.

#### *Bure Farm*

The Bure Farm is a good example of an intact, compact farm located within the town of Westphalia, rather than in a sprawling rural setting. The property includes the original farmhouse (an I-house), barn, icehouse, privy, chicken house, and a contemporary Ranch house. MoDOT and SHPO staff concur that the Bure I-house, with its decorative spindle-frieze porch, is one of the best-preserved examples of its type in the corridor and that it fulfills NRHP eligibility criteria for its architectural significance under Criterion C. The accompanying outbuildings add to the property’s historical significance as a small, extant late 19<sup>th</sup> century farm; therefore, the farm is also considered eligible under Criterion A (Agriculture). Under Criterion C, the period of significance would coincide with the year the house was built and, under Criterion A, would be expanded to include the years the ancillary buildings were constructed and the property functioned as a farm. These dates are undetermined at this writing, but an estimated construction date for the I-house is ca. 1885. With the exception of the Ranch house addition, little has

changed at the farm since it was depicted on highway project plans in 1929. The present owner's parents acquired the property in 1940 and the Bure Family kept livestock within the confines of the small "urban" farm for several years. The recommended NRHP boundary is the current northern, western, and southern parcel boundaries; the eastern boundary would be immediately beyond the I-house, just west of the Ranch house on the lot. Alternate 2 would have an adverse effect on the property. SHPO concurred with this assessment.

#### *Former Gas Station*

This vintage gas station is considered eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A for its association with the broad pattern of transportation development in Missouri, and Criterion C for its architectural significance. Its omission from early highway project plans indicates it post-dates 1929. An estimated construction date is ca. 1940, following the relocation of Route 63 in the early 1930s. Besides functioning as a gas station and residence until the early 1980s, it has also been a restaurant and it presently houses an insurance company. Its form is representative of the domestic type of gas station, modeled at a residential scale and minimal style to fit appropriately in its small-town neighborhood, directly adjacent to Route 63. Designated a "house and canopy" form, its design may be traced to early Texaco stations. The NRHP period of significance would be its construction date; the recommended NRHP boundary is the building footprint. Like the other two historic Westphalia properties discussed above, Alternate 2 would have an adverse effect on the old gas station. SHPO concurred with this assessment.

### **What is the next step in the cultural resources investigation?**

The evaluation of cultural resources will continue with a thorough study of the selected alternative, including archaeological Phase I testing. As a result of preliminary investigations at the draft EIS stage, it appears that all the historic architectural resources will be avoided so none is adversely affected by the project. MoDOT will host additional public meetings and seek more public involvement and comments. MoDOT HP staff will prepare a cultural resources report to submit to the SHPO for review prior to the completion of the final EIS. Copies may be requested by contacting MoDOT's HP section at MoDOT, P.O. Box 270, Jefferson City, Missouri, 65102 or calling (573).526.4778.

**Cultural Resources Agency Consultation  
Route 63, Osage, Maries, and Phelps Counties  
MoDOT Job No. J5P0950  
Drafted March 4, 2008; Revised March 28, 2008**

Historic preservation (HP) staff from the Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) and Missouri Department of Natural Resources, State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), met for interagency field consultation regarding cultural resources involved in the Route 63 Corridor Study on March 3, 2008. The following individuals participated in this field survey/consultation: Larry Ayres, MoDOT archaeologist; Tom Gubbels, MoDOT historian; Toni Prawl, MoDOT architectural historian, Judith Deel, SHPO archaeologist, Michelle Diedrich, SHPO survey coordinator, and Rebecca Rose, SHPO historian. This consultation followed a meeting about the project and project methods at MoDOT's HP office on November 5, 2007, as well as four public meetings MoDOT hosted in May and October 2007. The purpose of the field consultation was to identify historic properties and to discuss anticipated project effects, efforts to minimize harm, and appropriate mitigation measures.

The consultation team viewed a number of resources associated with the three reasonable alternatives under study for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). During this screening and preliminary evaluation, the consultation team concurred that 11 properties fulfill eligibility criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The eligibility of a 12th property (the Castrop Barn) was debated and ultimately determined eligible.

A second group of properties is noted below to capture MoDOT and SHPO staff evaluations during this consultation. The listed resources are considered ineligible, but it is not a complete inventory of all the screened and ineligible properties. Once a preferred alternative is selected, the cultural resources investigations will concentrate on all the resources associated with that one alternative. Resources linked to alternatives not selected will be dropped from the study, and therefore, will not require further evaluation.

**NRHP-Eligible Properties**

<u>Region/Property Name</u>	<u>Applicable NRHP Criterion/Criteria and Period of Significance</u>
-----------------------------	--

*Westphalia Region*

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Fechtel Farm</li></ul>	C and likely A, Agriculture, 1860 and 1880, Farm Nucleus The period of significance probably will be extended to 1958 if the outbuildings pre-date 1958 and are contributing resources. The proposed historic district would encompass the buildings and ponds as the nucleus of the farm; little associated acreage is thought necessary to convey significance. An adverse effect is likely unless the project can avoid impacting all contributing resources at the farm. MoDOT will seek avoidance alternatives to minimize impacts, including starting the project farther to the south or shifting the alignment to the east.
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Castrop Barn</li></ul>	C (and possibly A, Recreation), ca. 1850 (& 1930-1940?), Barn only This ca. 1850 barn is a local landmark in Westphalia and is known for the dances held there during the Depression era. During preliminary field consultations, SHPO staff questioned its architectural significance (Criterion C) and the brevity of its recreational role under Criterion A. Typically, it is difficult to support the eligibility of barns as individual buildings unless they are unusual in their design and retain a high degree of integrity. Associated buildings such as the house, garage, and other outbuildings at the farm are old and interesting, but the house has been altered a great deal and the consultation team concurred that it and other buildings did not have enough integrity for the individual property to warrant further NRHP consideration as a complex or historic district. SHPO staff opted to
--	--

review the eligibility of the barn with office colleagues, in particular the National Register Coordinator, to seek additional opinions. Upon further consideration following the field review, SHPO staff determined the barn is likely to fulfill NRHP eligibility criteria as a contributing building to a historic district comprised of multiple properties in Westphalia.

- Schmitz Extended Gable Barn C, ca. 1890?, Barn only

Only one building at this property is considered NRHP-eligible, the extended gable barn. It represents an unusual design that needs further study, both for its architecture and its agricultural use. The NRHP boundary would include only the extended gable barn.

- Maries Valley Farm C (and possibly A), ca. 1920, Hatchery only

The two associated buildings at the property—the residence and garage (a former summer kitchen)—are not considered eligible due to significant alterations that have affected their integrity. Further study under Criterion A should evaluate the areas of agriculture and industry. The NRHP boundary would include only the hatchery.

- Bure Farm C (and A?) ca. 1890

The NRHP boundary would be the parcel boundary but would not include the Ranch house because it is not a contributing resource.

- Former Texaco Gas Station C (and A?), 1921 (if that is the correct construction date)

With further study, Criterion A may also apply in the areas of transportation and/or commerce. The NRHP boundary would be the building footprint.

- Luebbert Farm C (and A?), ca. 1860, Historic District

Historic district would be drawn to include the Missouri-German stone buildings, retaining wall, and appropriate outbuildings. Applicable areas of significance may include settlement and agriculture.

- Westphalia Bridge A and C, 1893 and 1903

#### *Freeburg Region*

- Bauer Dogtrot House C, Dogtrot house (log construction)

Other buildings at the property are not eligible; only the log, dogtrot house.

- Johannesmeyer Stack House C, Stack house (log construction)

Other buildings at the property (including the barn built in 1914 and the giraffe rock house built in 1945 with 1978 addition) are not eligible; only the log, stack house.

#### *Vienna Region*

None

#### *Vichy Region*

- Vichy Normal & Business Inst. C, ca. 1880, Building footprint

- Vichy Public School A, 1901-1954, Building footprint

In 2004, SHPO concurred with MoDOT that these two properties in Vichy were eligible for the NRHP. Because they have changed little since that evaluation, they are still recognized as historic properties at this time.

## **Ineligible Properties (Incomplete List)**

### *Westphalia Region*

- Schmitz Farm

The historical integrity of the property is too compromised. The numerous alterations to the house and its contemporary siding affect its architectural significance and deter from the possibility of a historic district. Many of the historic outbuildings no longer survive and one of the two barns is a recent addition to the farm. Settlement patterns, associated families, property history, use, and current condition were discussed and Criteria A, B, and C are considered not applicable. The log core within the house is concealed by additions and renovation projects; therefore, it is likely to yield little information about its construction under Criterion D. In its present state, the property does not convey historical significance or integrity.

- Holterman/Mertensmeyer Farm

The consensus was that the historical integrity of the property is too compromised. The alterations to the house and its various siding materials affect its architectural significance and integrity, which deter from the possibility of a historic district. While log outbuildings are present, their types are not considered unusual or significant enough to qualify for the NRHP individually. Exterior metal siding obscures two of three log buildings, so Criterion D also was considered but dismissed because the barns' construction is evident through the interior.

- Koester Property, 1920s Craftsman influence
- Heckman Foursquare Rock House/Farm
- I-houses, northern Westphalia, Castlerock Road

### *South Westphalia Region*

- Rehagen Farm

Although the stone house and smokehouse represent an early period for the area (1865-1870) and the stone construction is noteworthy, the consultation team believed the property lacked historical integrity and that better examples of stone architecture survive in Osage County. Neither the stone buildings nor rest of the complex is considered eligible (either as individual buildings or as a district).

### *Freeburg Area*

- Route PP/Freeburg I houses

## **Additional Comments**

- Charcoal Kilns north of Freeburg

A group of charcoal kilns is located near the western edge of the existing Route 63 alignment alternative. While the structures are located outside the project footprint and are not considered in the area of potential effects, the parcel is situated within the study limits. Additional information regarding the history of the kilns and the role they played in the community should be obtained to supplement the general project history in our technical report. The kilns will not be evaluated for their historical significance because they are not considered a resource in our APE.

- Freeburg Tower, Missouri Department of Conservation (MDC)

Some fire towers in the state have been identified as historic properties. The estimated age for the Freeburg tower is ca. 1949, but it looks like a more recent example. MDC staff will be consulted further