

**ST. CROIX RIVER CROSSING PROJECT SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT EIS
CHAPTER 11
ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES**

11.0 INTRODUCTION

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended) requires federal agencies or their designees to assess the effects of their actions by identifying properties listed on, or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP); determining effects of the project on those properties; and consulting with interested parties to determine ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate effects caused by an undertaking.

For the St. Croix River Crossing Supplemental Draft EIS, FHWA, Mn/DOT and Wis/DOT are the three lead agencies for addressing Section 106 requirements under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. FHWA has indicated that they will act as the lead federal agency in assisting the National Park Service, National Trust for Historic Preservation, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Coast Guard, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in meeting their Section 106 requirements under federal law. FHWA has requested that these federal agencies identify their undertakings and that they participate in coordinating and signing the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) that will be developed for the project. FHWA, Mn/DOT and Wis/DOT are responsible for all decisionmaking in the Section 106 process and have guided activities conducted as part of this SDEIS.

It has been the intent of the three lead agencies to coordinate NEPA and Section 106 review throughout the process. Public meetings and various public subgroups have included discussion and review of historic and archaeological resources as part of their activities. These public involvement activities have informed the decisionmaking process and will continue to be used by the lead agencies in Section 106 deliberations. Further discussion of the Section 106 process and public involvement activities can be found in Section 11.2.

This chapter describes historic resources found in the St. Croix River Crossing Project area of potential effect (APE), and it addresses the anticipated effects on these resources that may be caused by the No-Build Alternative and the Build Alternatives. In addition to the requirements under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended), Minnesota Statute Chapter 138 requires that state departments and agencies consider impacts on properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the State Register of Historic Places, and the State Historic Site Network in their project planning. The Minnesota Field Archaeology Act requires investigations of non-federal public land where archaeological sites are known or suspected to be located. Wisconsin State Statutes also provide for consideration of historic and archaeological resources.

Minnesota Chapter 4410.3900 (Environmental Review Program) states that when a joint federal and state environmental document is being prepared, governmental agencies shall, to the fullest extent, avoid duplication between Minnesota Statutes and federal requirements. Therefore, for

the purposes of this Supplemental Draft EIS, the federal Section 106 process, described below, is being conducted to meet requirements set forth by Minnesota Statute Chapter 138 and the Field Archaeology Act.

The Section 106 process consists of four steps: (1) initiation of the Section 106 process; (2) identifying and evaluating historic properties; (3) assessing the effects of an undertaking on historic properties; and (4) consultation for methods to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any adverse effects. A historic property is defined as any prehistoric or historic building, structure, site, object or district included in, or eligible for inclusion on the NRHP.

Criteria for determining whether a site, building, structure, or object is eligible for listing on the NRHP, as set forth in federal regulation 36 CFR 60, are used to evaluate the significance of historic properties. To qualify for listing in the NRHP, a property must possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, association, and significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering and culture under one of the following criterion:

Criterion A: association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history; or

Criterion B: association with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

Criterion C: embodiment of the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or representation of the work of a master, possession of high artistic values, or representation of a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

Criterion D: the ability to yield information important in prehistory or history (U.S. Department of the Interior 1997: 2).

11.1 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Evidence of precontact settlement of Washington County, Minnesota, and St. Croix County, Wisconsin, has been found relating to cultures as early as 2,500 years ago. Extant sites within the two counties include multi-component Archaic sites, Woodland Tradition sites, including mounds and a rock shelter, and a later Oneota period occupation site. None of these sites is located in or near the project area.

Two Native American populations occupied the area during the European contact period — the Sioux (Dakota) and the Chippewa (Ojibwe). The St. Croix River valley was used as a travel and trading route. Accounts from early nineteenth-century explorer Stephen Long noted that Native Americans had no permanent villages on Lake St. Croix but that the area was used as hunting grounds. During this time, both the Dakota and Ojibwe claimed the lands north of the Minnesota River, creating hostility between the two groups. Neither group maintained permanent villages in the area, likely due to conflicts resulting from these claims.

In 1837, land-cession treaties were negotiated between the U.S. Government, the Dakota and the Ojibwe, whereby a considerable amount of land between the Mississippi and the St. Croix was surrendered by the tribes. This opened the area to lumbermen, farmers, and others who were eager to establish themselves in the region. Because of its location on the St. Croix River at the easternmost edge of present day Minnesota, and the desire to harvest nearby white pine forests, the area around Stillwater was among the first settled in present day Minnesota.

Stillwater's first sawmill began operation in 1844. By 1857, the Stillwater area led the state in lumber exports, in a time when lumbering was the dominant industry. Lumbering brought incredible prosperity to the Stillwater area in the 19th century, as evidenced by the many large residences still present on its streets. Lumbering operations continued throughout the 19th century until 1914. During the half-century of St. Croix lumbering, area mills cut some ten billion board feet of lumber.

The community of Oak Park (now Oak Park Heights) was laid out in 1857 on an upland site along the territorial road and overlooking Lake St. Croix. Its location on a well-traveled road, adjacent to Stillwater was a likely factor in its early growth and development.

Across the river in Wisconsin, St. Croix County commissioners established the township of St. Joseph in 1860, one of thirteen townships in the county. At that time, St. Croix County's population was 5,394, and once the first bridge was built linking St. Joseph Township to Stillwater in 1876, the population grew even more quickly.

The community of Houlton, in the western part of St. Joseph Township, has never been incorporated. It was considered to be a subsistence community, serving the surrounding rural area with support businesses. In 1901 it had a population of 345 people, with three saloons, one boot/shoe/harness dealer, one hardware dealer, one meat dealer, one general store, a blacksmith shop, and a creamery.

11.2 AGENCY COORDINATION AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

As noted in the introduction, FHWA, Mn/DOT and Wis/DOT are the three lead agencies for the St. Croix River Crossing Project, with FHWA also serving as the lead federal agency for Section 106 purposes. The three lead agencies are responsible for all decisionmaking in ongoing Section 106 review and consultation in this project.

A long history (20+ years) of agency coordination exists for this project, which includes agency coordination during the 1990 Draft EIS and 1995 Final EIS, the Braun Facilitation Process, and coordination prior to suspension of the project in 2001. During this time, numerous federal, state, and local agencies have been involved in the St. Croix River Crossing Project. The following discussion identifies agency coordination and public involvement related to Section 106 review throughout the most recent public processes. The various studies that identified historic properties are also noted to document the reports completed since the late 1980s.

11.2.1 1990 Draft EIS and 1995 Final EIS

Analyses of historic and architectural properties for the St. Croix River Crossing were documented in Minnesota Historical Society memorandums as early as 1985. These early memorandums identified historic properties on the NRHP in the Stillwater area, and known archaeological sites in that vicinity. The NRHP nomination of the Stillwater Lift Bridge (the Lift Bridge) in 1989 grew from this era of studies. A report for Mn/DOT, *Special Study: Historic and Archaeological Impacts Stillwater and Houlton Bridge* (Phase I report, March 1990); formed the basis for the historic and archaeological properties section of the 1990 *Stillwater-Houlton Draft Environmental Impact Statement and 4(f) Evaluations* (March 1990).

The 1990 *Special Study* identified historic resources for five river crossing alternatives considered in the 1990 Draft EIS. The report identified 18 historic sites and standing structures listed on the NRHP and six archeological sites, one of which was listed on the NRHP. The study concluded that the Central Corridor, which left the Minnesota shore south of downtown Stillwater, would likely result in no direct historic or archaeological impacts requiring mitigation. Further, the study identified the No-Build Alternative (which would not remove traffic from downtown Stillwater), as having the potential for the most serious long-term adverse impacts on Stillwater's historical resources due to an increasingly high volume of vehicular traffic through downtown Stillwater.

The 1995 *Final EIS and Section 4 (f) Evaluation for the New St. Croix River Crossing* resulted in additional review of archaeological and historic properties. Preparation of the 1995 Final EIS relied on the following studies:

- Loucks & Associates, Inc., *Cultural Resources Investigation Trunk Highway (TH) 36 and Stillwater/Houlton Bridge Project* (Phase I Report, April 1994);
- Loucks & Associates, Inc., *Cultural Resources Investigation Phase II TH 36 and Stillwater/Houlton Bridge Project* (July 1994);
- Rivercrest Associates, Inc., *Phase III Historical Documentation Study: The Moritz & Bertha Bergstein House, Shoddy Mill & Waste Materials Yard* (May 1997);
- John H. Broihahn, *A Report on the Phase I Survey of the Interstate Bridge from Houlton, Wisconsin, to Stillwater, Minnesota, and Alterations to the Approaches (State Trunk Highway [STH] 64, STH 35) St. Croix County, Wisconsin* (DOT ID 1550-00-02; SHSW 87-0167) (State Historical Society of Wisconsin, April, 1989);
- Dr. Robert Barth, *Archaeological Survey Field Report*, [area affected by relocating County Trunk Highway (CTH) E], October 1991; and
- *State Historical Society of Wisconsin Archaeological Survey Field Report*, [Thelen family cemetery area], 1991.

The Wisconsin investigations prepared for the 1990 Draft EIS and the 1995 Final EIS identified no significant historic resources in the project area.

The Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III reports provided a more detailed examination of the Minnesota portion of the South Corridor, identified as the Preferred Alternative, for the 1995 Final EIS. The archaeological, visual, audible, air quality, and traffic areas of potential effect (APEs) included the proposed highway corridor, potential wetland mitigation areas, and properties within 200 feet of the highway center line. The traffic APE also included downtown Stillwater and the Lift Bridge, due to anticipated changes in traffic patterns; however, further analysis of these historic resources was not provided, as both the downtown Stillwater Commercial Historic District and the Lift Bridge were already listed on the NRHP.

The Phase I report documented the survey of 156 buildings or structures contained in approximately 412 acres. No precontact or historic archaeological sites were identified. Seven historic properties potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP were found within the project area:

- 1) John and Susan (Cover) Parker House, 5870 Stagecoach Trail;
- 2) Ludwig Henke House, 6017 Peller Avenue North;
- 3) Moritz Bergstein Shoddy Mill, 6041 Stagecoach Trail;
- 4) Moritz Bergstein House, 6046 Stagecoach Trail;
- 5) Albert R. Turnbull House, 5856 Stagecoach Trail;
- 6) St. Croix Overlook, east side, Lookout Trail; and,
- 7) The Log Cabin Restaurant, 15021 60th Street North.

The Phase II Report provided a detailed investigation of these seven properties. Based on detailed research, four of the seven properties were considered eligible for listing on the NRHP:

- 1) Stillwater Wayside Overlook (St. Croix Overlook);
- 2) The Log Cabin Restaurant;
- 3) Moritz Bergstein House; and,
- 4) Moritz Bergstein Shoddy Mill.

Of these four properties, only the Bergstein House and Mill were determined to have an adverse effect by the project, as demolition of these properties was required for right-of-way. A public information meeting on the Section 106 findings was held on October 12, 1994. After consideration of public and agency input, a Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) was prepared to identify measures to mitigate impacts on historic properties (see Appendix G).

The 1994 MOA included the clause that the Lift Bridge “will remain on the states’ respective trunk highway systems, will not be affected by this project, and will be subject to further review pursuant to 36 CFR 800 for future changes in jurisdiction or disposition.” Stipulations in the MOA addressed:

- (1) A complete historical documentation study on the Bergstein House and Shoddy Mill (carried out in the 1997 Phase III study);

- (2) Consultation of Mn/DOT and MnSHPO on design plans for project elements in the vicinity of the Log Cabin restaurant;
- (3) Mn/DOT development and implementation of a plan for the Stillwater Overlook in consultation with MnSHPO;
- (4) Design of the new bridge developed in consultation with, and review by MnSHPO;
- (5) FHWA and MnSHPO shall consult on any disagreements regarding the MOA, and shall request the Advisory Council to comment.

The 1994 MOA was signed by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, FHWA, MnSHPO, the WisSHPO, Mn/DOT, and Wis/DOT.

11.2.2 Braun Facilitation Process and Supplemental DEIS (1996-2001)

Following project suspension in 1995, the 1998 Facilitation Process identified a river crossing alternative thought to address river agencies' concerns regarding the 1995 project. This process, which included participation by the MnSHPO, WisSHPO and other parties, was concluded by a Memorandum of Understanding directing completion of a SDEIS on the newly identified alternative, thereafter referred to as the "Consensus Alternative," and requiring resolution of the future of the Lift Bridge in conjunction with completion of the environmental process for the Consensus Alternative. Following completion of the Braun Facilitation Process, an Amended Scoping Decision Document was completed in February 1999, outlining the work to be completed on a Supplemental Draft EIS for the Consensus Alternative. Work began on an SDEIS¹ in 1999 and required additional historic property investigations for the new corridor as well as for downtown Stillwater, due to the possible removal of the Lift Bridge as well as to the location of the proposed bridge within the general viewshed of many of Stillwater's historic resources. Refer to Chapter 1 for additional information on the Braun Facilitation Process, the 1999 Amended Scoping Decision Document, and the project suspension in 2001.

The additional studies completed for the Supplemental Draft EIS included the following:

- Charles R. Moffat, *An Archaeological Survey of the Stillwater Bridge Braun C Alternative, St. Croix, Wisconsin* (Wis/DOT, December 1998);
- *Archaeological Report on Wisconsin Optional Alignment* (Wis/DOT, June 1999);
- Wisconsin Architectural Survey (Wis/DOT, June 1999);
- John Nicholas Thelen Farmstead Determination of Eligibility (Wis/DOT, December 1999);
- Rivercrest Associates, *Cultural Resource Investigation, St. Croix River Bridge* (Mn/DOT, August 1999); and,
- Rivercrest Associates, *Cultural Resource Investigation for St. Croix River Bridge of Kolliner Park* (Mn/DOT, October 1999).

¹ Work on the project was suspended by the DOTs in 2001. The SDEIS addressing the Consensus Alternative was not published.

The December 1998 and June 1999 Wisconsin archaeological surveys covered 34 acres of land for the Consensus Alternative that were not investigated in studies conducted for the 1990 Draft EIS or the 1995 Final EIS. Two small, undocumented Euro-American historic sites were identified within or near the study area; however, both sites appeared to have very low potential for NRHP eligibility due to low potential for intact subsurface features or artifacts. Additional investigation of these two sites was not recommended. The survey identified no archaeological sites within the study area.

The Wisconsin architectural survey (June 1999) examined standing structures within the Wisconsin portion of the study area for the Consensus Alternative, including the Optional Alignment in Wisconsin. The report examined 16 properties to determine their potential for National Register eligibility and identified one property, the Thelen Farmstead, as being potentially eligible for the NRHP. The Thelen Farmstead Determination of Eligibility (December 1999) provided further information on the history and significance of the farmstead and determined it eligible for the NRHP.

The August 1999 Mn/DOT Historic Resource Investigation was completed to supplement previous Minnesota studies and to identify additional properties potentially affected by the Consensus Alternative. In addition to identifying 13 properties (including the 82-property Stillwater Commercial Historic District) already listed on the NRHP, the report also recommended the Stillwater Cultural Landscape District and the Hersey & Bean Sawmill and Planing Mill archaeological site as being eligible for the NRHP. This report was supplemented by the October 1999 report that discussed two historic archaeological sites, the Tourist Camp Site and the Legion Camp Site, in Kolliner Park at the eastern end of the Lift Bridge. These sites were added to the Cultural Landscape district as contributing elements.

Public input regarding the identified historic properties and potential effects resulting from the project was also sought during this timeframe. Numerous historical preservation groups/interests were invited to participate in the Section 106 process following publication of the 1999 Amended Scoping Decision Document and during preparation of an SDEIS. Thirty-six local, state, and federal agencies were invited to meetings on January 27, 1999, and May 5, 1999, to discuss the possible effects of the Consensus Alternative on the Lift Bridge.

Public open houses to obtain public comments were held on February 25, 1999, March 3, 1999, May 12, 1999, July 22, 1999, November 15, 1999, and November 17, 1999. These open houses provided information on the results of historic properties investigations, the effects resulting from the alternatives, and possible mitigation items, as well as other information about the project.

In addition, meetings with the cooperating agencies and representatives of the City of Stillwater, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Stillwater Heritage Preservation Commission, and Rivertown Restoration, a local non-profit preservation organization, were held to discuss study results and project effects.

Consultation had also occurred with Native American tribes to identify historic resources in the project area during this study. In accordance with 36 CFR Part 800 (rules governing implementation of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act) Native American tribes were contacted and asked to provide assistance in identifying historic properties to which their tribe attaches religious and/or cultural significance to in the project area.

11.2.3 2004 Supplemental Draft EIS

The following sections describe the work completed for this document.

11.2.3.1 Public Involvement and Consultation

The St. Croix River Crossing Project was suspended in 2001, but began again in 2003 and led to the work presented in this SDEIS. The Section 106 process was led by the three lead agencies, FHWA, Mn/DOT and Wis/DOT. Six other federal agencies have also joined the three lead agencies as cooperating agencies for the project. Federal cooperating agencies include: the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the National Park Service, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, U. S. Coast Guard, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency. State cooperating agencies include the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, the Wisconsin State Historic Preservation Office, and the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office. In addition to their formal role as cooperating agencies, some of these agencies were participants in the Historic Resources Subgroup (Section 106 Subgroup) and in the Stakeholder Resolution Process (see Chapter 1 for a list of participants in the Stakeholder Group).

The Section 106 Subgroup met throughout the SDEIS preparation process, reviewed the determinations of eligibility of historic properties and discussed potential effects to those properties from the various Build Alternatives. This group will continue to meet and participate in discussions for development of a Memorandum of Agreement.

Numerous historical preservation groups/interests also participated in the Stakeholder Group process. The Stakeholder Problem Solving Process included the identification of interests, concerns and needs of the stakeholders that would need to be satisfied for the group's consensus agreement. This involved creation of a list of draft criteria for decision making specifically for historic resources. Development of this problem solving process also outlined the regulatory requirements of the project pertinent to Section 106. The Stakeholders were provided updates on the progress of the Section 106 Subgroup to include in their deliberations.

The Stakeholder group included a variety of participants with historic properties interests in the St. Croix River Crossing Project vicinity. This group included representatives including the Stillwater Lift Bridge Association, the Minnesota Preservation Alliance and the Stillwater Heritage Preservation Commission as well as the Minnesota SHPO, Wisconsin SHPO and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The Stillwater HPC conducts surveys, designates historic properties and conducts design review on historic properties that are locally designated, many of which are also listed on the NRHP or have been determined eligible for the NRHP. The National Trust for Historic Preservation was invited to participate, but chose, instead, to be an observer of the process.

Throughout the 2004 SDEIS process, the lead agencies coordinated NEPA and Section 106 public involvement activities. Information regarding the identification of historic resources and preliminary determination of effects was shared with the public during public information meetings held during preparation of the scoping documents and the SDEIS. The

public was invited to comment on study findings presented at public information meetings on June 15, 2004 and June 22, 2004. (See Chapter 15 for additional discussion of public involvement).

FHWA also solicited comment from over 20 Indian tribes with possible interest in the St. Croix River Crossing area. On April 22, 2004, FHWA sent the 2004 Amended Final Scoping Decision Document and asked the tribes to identify any properties to which a tribe attached religious and cultural significance within the Area of Potential Effect of the project. If such properties were identified, the tribe would be asked to be a consulting party in the Section 106 process. A list of tribes who received this letter is included in Table 11-1. Three tribes responded to this letter with requests for further information or requested the opportunity to review additional materials. The three tribes expressing interest are the Lac Du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians; the Sac & Fox Nation of Missouri in Kansas & Nebraska; and the Ho-Chunk Department of Heritage Preservation Cultural Resources Division. These tribes will be included in the ongoing consultation process according to their interest.

Public meetings and comments will be solicited throughout the rest of the SDEIS process. FHWA, Mn/DOT and Wis/DOT will incorporate public comments and additional information into a final determination of effects on historic properties and identification of methods to avoid, minimize or mitigate effects on historic properties. Mitigation will be addressed in a Memorandum of Agreement and signed by consulting parties.

Section 106 rules require federal agency officials to include consulting parties in the public review process and in developing MOAs. Consulting parties typically include the SHPOs of the involved states, Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (or other selected tribal representatives) who express interest in the project; representatives of local governments within the area of the project; applicants for federal assistance, permits, licenses and other approvals required as part of the project; and additional individuals and organizations with a demonstrated interest in the project (36 CFR Part 800.2 (4) (c)). Consulting parties will be determined by the three lead agencies and will include members of the 106 Subgroup, the Stakeholder Subgroup, interested Indian tribes, property owners, and interested members of the public.

11.2.3.2 Architectural History

In conjunction with the SDEIS, further work was undertaken in both Minnesota and Wisconsin in 2004. In Minnesota, Phase I and II architectural history investigations were conducted in May and June. An area of potential effect (APE) was outlined by the Mn/DOT Cultural Resources Unit (CRU) utilizing topographic data to map an area where crossing alternatives could theoretically be viewed or where they may impact views of the shore and blufflines along the St. Croix. This APE also included areas where construction work was proposed outside the visual effect of the river crossings. The APE was then reviewed in meetings with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Minnesota and Wisconsin SHPOs and the Historic Resources Subgroup. The APE was also field-reviewed by the Subgroup and again by the consultant and the Mn/DOT CRU and refined. The finalized APE takes into account much of the shoreline north of the downtown Stillwater area, the entirety of the Stillwater original plat (designated as a NRHP-eligible historic cultural landscape), portions of Oak Park Heights within the viewshed of one or more project alternatives, and areas north and south of TH 36, west to TH 5, that may be affected by road improvements (Figure 11-1).

**TABLE 11-1
ST. CROIX RIVER CROSSING TRIBAL CONTACTS (2004)**

Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe Indians	Onamia, MN
Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin.....	Odanah, WI
Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin	Hayward, WI
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	Cass Lake, MN
Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians	Bayfield, WI
Sokaogon Chippewa Community of the Mole Lake Band	Crandon, WI
St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin.....	Hertel, WI
White Earth Band of Minnesota Chippewa Indians.....	Ponsford, MN
Lower Sioux Indian Community	Morton, MN
Prairie Island Indian Community.....	Welch, MN
Shakopee Sioux Community Council.....	Prior Lake, MN
Ho-Chunk Nation.....	Black River Falls, WI
Upper Sioux Indian Community	Granite Falls, MN
Great Lake Inter-Tribal Council, Inc.	Lac du Flambeau, WI
Forest County Potawatomi Community of Wisconsin	Crandon, WI
Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin	Lac du Flambeau, WI
Oneida Nation	Oneida, WI
Stockbridge Munsee Community of Wisconsin	Bowler, WI
Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin	Keshena, WI
Sac & Fox Nation of Oklahoma.....	Drumright, OK
Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation	Mayetta, KS
Sac & Fox Nation of Missouri	Reserve, KS
Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma	Perkins, OK

The Phase I and II Architectural History Survey for the St. Croix River Crossing Project, Stillwater, Washington County, Minnesota (July 2004) covered areas in the APE that had not previously been surveyed, or had been inventoried but not evaluated. Property types included residential properties, cemeteries, railroads, trails, and highways. Of the properties identified and evaluated, two properties were already listed on the NRHP: the Stillwater State Prison Historic District (WA-BPC-007) and the St. Croix Boom Site (WA-SWT-004). Three properties received Phase II investigations. One property, the Louis Billido Town Barn (WA-SWC-1488) was determined not eligible, and two properties, the William N. Danforth House (WA-SWC-1067) and the Fairview Cemetery (WA-SWC-1486), were determined eligible. The Stillwater and St. Paul Railroad was also determined eligible.

In Wisconsin, the *State Trunk Highway 64 Stillwater Bridge and Approaches, Architecture/History Survey, St. Croix County, Wisconsin, (Wis/DOT ID 1550-00-02)* (May 2004) survey was undertaken to supplement and reevaluate the 1999 survey conducted for the

Figure 11-1 – Area of Potential Effects – Minnesota (8.5x11 – b/w)

Braun Facilitation Process. The APE was defined by Wis/DOT, bounded by CTH V on the east and south, the St. Croix River on the west and the north town line for the Town of St. Joseph (Figure 11-2). This APE was selected based on the following considerations:

- Differential impacts of one build alternative vs. another
- Indirect commercial and retail effects that might be related to the project
- Location of secondary effects based on development intensity
- Potential locations of noise impacts
- Potential locations of light impacts
- Potential visual impacts in consideration of topographic features.

The WisSHPO staff indicated a desire for a larger APE to cover potential effects of continued development in western Wisconsin related to this project. Wis/DOT (on behalf of FHWA), however, felt that the APE as defined was appropriate for analyzing the effects caused by the project.

Six properties not included in the 1999 survey were identified in the expanded APE. Two properties from the 1999 survey were reevaluated as potentially eligible for the NRHP. From the previous and current surveys, five properties received Phase II studies for Determination of Eligibility. The St. Croix Hilltop Drive-In Theater was determined eligible; the Louis C. Kriesel Farmstead is currently under review as potentially eligible and requires a boundary determination.

11.2.3.3 Archaeology

In Minnesota, a survey and investigations were underway in Summer 2004 and documented in the *Intensive Literature Search and Phase I/II Archaeological Investigations for the St. Croix River Crossing, Washington County, Minnesota* (Letter Report May 2004 - Final Report

Pending) The literature search was conducted to determine whether the APE for the alternatives contained any previously recorded archaeological resources or had the potential to contain unrecorded archaeological resources that may be potentially eligible for the NRHP. The APE for archaeology is limited to the construction limits (including pond locations) of each of the alternatives (Figure 11-1).

Based on the literature search, fieldwork was recommended for three sites:

- Phase I archaeological survey of a one-third mile roadway between Norwich Avenue and Oakgreen Avenue for potential for intact precontact deposits;
- Phase II archaeological survey and evaluation of the Hersey & Bean Lumber Company;
- Phase I/II archaeological survey and evaluation of the “Slab Alley” neighborhood.

The roadway site west of Oakgreen Avenue was found not eligible; archaeology fieldwork is in progress on the other two sites. These properties are included for consideration in the evaluation of effects in this report, pending an eligibility determination. They will be removed from consideration if the sites are not eligible.

Figure 11-2 – Area of Potential Effects – Wisconsin (8.5x11 – b/w)

In Wisconsin, archaeology survey work has been carried out in various reports over the course of the project. A consultant archaeologist has been retained to review the 2004 APE with previous surveys. The APE for archaeology is limited to the construction limits (including pond locations) of each of the alternatives (Figure 11-2). A small portion of land along the B-1 Alternative is currently under study to determine whether any sites are present. Wis/DOT and WisSHPO will continue consultations should any additional archaeological sites be identified.

All studies will be completed in 2004 and the results incorporated into the Supplemental Final EIS, and taken into consideration during consultation if eligible sites are found.

11.3 ASSESSMENT OF ADVERSE EFFECTS

FHWA, as the lead Federal agency involved in the St. Croix River Crossing Project, is charged with considering the effects of this project on historic properties listed on, or eligible for, the NRHP. In carrying out its Section 106 responsibilities, FHWA has made a "Preliminary Assessment of Effects" for this SDEIS document. In making a determination of effects, FHWA requires review by the public, consulting parties, SHPOs and others before concluding a final determination of effects. The "Preliminary Assessment of Effects" in this SDEIS represents the information known at this time, but is subject to change following public review and comment. Coordination with various agencies and comments will be incorporated throughout the preparation of a Supplemental Final EIS. If adverse effects to historic properties listed on or determined eligible for the NRHP are found as a result of any of the Build Alternatives, mitigation measures will be developed and carried out through a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA).

Assessment of adverse effects on historic properties was conducted using the Criteria of Effect and Adverse Effect (36 CFR 800.5). The criteria state that an "adverse effect is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics that qualify the property for inclusion in the NRHP in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association." The criteria further state that "consideration shall be given to all qualifying characteristics of a historic property, including those that may have been identified subsequent to the original evaluation of the property's eligibility for the National Register."

Adverse effects may include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance, or be cumulative.

Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:

- i. Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property;
- ii. Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation, and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the Secretary's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR part 68) and applicable guidelines;

- iii. Removal of the property from its historic location;
- iv. Change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance;
- v. Introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features;
- vi. Neglect of a property which causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization; and
- vii. Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property's historic significance.

The section following Table 11-2 describes the historic properties as listed on, determined eligible, or potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as a result of studies conducted for the various St. Croix River Crossing documents.

**TABLE 11-2
NRHP-LISTED, DETERMINED ELIGIBLE, AND POTENTIALLY ELIGIBLE
PROPERTIES EVALUATED FOR EFFECTS**

Property Name	NRHP Criterion	SHPO Number	Eligibility Status
Log Cabin Restaurant (Club Tara)	A	WA-OHC-019	Determined Eligible
Bergstein Shoddy Mill	A	WA-OHC-001	Determined Eligible
Stillwater State Prison Historic District	C	WA-BPC-007	NRHP Listed; 22 contributing properties, 8 non-contributing
St. Croix Overlook	A & C	WA-OHC-005	Determined Eligible
William N. Danforth House	C	WA-SWC-1067	Determined Eligible;
Fairview Cemetery	C	WA-SWC-1486	Determined Eligible;
Hersey and Bean Site	A	21-WA-91 & 92	Recommended Eligible; review pending
Slab Alley			Potentially eligible, undergoing testing
Stillwater & St. Paul Railroad	A		Recommended Eligible
St. Croix Boom Site	A	WA-SWT-004	National Historic Landmark
Stillwater Lift Bridge	C	WA-SWC-322	NRHP Listed; contributing to Stillwater Cultural Landscape Dist.
Stillwater Commercial Historic District	A & C	Multiple numbers	NRHP-Listed; 82 properties; Lift Bridge not included
Stillwater Cultural Landscape District	A & C	Multiple numbers	Determined Eligible; 247 contributing properties and 187 non-contributing properties; 3 contributing archaeological sites; Lift Bridge included
Thelen Farmstead	C		Determined Eligible
St. Croix Hilltop Drive-In Theatre	C		Determined Eligible
Kreisel Farmstead	C		Determined Eligible

11.3.1 Log Cabin Restaurant, (Club Tara) 15021 60th Street North

11.3.1.1 Affected Environment

Built in 1932, the Log Cabin Restaurant is a relatively unaltered example of early 20th-century roadside architecture (see Figure 11-3 for site location). Like other roadhouses of the period, it was built to serve food, alcohol and gasoline from a distinctive building designed to attract passing motorists. The Log Cabin was originally located on the trunk highway, but now faces the frontage road south of TH 36 due to past roadway modifications. With its large round logs and prominent cobblestone fireplace chimney, the rustic cabin evokes images of coziness, leisure, warmth, and friendliness.

The Log Cabin Restaurant is eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A, as illustrative of the significant historical pattern of auto tourism that flourished during the 1920s and 1930s.

11.3.1.2 Environmental Consequences

Alternative B-1: Under Alternative B-1, the TH 36 roadway would be shifted approximately 22 feet farther north, and lowered ten feet below the level of the existing TH 36. Currently TH 36 is approximately 11.5 feet above the Log Cabin and traffic is visible.

Noise impact analysis reveals that daytime noise changes would be under 5 dBA and do not require noise abatement analysis. Nighttime noise is projected to increase by 7 dBA over existing levels.

The frontage road that currently provides access and parking for the Log Cabin would be opened and extended east past the property to connect with Stagecoach Trail. A 12-foot-wide trail would be south of the frontage road, adjacent to the Log Cabin, and provide a buffer between frontage road traffic and the parking lot.

The existing frontage road ends at the Log Cabin parking lot and frontage road right-of-way has been informally used for overflow patron parking. Because the frontage road right-of-way would become roadway in this alternative, concerns have been raised on whether the Log Cabin could experience parking shortages during busy periods. A study of the parking lot area (without frontage road right-of-way) has found that 27 stalls and 2 handicapped accessible spaces could be accommodated on the site with improvements. Daily traffic counts in June 2004 showed an average weekday maximum of 30 vehicles and an average weekend day maximum of 32 vehicles on the frontage road. The single-hour maximum totaled 47 vehicles on a Saturday between 7-8 pm.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Alternative B-1 would improve the setting of the Log Cabin by reducing TH 36 traffic visibility and moving it farther away. Because nighttime noise would increase by 7 dBA over existing levels, noise abatement analysis should be conducted to determine whether mitigation is appropriate. The frontage road connection would restore the relationship of the Log Cabin to an adjacent two-lane roadway and may bring additional business because of better accessibility. The opening up of the frontage road would provide through traffic, similar to the road access that contributed to the property's eligibility as an example of auto tourism in the post-World War I era.

**Figure 11-3 – Location of National Register Listed or Eligible Properties in Project Area
(8.5x11 – b/w)**

The 1994 MOA directed Mn/DOT to develop design plans for project elements in the vicinity of the Log Cabin in consultation with MnSHPO and to review the frontage road, access points to parking areas, landscaping, and any other project-related changes to the setting. It is recommended that final design for the frontage road be reviewed by Mn/DOT Cultural Resources Unit (CRU) and SHPO to ensure that the relationship to the Log Cabin is appropriate. Although the frontage road would use the right-of-way that has been informally used for Log Cabin parking, it appears that more efficient utilization of existing space could accommodate most parking needs for the business. The large crowds on weekend nights, however, could result in overflow parking on the frontage road. Lack of safe and efficient parking under Alternative B-1 could have a negative economic effect on the Log Cabin Restaurant and would result in an adverse effect on the Log Cabin's ongoing business activity.

Alternatives C, D and E: The only change to the Log Cabin under Alternatives C, D, and E is that the TH 36 roadway would be located in approximately the same right-of-way as the current road and the roadway grade would be lowered 15 to 20 feet below the level of the existing TH 36 grade and approximately 5 feet below the proposed frontage road. All other impacts would be the same as identified in Alternative B-1.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: The location of the TH 36 roadway in the same right-of-way and lowering the roadway grade 5 feet below the proposed frontage road would improve the setting of the Log Cabin Restaurant by removing the visibility of the TH 36 traffic. All other information in the Preliminary Assessment of Effects for B-1 is applicable for Alternatives C, D and E. The large crowds on weekend nights could result in overflow parking on the frontage road. Lack of safe and efficient parking under Alternatives C, D and E could have a negative economic effect on the Log Cabin Restaurant and would result in an adverse effect on the Log Cabin's ongoing business activity.

11.3.2 Bergstein Shoddy Mill, 6041 Stagecoach Trail

11.3.2.1 Affected Environment

This site, originally six buildings dating from the late 19th century constructed by Jewish immigrants Moritz and Bertha Bergstein, was a rare surviving Minnesota example of the daily economic pursuits often associated with Jewish immigrants (see Figure 11-3 for site location). The site was directly associated with the Bergstein shoddy mill and junkyard operations and the family's adaptations to American life. These included the house, town barn, and two outbuildings on the house lot, and the shoddy mill/warehouse and fieldstone storage building across the street. The complex was found to be eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A in the area of social history.

Since the determination of eligibility in 1997, the house, town barn and two outbuildings on the west side of the street have been demolished. The shoddy mill/warehouse and fieldstone storage building remain. The current 2004 study has determined that the two remaining buildings retain the characteristics that make them eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A in the area of social history.

11.3.2.2 Environmental Consequences

Alternatives B-1, C, D and E: Under all the Build Alternatives, the Bergstein shoddy mill/warehouse and fieldstone storage building would be acquired for right-of-way and the buildings demolished.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: All six buildings in the Bergstein complex were documented in a Phase III study as a result of the 1994 MOA (executed for the 1995 Final EIS Preferred Alternative). Demolition of the remaining two buildings on this property constitutes an adverse effect and additional mitigation measures should be considered to mitigate the total loss of this resource.

11.3.3 Stillwater State Prison Historic District, 5500 Pickett Avenue

11.3.3.1 Affected Environment

The Stillwater State Prison Historic District contains 30 properties of which 22 are contributing (see Figure 11-3 for site location). Designed by Clarence H. Johnston, Sr., the prison was completed in 1914 and is noteworthy for its unusual and influential “telegraph pole” design. The buildings were designed in a Gothic Revival style of brown brick with buff-colored stone sills and geometric, ornamental detailing. Most buildings are one to three stories and have flat roofs or have gable, tile-clad roofs. The Stillwater State Prison Historic District was named to the NRHP in 1986 under Criterion C.

11.3.3.2 Environmental Consequences

Alternatives B-1, C, D, and E: Minor improvements to CSAH 28 (Pickett Avenue) are included in all the Build Alternatives. These include the realignment of the CSAH 28 (Pickett Avenue)/TH 95 intersection just south of its existing alignment. The 56th Street “slip ramp” and intersection with TH 95 south and east of CSAH 28 (Pickett Avenue) would be removed. Fifty-sixth Street would form a T-intersection with CSAH 28 (Pickett Avenue) near the northeast corner of the Correctional Facility property.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Under all Build Alternatives, the minor roadway improvements in the vicinity of the Stillwater State Prison Historic District would have no effect on the property.

11.3.4 St. Croix Overlook, East Side of Lookout Trail

11.3.4.1 Affected Environment

A product of a federal public works program from the 1930s, the St. Croix Overlook is an excellent, relatively unaltered example of an important property type, the scenic wayside overlook (see Figure 11-3 for site location). Built in cooperation with the Minnesota Highway Department and designed to afford a view of Lake St. Croix, the Overlook meets the NRHP requirements of the Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPD), Federal Relief Construction

in Minnesota, 1933-1941. In the MPD, the St. Croix Overlook was specifically singled out as a “particularly intact and well preserved” wayside overlook constructed of “finely crafted native stone.” The property is eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and C, as both a well-conceived design and a good example of New Deal work relief programs intended to provide youth with meaningful training. Alterations to the Overlook are minimal: the historic marker and two small stone benches have been removed. The flagpole is a recent addition. Design plans may date from as early as 1936, with the structure built in 1938.

11.3.4.2 Environmental Consequences

Alternative B-1: Under Alternative B-1, the view from the St. Croix Overlook would be altered with the new bridge in the foreground of the view to the southeast. The overlook elevation is 810 feet; the new bridge elevation ranges from 785 to 840 feet and would be approximately one-half mile southeast, the primary orientation of the view from the overlook.

The primary access from TH 95 would be closed under Alternative B-1. This access point is signed on TH 95 and the most obvious entrance to the overlook for travelers; however, it is not the original access to the Overlook. Access would be provided from the west, but it would not be as direct for travelers.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Although the bridge would be located approximately one-half mile away, it would add a major intrusion to the primary viewshed to the southeast, a view of the river valley that is integral to the St. Croix Overlook. The 1994 MOA provided for planning, rehabilitation and interpretation of the Overlook. These provisions would be addressed in current evaluations of the site. It would be important to ensure that the reduction in access does not diminish the opportunities for travelers to locate and visit the site. In addition, potential transfer of ownership from Mn/DOT should not result in a lack of long-term site maintenance. Because the new bridge would be a major intrusion in the view from the Overlook, Alternative B-1 would have an adverse effect on the St. Croix Overlook.

Alternative C: Under Alternative C, the view from the St. Croix Overlook would be altered with the new bridge approximately 2,000 feet northeast. The overlook elevation is 810 feet while the new bridge elevation ranges from 760 to 845 feet.

Additional ramps and roadways would be constructed below the Overlook under this alternative. Noise impact analysis reveals that daytime noise changes would be under 5 dBA, while nighttime noise is projected to increase by 7 dBA over existing levels.

The primary access from TH 95 would be closed under Alternative C. This access point is signed on TH 95 and the most obvious entrance to the overlook for travelers; however, it is not the original access to the Overlook. Access would be provided from the west, but it would not be as direct for travelers.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: The new bridge would change the view to the northeast from the St. Croix Overlook. The primary orientation of the Overlook is southeast, and the new bridge would still be visible approximately 2,000 feet northeast. The increase in

nighttime noise levels would trigger noise abatement analysis to determine whether mitigation is appropriate. The 1994 MOA provided for planning, rehabilitation and interpretation of the Overlook. These provisions would be addressed in current evaluations of the site. It would be important to ensure that the reduction in access does not diminish the opportunities for travelers to locate and visit the site. In addition, potential transfer of ownership from Mn/DOT should not result in a lack of long-term site maintenance. Because the new bridge would be an intrusion in views from the Overlook, Alternative C would have an adverse effect on the St. Croix Overlook.

Alternatives D and E: Under Alternatives D and E, the view from the St. Croix Overlook would show only the Wisconsin touchdown of the new bridge almost a mile northeast. All other information identified in Alternative C is applicable to Alternatives D and E.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Under Alternatives D and E, the new bridge would be only slightly visible to the northeast from the St. Croix Overlook and would not affect the primary viewshed. All other discussion noted in the Alternative C Preliminary Assessment of Effects is applicable to Alternatives D and E. With these recommendations, Alternatives D and E would have no adverse effect on the St. Croix Overlook.

11.3.5 William N. Danforth House, 1224 S. Third Avenue

11.3.5.1 Affected Environment

The William N. Danforth House is one of the remaining three Second Empire residential properties in the Original Town Plat of Stillwater (see Figure 11-3 for site location). The Danforth house is distinguished by its board-and-batten cladding that conveys a rural feeling much like Gothic Revival cottages popular in the nineteenth century. The Danforth house also incorporates the distinctive Mansard roof, a modest tower and a wide, molded cornice, thus retaining the most character-defining aspects of the Second Empire style. As a well-designed, local example of a distinctive style with sufficient integrity to convey that significance, the Danforth House is determined eligible for listing on the NRHP under Criterion C.

11.3.5.2 Environmental Consequences

Alternatives B-1, C, D, and E: The Danforth House is located on the west side of S. Third Avenue, a street on the bluff above TH 95. Properties on the east side of S. Third Avenue may have river views from the rear of their dwellings, but those on the west such as the Danforth House would not have direct views of any of the bridge alternatives. Alternatives B-1, D and E are distant and would not be visible from the street. Alternative C crosses the river directly east of the Danforth House, but still would not be directly visible because of the properties on the east side of S. Third Avenue. Noise monitors below the bluff do not indicate any increases that would require noise abatement analysis. No other impacts have been identified for the Danforth House.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Alternatives B-1, C, D and E would have no effect on the Danforth House.

11.3.6 Fairview Cemetery, Southwest Corner of S. Fourth Street and W. Orleans Street

11.3.6.1 Affected Environment

The Fairview Cemetery Association was formed in 1867 and a cemetery was laid out on the southwestern outskirts of Stillwater in 1869 (see Figure 11-3 for site location). Although originally laid out with several oblong blocks separated by a mall, the cemetery was greatly expanded in 1879 based on the work of landscape architect A. N. Carpenter, an adherent of the picturesque Rural Cemetery Movement. Carpenter's plan tripled the size of the cemetery and incorporated the previous formal design as the core of his informal picturesque plan. Carpenter's plan included a series of irregular, winding roads interrupted by six small ponds. Fairview Cemetery is determined eligible for listing on the NRHP under Criterion C, within the context of the Rural Cemetery Movement.

11.3.6.2 Environmental Consequences

Alternatives B-1, C, D, and E identify a realigning and widening of the north TH 36 frontage road, beginning east of Tuenge Drive and angling northeast to the intersection with Osgood Avenue N. The frontage road would take approximately .15 acres of Fairview Cemetery in order to line up the intersection with 62nd Street at Osgood Avenue (S. Fourth Street). This acquisition would occur in the extreme southeast corner of the cemetery, away from burials and in an area that currently has a wildflower bed. Two oak trees west of this intersection would also be removed. The cyclone fence on the south cemetery boundary would be removed and replaced after construction along the north side of the new road and adjacent to the 10-foot bicycle/pedestrian trail. If the trail turned north along Osgood as has been suggested, a narrow band would be acquired. This acquisition would require moving and replacement of the wrought iron fence along Osgood.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: The acquisition of .15 acres of property from Fairview Cemetery occurs at the extreme southeast corner of the cemetery. The flower bed in this area is not part of a historic designed landscape and could be replaced or replanted in an appropriate location after the construction. The roadway would not affect any aspects of the designed landscape such as the winding roads or mature vegetation.

The addition of the frontage road on the south boundary of the cemetery would bring traffic activity and noise into an area that is currently a local, dead-end street. Higher traffic volumes would have a visual and atmospheric effect on the setting of the cemetery. An important aspect of the Rural Cemetery Movement concept is the restful, park-like atmosphere that the cemeteries provided. As a significant example of the Rural Cemetery Movement, the impact of traffic activity and noise would be an adverse effect on Fairview Cemetery. In addition, if the trail is built north along Osgood and requires additional right-of-way, the trail would require a change to the boundaries of the cemetery. Changes to the boundary of the property would result in an adverse effect on the cemetery.

11.3.7 Hersey and Bean Sawmill and Planing Mill Site

11.3.7.1 Affected Environment

The Hersey & Bean Sawmill Site occupies a site along the St. Croix as shown on Figure 11-4. Structural ruins on the site include the foundation walls of an office/store, an engine mount, a stone chimney, and a stone retaining wall. The Planing Site is located to the south and contains foundation remnants of a later sawmill and planing mill.

The original owners, Samuel F. Hersey of Maine and Isaac Staples, began the sawmill operation in 1854. The level of technology incorporated in the mill construction and implementation of the first circular saw in Stillwater represented a definitive shift away from crude, water-powered mills that produced low yields. By 1856, Hersey and Staples employed 160 employees and produced 65,000 feet of lumber and 35,000 feet of lath daily. The company became Hersey, Bean & Company in 1871, and by 1875 was known as Hersey & Bean. The second mill was constructed in 1873 to saw unusually long pieces of lumber for railroad bridges and other heavy construction uses. The mills continued in operation until 1906 when the mills were sold to a salvager.

Hersey & Bean, with their emphasis on the latest technological developments and their investment in all tiers of the lumber trade, epitomized the New England approach applied to logging in the St. Croix River valley. Hersey & Bean was founded with Eastern capital and was owned by New England residents. The firm's operations included all aspects of lumber production, including ownership and leasing of pineland, logging of the pineland, selling goods to loggers, developing specialized lumber techniques and employing the latest technological improvements, and using two railroads to move lumber. Due to their innovation and role in the logging industry, Hersey & Bean was considered one of the most important milling complexes to nineteenth century Stillwater residents.

The Hersey & Bean Sawmill and Planing Mill Sites have been identified as a single contributing property to the NRHP-eligible Stillwater Cultural Landscape District. Because the mill made an important contribution to the development of the St. Croix logging industry and the role of Stillwater as a lumber center in the St. Croix River valley, the foundations and features associated with this mill complex are recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A. Further research is being conducted to define the boundaries of the site and to determine if there are significant subsurface features associated with the mill.

11.3.7.2 Environmental Consequences

The Stillwater Cultural Landscape District has been established with broad concepts related to the natural and physical environment and effects to the District have been evaluated on a District-wide level. Since the primary effect of the alternatives to the Landscape District would be visual, it is not anticipated that effects would differ substantially among the individual properties that make up the district. Therefore, effect assessments on individual properties within the Stillwater Cultural Landscape District, including individually eligible or listed

**Figure 11-4 – Location of National Register Eligible Archaeological Sites in Project Area
(8.5x11 – b/w)**

properties, will not be undertaken. However, the Hersey and Bean site, which is included in the District, has been individually evaluated for effects because several Build Alternatives would cause the destruction of the site. This direct effect to the site is in contrast to visual affects to other individually nominated and NRHP-listed properties within the Stillwater Cultural Landscape District.

Alternatives B-1 and C: Under Alternative B-1, the new bridge would be located approximately 4,800 feet to the south and no roadway improvements would be within 1,000 feet of the site. Under Alternative C, the new bridge would be located approximately 1,600 feet south and no roadway improvements are anticipated within 1,000 feet of the site.

Although not part of the Build Alternatives, it should be noted that the City of Stillwater has discussed developing the site as a park with a trail. This project is in a conceptual planning stage and no funding has been identified, although it has been suggested as a potential mitigation option. Should this plan proceed in the future, the City would seek to interpret the archaeological resources. If this plan does proceed, the park plans should be reviewed by Mn/DOT CRU and SHPO for any potential effects to the archaeological resources (or effects to the Cultural Landscape District).

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Alternatives B-1 and C would have no effect on the Hersey & Bean site.

Alternatives D and E: Under Alternatives D and E, the property would be acquired for Right-of-Way. Bridge and roadway approach pilings have the potential to destroy portions of historic material on the site. The limits of cultural material on this site are currently being identified.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Under Alternatives D and E, bridge and roadway approach pilings have the potential to destroy portions of historic material on the site. These alternatives would have an adverse effect on the Hersey & Bean site.

11.3.8 Slab Alley, TH 95 north of River Oasis Cafe

11.3.8.1 Affected Environment

The west side of TH 36/95 from the location of the present River Oasis Café north to the Wolf Brewery was the site of a former neighborhood of dwellings and businesses referred to as “Slab Alley” (see Figure 11-4 for site location). This series of approximately 20 structures included working class dwellings inhabited during the height of the lumber boom prior to 1870. Although the dwellings were removed by TH 95 construction in 1934, the back lots of these properties have a high potential for intact archaeological features and have the potential to be eligible for the NRHP. Slab Alley is located within the boundaries of the Stillwater Cultural Landscape District. The Slab Alley area is currently undergoing testing to determine eligibility. If found eligible, it would be a contributing property within the Landscape District.

11.3.8.2 Environmental Consequences

Alternatives B-1 and C: Alternatives B-1 and C do not require any roadway changes or right-of-way acquisition in the immediate area and would have no effect on the Slab Alley site.

Alternatives D and E: Alternatives D and E would require the taking of property, including the River Oasis Café and nearby areas that would be affected during construction. If the Slab Alley property is found eligible, this site would likely suffer an adverse effect (based on site boundaries as understood at this time).

11.3.9 Stillwater & St. Paul Railroad

11.3.9.1 Affected Environment

The Stillwater and St. Paul (S&SP) line, completed in 1870, was originally a branch line of the Lake Superior & Mississippi Railroad Company. The line connected White Bear Lake and Stillwater, running east from White Bear to the northern edge of Stillwater and south along the river to the Lift Bridge (see Figure 11-3 for site location). As the first line in Stillwater, the S&SP provided a new means for transporting the town's major commodity, lumber. The S&SP Railroad line is now owned and operated as a tourist attraction by Minnesota Zephyr Ltd. It is recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A, for its role in the development of the Stillwater economy.

11.3.9.2 Environmental Consequences

Alternatives B-1, C, D, and E: All of these alternatives and associated infrastructure improvements would be located to the south of the Stillwater & St. Paul Railroad, which reaches its southern end at the Lift Bridge.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Alternatives B-1, C, D and E would have no effect on the Stillwater & St. Paul Railroad.

11.3.10 St. Croix Boom Site

11.3.10.1 Affected Environment

The St. Croix Boom Site was the earliest, most important, and longest-lived of the major log storage and handling areas in Minnesota. Opened in 1856, the St. Croix Boom was a major factor in Minnesota lumber production, making the state the third highest producer behind Michigan and Wisconsin from 1880 to 1910. Until it closed in 1914, the St. Croix Boom was the terminal point for Minnesota log drives on the St. Croix River. At the Boom, logs were stored until they could be sorted, scaled, measured and ownership determined. Logs were made up into rafts to be sent down river to mills. The Boom Site was located approximately 2 miles up the St. Croix from Downtown Stillwater, just north of Lookout Point (see Figure 11-3 for site location). After the Boom closed in 1914, all traces of the site, including mills and pens, disappeared.

The Boom Site was critical to Minnesota's lumber industry and helped to encourage the growth of Stillwater as a lumber town. The St. Croix Boom Site was named a National Historic Landmark in 1975. The Boom Site includes 26.10 acres, identified in the National Historic Landmark nomination as an isosceles triangle with the base at Lookout Point and the peak approximately a mile north. It remains today as a place on the landscape with no distinguishing characteristics from its historic period.

11.3.10.2 Environmental Consequences

Alternatives B-1 and C: Due to distance and the curve of the river, Alternatives B-1 and C would not be visible from the St. Croix Boom Site.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Alternatives B-1 and C would have no effect on the St. Croix Boom Site.

Alternatives D and E: Under Alternatives D and E, the Minnesota side of the proposed bridge may be visible from the southern edge of the Boom Site. The proposed bridge would be approximately two miles from the Boom Site.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Although portions of the new bridge under Alternatives D and E may be visible from the Boom Site, the distance from the new bridge would ensure that there would be no effect to the views from or the setting of the St. Croix Boom Site.

11.3.11 Stillwater Lift Bridge, St. Croix River at Chestnut Street

11.3.11.1 Affected Environment

The Stillwater Lift Bridge was listed on the NRHP in 1989 under Criterion C as a rare surviving example of the vertical-lift highway bridge construction of the Waddell and Harrington type. The Lift Bridge is one of two surviving vertical-lift highway bridges built in Minnesota and Wisconsin prior to World War II. The other surviving vertical-lift highway bridge of this type is located in Duluth, Minnesota.

Opened in 1931, the Lift Bridge is a two-lane highway bridge connecting downtown Stillwater and Houlton, Wisconsin (see Figure 11-3 for site location). At the location of the bridge, the St. Croix River is approximately 1,800 feet wide. The bridge itself spans approximately 1,050 feet across the river with the remaining distance covered by an earthen causeway. The causeway was built out from the Wisconsin shore to reduce the grade difference between the opposing banks, as well as to reduce the bridge costs.

The Lift Bridge is a 10-span bridge that includes a counterweighted, tower-and-cable, vertical-lift span (see Figure 11-5). The bridge rests on reinforced concrete piers and abutments. Starting at the Minnesota end of the bridge, the bridge superstructure is made up of the following span sequence: two concrete-slab approach spans; one fixed steel truss; one vertical-lift span; five fixed steel trusses; and one concrete-slab approach span.

Figure 11-5 – Lift Bridge (8.5x11 – b/w)

The six fixed steel truss spans are all of similar size and configuration. The spans measure approximately 140 feet in length. Each is a seven-panel, riveted, through Parker truss with angle-iron portal, top-lateral, and sway bracing. The webs are further stiffened by horizontal, angle-iron bracing across the four center panels. Except for the top chord, which consists of heavy paired channels tied with cover plate above and cross-lacing below, the web members are built of paired, back-to-back angles tied with batten plates (as in the bottom chord and diagonals) or v-lacing (as in the verticals).

The vertical-lift span is also 140 feet in length with a seven-panel, Parker through truss. The style of this vertical-lift span was originally developed by J. A. L. Waddell in 1892 and subsequently refined in partnership with John Lyle Harrington. This style of lift bridge is referred to as a “Waddell and Harrington vertical lift.” The span is raised and lowered by steel cables passing over sheaths at the top of steel towers mounted on the span’s piers. To ensure easy movement, concrete blocks that travel up and down within the tower framework counterweigh the span. Originally, the motive force was supplied by a gasoline engine, which was replaced by a 25-horsepower electric motor in 1980. The control machinery is sheltered in a welded framework at mid-span on the north (upstream) side. Reduction gears and winding drums for the cables are located beneath the house. With the span in a raised position, vertical navigation clearance is 57 feet above normal pool elevation. The span itself is engineered for a rise of 48 feet above the bridge deck, although an additional three feet of lift is available for emergency situations.

Measuring 23 feet in width, the bridge’s concrete deck is bordered on the north by an angle-iron railing and on the south by a concrete sidewalk with an ornamental metal railing. The sidewalk is cantilevered on metal brackets. The concrete deck was rebuilt in 1973, as was the east-shore, concrete-slab approach span in 1979. The sidewalk was replaced in 1998. None of these alterations has significantly affected the bridge’s integrity. The vertical-lift span remains in operation during the May-October navigation season. A Coast Guard permit applies to this structure.

11.3.11.2 Environmental Consequences

Alternative B-1: Under Alternative B-1, the new bridge would be located over a mile to the south of the Lift Bridge. Traffic uses at the Lift Bridge would change, with emphasis on local rather than commuter traffic or conversion to a bicycle/pedestrian facility. Ownership of the bridge would change from Mn/DOT and Wis/DOT to a local government or non-profit owner. A Lift Bridge Rehabilitation Plan addressing short-term needs has been completed and funding identified to maintain the bridge for the next 5 to 10 years (Project Memorandum, Lift Bridge Repair, Bridge #4654, March 2004). However, a long-term maintenance and rehabilitation plan has not been assured.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: The changing traffic use with a conversion from commuter to local traffic or a bicycle/pedestrian facility will alter the use of the Lift Bridge and its role in the transportation system. The change in ownership from Mn/DOT and Wis/DOT to another owner could have an effect on long-term maintenance and/or rehabilitation. Without a

specific plan to identify actions and funding, the Lift Bridge's long-term management could be at risk. The change in ownership, change in traffic use, and lack of assurances for long-term management would have an adverse effect on the Lift Bridge.

Alternative C: Under Alternative C, the new bridge would be located approximately 0.75 miles south of the Lift Bridge and would be visible from the Lift Bridge. All other characteristics identified under Alternative B-1 would be the same.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Under Alternative C, the new bridge is more prominent in views from the Lift Bridge. All other elements as identified under the Preliminary Assessment of Effects for Alternative B-1 are the same. As with Alternative B-1, the change in ownership, change in traffic use, and lack of assurances for long-term management would have an adverse effect on the Lift Bridge under Alternative C.

Alternative D: Under Alternative D, the new bridge would be located approximately 1,900 feet south of the Lift Bridge at the Minnesota side and 160 feet south of the bridge on the Wisconsin side, crossing the river at an angle. On the Wisconsin side, the new bridge touches down on the Lift Bridge causeway. Traffic uses at the Lift Bridge would change, from vehicular to bicycle and pedestrian traffic only. Ownership of the bridge would change from Mn/DOT and Wis/DOT to a local government or non-profit owner. A Lift Bridge Rehabilitation Plan addressing short-term needs has been completed and funding identified to maintain the bridge for the next 5 to 10 years. However, a long-term maintenance and rehabilitation plan has not been assured.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: This alternative places the new bridge within the immediate setting of the historic bridge. The close proximity of the new bridge and the angle across the river would both exert an adverse effect on views of the Lift Bridge from both sides of the river. The construction of the new bridge, with its touchdown point on the Lift Bridge causeway, changes the setting of the Lift Bridge and perceptions of travelers as they experience the Lift Bridge crossing. The changing traffic use with a conversion from vehicular to bicycle and pedestrian traffic only will alter the use of the Lift Bridge and its role in the transportation system. The change in ownership from Mn/DOT and Wis/DOT to another owner could have an effect on long-term maintenance and/or rehabilitation. Without a specific plan to identify actions and funding, the Lift Bridge's long-term management could be at risk. Under Alternative D, the change in ownership, change in traffic use, lack of assurances for long-term management and the location and changes to setting caused by the new bridge would have an adverse effect on the Lift Bridge.

Alternative E: This alternative places the new bridge within the immediate setting of the historic bridge. Under Alternative E, the new bridge would be highly visible, located approximately 2,000 feet south of the Lift Bridge at the Minnesota side and 200 feet south of the bridge on the Wisconsin side, crossing the river at an angle. Traffic use of the bridge would change to one-way westbound. A Lift Bridge Rehabilitation Plan addressing short-term needs has been completed and funding identified to maintain the bridge for the next 5 to 10 years. However, a long-term maintenance and rehabilitation plan has not been assured.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: The close proximity of the new bridge and the angle across the river would both exert an adverse effect on views of the Lift Bridge from both sides of the river. The construction of the new bridge, with its touchdown point on the Lift Bridge causeway, changes the setting of the Lift Bridge. The changing traffic use with a conversion to one-way traffic facility will alter the use of the Lift Bridge and its role in the transportation system. Without a specific plan to identify actions and funding, the Lift Bridge's long-term management could be at risk. Under Alternative E, change in traffic use, lack of assurances for long-term management and the location and changes to setting caused by the new bridge would have an adverse effect on the Lift Bridge.

11.3.12 Stillwater Commercial Historic District

11.3.12.1 Affected Environment

The information below is largely drawn from the NRHP Registration Form prepared on the Stillwater Commercial Historic District in 1991.

The Stillwater Commercial Historic District encompasses most of the older portion of the downtown commercial area (see Figure 11-6). It includes some 11 blocks in the central business district. The district contains 57 contributing buildings, which are predominantly two and three stories high. Most are either red or yellow brick, with red predominating. Trim is stone, red sandstone, or concrete. A few limestone buildings, largely constructed in the 1860s through 1870s, some of which have been brick-faced or stuccoed, comprise the earliest structures in the district. Architectural styles represent national architectural trends popular between 1870 and 1940, including Italianate, Queen Anne, Richardsonian, Classical Revival and Early 20th century Commercial. In addition to commercial, industrial, and residential buildings, the district includes two contributing sites (Lowell Park and the Sunken Garden), three contributing structures (Wolfe tunnel/cave system, the Lowell Park Pavilion, and the Lowell Park Levee) and one contributing object (the fountain in the Sunken Garden.)

The Stillwater Commercial Historic District is distinguished by its dense concentration of storefronts along Main Street as well as the integrity of the historic structures and a certain uniformity of materials, mass, and height. Along the commercial thoroughfares buildings are set back the width of the sidewalk and there are no plantings or street furniture. The riverfront portion of the district is dominated by a levee and Lowell Park and is characterized by open space, trees, and a grassy area.

The Stillwater Commercial Historic District is eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and C within the following areas of significance: Architecture and Commerce. The historic contexts for this multi-property district are "The Development of Stillwater, 1860 – 1940," and "St. Croix Triangle Lumbering, 1839–1914." The primary period of significance covers 1860-1911, although significant elements represent dates as late as 1940. The majority of the buildings are historically associated with retail commerce in the central business district, with a few properties representing lumbering, manufacturing, and government. The district is a tangible reminder of the foresight of local businessmen who built a diversified economic base, allowing the city to continue to thrive after the white pine industry collapsed in the early years of the 20th century.

**Figure 11-6 – Location of Stillwater Commercial Historic District and Build Alternatives
(8.5x11 – b/w)**

11.3.12.2 Environmental Consequences

Alternative B-1: Under Alternative B-1, the new bridge would be distant from the Commercial Historic District. No property or right-of-way acquisition would occur in the District. Entry into the District along TH 95 would not be altered. Concerns have been raised regarding the economic impact of changing traffic patterns with a new bridge. The *Economic Impact Analysis: St. Croix River crossing, Minnesota TH 36/Wisconsin STH 64* (summarized in Chapter 5) examined the effects on businesses in various portions of the project area that would result from the Build Alternatives and the No-Build Alternative. Recognizing that downtown Stillwater has developed a successful niche for destination retailing, tourism, recreation and cultural activities, the study noted that Stillwater has not suffered the more typical downtown economic death that highway-oriented growth often causes in communities. The report identified downtown Stillwater as primarily a specialty destination center for outside visitors.

Further study of Lift Bridge travelers confirmed that relatively little of the current Lift Bridge traffic is bound for downtown Stillwater. Downtown draws trips primarily from the west, rather than from the east across the Lift Bridge and has a limited ability to gain from drive-by Lift Bridge traffic. The current downtown traffic condition, with congestion and travel delays, undesirable truck noise, a difficult pedestrian environment for crossing Main Street, perceptions of difficulty in parking, traffic using residential streets, and other issues, could all discourage people from visiting downtown. At the same time, the downtown atmosphere is anticipated to be enhanced by reducing traffic backups and delays that can discourage visitors from the destination trips that are critical to downtown Stillwater's economic health.

The study notes that a new bridge, by accommodating the traffic that is not destined for downtown, would have a positive effect on downtown if there is appropriate signage to guide visitors to downtown, a direct access route to downtown, sufficient parking, and an easy route back to the highway. The conclusions in the *Economic Impact Analysis* indicate that removal of the through trips on the Lift Bridge with the Build Alternatives should not have a negative economic impact on downtown Stillwater, but would likely enhance downtown by reducing congestion and other access problems that could otherwise discourage visitors.

The *Economic Analysis* has continued to raise concerns and differences of opinion on the study findings at public meetings. Discussion of the *Economic Analysis* and its results will continue to be evaluated during the study period and any new conclusions integrated into the review process regarding effects on the Downtown Commercial Historic District.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Under Alternative B-1, the distance of the new bridge from the Downtown Commercial Historic District would ensure that there would be no effects on the views from the District or the setting of the District. In addition, there would be no infrastructure improvements or changes within the District. The *Economic Analysis* indicated that as a specialty destination, Downtown would not suffer adverse economic effects from the new bridge removing through traffic from downtown. Rather, the reduction of congestion and other traffic-related issues would likely enhance the destination shopping activities that are a primary business activity in downtown. It is important to note that Downtown will be enhanced assuming that appropriate signage to guide visitors to downtown, a direct access route to

downtown, sufficient parking, and an easy route back to the highway are all carried out as noted in the *Economic Analysis*. With these provisions, Alternative B-1 would have no adverse effect on the Downtown Commercial Historic District.

Alternative C: Under Alternative C, the new bridge would be approximately 0.75 mile from the Commercial Historic District and would be visible from Lowell Park. All other characteristics would be the same as noted for Alternative B-1.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Under Alternative C, the new bridge is more visible in views from Lowell Park. However, the new bridge would not affect the characteristics that make the District eligible for the NRHP and there would be no effect on the views from the District or the setting of the District. In addition, there would be no infrastructure improvements or changes within the District. The *Economic Analysis* indicated that as a specialty destination, downtown would not suffer adverse economic effects from the new bridge removing through traffic from downtown. Rather, the reduction of congestion and other traffic-related issues would likely enhance the destination shopping activities that are the primary business activity in downtown. It is important to note that Downtown will be enhanced assuming that appropriate signage to guide visitors to downtown, a direct access route to downtown, sufficient parking, and an easy route back to the highway are all carried out as noted in the *Economic Analysis*. With these provisions, Alternative C would have no adverse effect on the Downtown Commercial Historic District.

Alternative D: Under Alternative D, the new bridge would be approximately 1,900 feet south of Lowell Park, the point in the Downtown Commercial Historic District where the new bridge would be most visible. Both the bridge, angled across the river and touching down on the eastern edge of the causeway, and a three-level interchange would be prominent in views.

Access into the Downtown Commercial Historic District would change in this alternative. The TH 95 entry north of Downtown would be altered with roads, ramps and the bridge approach. TH 95 into Downtown would be a two-lane urban section with a median, requiring the loss of 28 curbside parking spaces. In Alternative D, the Lift Bridge is converted to bicycle and pedestrian traffic only; vehicular traffic from Wisconsin would reach the downtown via the new bridge. Results of the *Economic Analysis* would be the same as noted above for Alternative B-1.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Alternative D would affect the immediate setting and views of the Downtown Commercial Historic District. Views of the St. Croix and to the Wisconsin bluffs from the District would suffer an adverse effect from the close proximity of the new bridge and the angle of its path across the river. The currently open vista of the river and bluffs would be truncated with the new bridge cutting across the view.

Roadway changes to TH 95 would alter the experience of arrival into the District from the south as well. TH 95 is a two-lane roadway in a narrow corridor that currently winds between the river and bluff, with trees on the east providing an edge to the corridor. Under Alternative D, there would be multiple traffic lanes, ramps and the three-level interchange rather than the narrow roadway winding into Downtown. This changes the perception of arrival on TH 95 from the current river corridor to a setting with heavy infrastructure improvements that are a major contrast with the scale of Historic District buildings.

While the *Economic Analysis* indicated that the loss of through traffic should not affect the destination shopping activity in downtown, the loss of 28 parking spaces could exert a negative effect on downtown retailing. Destination shoppers require ease of access, adequate parking, and reduced congestion. The loss of parking spaces would have a detrimental effect on destination shoppers who have been identified as primary downtown visitors. Under Alternative D, the impact to views from the Historic District, traffic changes, changes to the TH 95 roadway entrance to the District and loss of parking would exert an adverse effect on the Downtown Commercial Historic District.

Alternative E: Under Alternative E, the new bridge would be approximately 1,750 feet south of Lowell Park, the point in the Downtown Commercial Historic District where the new bridge would be most visible. Both the bridge, angled across the river and touching down on the eastern edge of the causeway, and bridge entrance ramps would be prominent.

Access into the Downtown Commercial Historic District would change in this alternative. TH 95 south of Downtown would be altered with the bridge and bridge ramps. TH 95 into Downtown would include two lanes southbound from Downtown and one lane northbound into Downtown, requiring the loss of 49 curbside parking spaces. In Alternative E, the Lift Bridge is converted to two lanes of westbound vehicular traffic. Results of the *Economic Analysis* would be the same as noted above for Alternative B-1.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Alternative E would affect the immediate setting and views from the Downtown Commercial Historic District. Views of the St. Croix and to the Wisconsin bluffs from the District would suffer an adverse effect from the close proximity of the new bridge and the angle of its path across the river. The currently open vista of the river and bluffs would be truncated with the new bridge cutting across the view.

Roadway changes to TH 95 would alter the experience of arrival into the District from the south as well. TH 95 is a two-lane roadway in a narrow corridor that currently winds between the river and bluff, with trees on the east providing an edge to the corridor. Under Alternative E, there would be additional traffic lanes, the bridge ramps and the bridge interrupting the narrow roadway winding into downtown. This changes the perception of arrival on TH 95 from the current river corridor to a setting with heavy infrastructure improvements that are a major contrast with the scale of Historic District buildings.

While the *Economic Analysis* indicated that the loss of through traffic should not affect the destination shopping activity in downtown, the loss of 49 parking spaces could exert a negative effect on downtown retailing. Destination shoppers require ease of access, adequate parking, and reduced congestion. The loss of parking spaces would have a detrimental effect on destination shoppers who have been identified as primary downtown visitors.

Under Alternative E, the impact on views from the Historic District, traffic changes, the TH 95 roadway entrance to the District and loss of parking would exert an adverse effect on the Downtown Commercial Historic District.

11.3.13 Stillwater Cultural Landscape District

11.3.13.1 Affected Environment

The Stillwater Cultural Landscape District (Figures 11-3 and 11-7) was identified as a National Register eligible resource in the August 1999 study, *Cultural Resources Investigation, St. Croix River Bridge*, with supplemental information provided in the October 1999 study, *Cultural Resources Investigation for St. Croix River Bridge of Kolliner Park*. As defined by the National Park Service:

A cultural landscape is a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources, associated with an historic event, activity or person. In the broadest sense, a cultural landscape is an expression of human adaptation to, and use of, the natural resources of an area.

The 1999 reports consider such character-defining features of the historic landscape as land uses and activities, patterns of spatial organization, responses to natural environment, cultural tradition, circulation networks, boundary demarcation, vegetation related to land use, property types, and small-scale elements. In addition to buildings, structures, and objects, prominent natural or designed landscape elements and historically-important views contribute to cultural landscapes. The relationship of historic patterns, natural features, and cultural elements provide a holistic understanding of the landscape.

The physical fabric of the Stillwater Cultural Landscape District continues to evoke its nineteenth and early twentieth century heritage, despite inevitable change. Major landmarks, physical geography, and numerous relatively unaltered buildings contribute to the visual cohesiveness of the District. Main Street remains a well-unified district of commercial buildings. The residential buildings within the district have seen relatively little alteration. The Stillwater Cultural Landscape District represents one of the best-preserved community landscapes in Minnesota.

The Stillwater Cultural Landscape District contains 250 properties that contribute to its significance, including residences, commercial buildings, public stairways, buildings, parks, and an historic archaeological site. Among the 250 properties that contribute to the Stillwater Cultural Landscape District, 12 individual properties and the 82-property Stillwater Commercial Historic District are listed on the NRHP. The ruins of the large mill complex of Hersey & Bean are a key lumber-era site within the Stillwater Cultural Landscape District. Established in 1853 as Hersey, Staples & Company, the lumber company was located on the banks of the St. Croix (on the Stillwater Municipal Barge Facility property) just south of present downtown Stillwater. The lumber milling operation was one of the earliest, most successful, and longstanding Stillwater businesses associated with logging along the St. Croix and its tributaries. The company was in operation until 1906. Remnants of the company's office/store, main sawmill, planing mill, retaining wall, train tracks, and chimney still remain. The milling ruins represent the community's visual and historic relationship with the St. Croix River, and the importance of logging and lumbering to the development of the community. It also interprets the milling and shipping process of that time. Because of these associations, the mill site has been determined to be a contributing resource in the Stillwater Cultural Landscape District.

Figure 11-7 – Stillwater Cultural Landscape Boundaries (8.5x11 – b/w)

The boundaries of the Minnesota portion of the district include the 1848 Original Town Plat (O.T.P.) for Stillwater and reflect a natural bowl in the bluffs at this location on the St. Croix. The district extends south along the riverfront to include the Hersey & Bean Sawmill Site. The boundaries of the O.T.P. include 50 blocks of densely platted lots between Willard Street on the south (including part of the Stillwater Municipal Barge Facility property), Sixth Street on the west, Maple Street on the north, and the St. Croix River on the east.

The Cultural Landscape District boundaries include the Lift Bridge and a portion of the Wisconsin riverbank bounded by the Kolliner Park property. This area in Wisconsin was originally developed for industrial use by the early Stillwater lumber industry. After the lumbering operations had closed, the property was donated to the city of Stillwater to preserve views of the natural river bluffs across the St. Croix River as well as to promote recreational use in 1917. The area north of the present-day bridge was developed as a Tourist Camp in 1923. In 1931, the southern portion was developed as a public bathing beach, Legion Park. These sites are labeled as the Tourist Camp Site and the Legion Park Site respectively on Figure 11-4. The structural remains of these activities represent the city's desire in the early decades of the twentieth century to transform the St. Croix River valley from a lumber-related area to a recreational and tourist-related resource.

As part of the 2004 review of historic properties, Mn/DOT CRU and the MnSHPO have agreed to expand the viewshed included in the Cultural Landscape District. The viewshed will extend from the northern and southern ends of the Landscape District eastward across the St. Croix River to the Wisconsin bluffs. This extension of the viewshed will not exert any additional effects, but is more inclusive of the area of the river that had been considered as a de facto portion of the Cultural Landscape District.

The areas (and their periods of significance) that have contributed to the development of the Stillwater Cultural Landscape District include the following:

- **Industry (Lumber), 1860s – 1914:** Lumbering and its associated activities began in earnest in the early 1860s. When the Boom Site (where logs were stored and sorted just north of the city of Stillwater) closed in 1914, the dominant lumbering period, upon which district significance is based, essentially ended.
- **Social History, 1839 –1940:** Social history is the history of society and the lifeways of its social groups. In Stillwater, responses to the lumber industry economy, as well as less direct decisions by various social groups (e.g., church establishment or school openings), provided an important component of the development of the district.
- **Architecture, 1848 – 1927:** The district includes properties dated as early as 1848, with a peak period of development in the 1870s and 1880s. The Stillwater Cultural Landscape District has been characterized as a “museum” of commercial and residential architecture from the second half of the nineteenth century. The district includes numerous examples of Greek Revival, Italianate, “Greek-Italianate,” Queen Anne, Shingle, Stick, and Colonial Revival residential styles, directly reflective of the community’s years as a lumber town. The relatively low representation of early twentieth century house styles mirrors the change in Stillwater’s economy with the end of the St. Croix River valley lumbering (1914).

- **Community Development, 1839 – 1939:** Community development centers on civic improvement initiatives by Stillwater citizens and businesses. It dates from the time of early settlement (1839) and continued for 100 years. Waterfront improvement plans for Lowell Park dated from 1911 and included 1916 landscape architectural plans by Morrell and Nichols, 1923 plan revisions to accommodate the proposed Lift Bridge (completed in 1931), and other changes. It also included 1930s public works projects along the St. Croix.

The Stillwater Cultural Landscape District is considered eligible for listing on the NRHP under Criterion A and Criterion C. The district and its development is directly associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of national, regional, and state history (Criterion A), including westward expansion and the lumber industry. In addition, the district embodies the distinctive characteristics and appearance of the periods of development (Criterion C).

11.3.13.2 Environmental Consequences

The Stillwater Cultural Landscape District was originally studied to identify the factors that connect the natural and cultural landscape and to explain Stillwater's location on Lake St. Croix.

In evaluating the Stillwater Cultural Landscape District, the elements to consider include the bowl of downtown Stillwater and its relationship to the river, the river as it is framed by the bluffs on both sides, and the vegetation that covers the bluffs in Wisconsin and around downtown Stillwater. The Cultural Landscape includes not only views within the District across the river, but views toward the river and north and south along its length within the District. Natural and manmade features that help to define the natural landscape, such as ravines and topographic features, are also critical elements. Changes to man-made elements such as streets, bridges or major activities along the river could also cause major effects.

Alternative B-1: Under Alternative B-1, the bridge would be located over a mile to the south of the Lift Bridge and Downtown and approximately 0.75 mile from the extreme southern edge of the Landscape District. The new bridge would be visible from Lowell Park and the Lift Bridge, the Hersey and Bean site, and to people on the river. No property or right-of-way acquisition would occur in the District, and no noise increases would require noise abatement analyses. Entry into the District along TH 95 would not be altered. If commuter traffic is routed over the new bridge, there may be reduced congestion in Downtown Stillwater, on the Lift Bridge and through the Wisconsin bluffs. Traffic uses at the Lift Bridge would change, with emphasis on local rather than commuter traffic, or conversion to a bicycle/pedestrian facility. Ownership of the bridge would change from Mn/DOT and Wis/DOT to a local government or non-profit owner.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Under Alternative B-1, the change in ownership from Mn/DOT and Wis/DOT to another owner could have an adverse effect on long-term maintenance and/or rehabilitation. Without a specific plan to identify actions and funding, the Lift Bridge's long-term management could be at risk. The changing traffic uses, with a conversion from commuter to local traffic or to a bicycle/pedestrian facility will alter the use of the Lift Bridge and its role in the transportation system.

The view toward Downtown Stillwater would be lost to vehicular traffic with the change of access on the Lift Bridge. The approach from Wisconsin across the Lift Bridge has traditionally been one of the most prototypical views of Stillwater and the St. Croix River. This approach and view are important to our understanding of Stillwater and its relationship to the river, and would be reduced with the loss of vehicular access.

The distance of the new bridge from Downtown Stillwater and the rest of the Landscape District would ensure that there is no effect on the setting of the District, views of the river from the District, or views of major landmarks in the Landscape District as a result of the new bridge. However, the change in ownership, change in traffic use and a lack of assurances for the long-term management of the Lift Bridge under Alternative B-1 would have an adverse effect on the Stillwater Cultural Landscape District.

Alternative C: Under Alternative C, the bridge would be located approximately 0.75 mile south of the Lift Bridge and Downtown and approximately 1/4 mile from the extreme southern edge of the Landscape District. The new bridge would be visible from Lowell Park and the Lift Bridge, the Hersey and Bean site, and to people on the river. All other elements would be the same as noted under Alternative B-1.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Under Alternative C, change in ownership from Mn/DOT and Wis/DOT to another owner could have an adverse effect on long-term bridge maintenance and/or rehabilitation. Without a specific plan to identify actions and funding, the Lift Bridge's long-term management could be at risk. The changing traffic uses, with a conversion from local to commuter traffic or to a bicycle/pedestrian facility will alter the use of the Lift Bridge and its role in the transportation system.

Should the bridge be converted to bicycle/pedestrian use only, the view toward Downtown Stillwater would be lost to vehicular traffic with the change of access on the Lift Bridge. The approach from Wisconsin across the Lift Bridge has traditionally been one of the most prototypical views of Stillwater and the St. Croix River. This approach and view are important to our understanding of Stillwater and its relationship to the river, and would be reduced with the loss of vehicular access.

Under Alternative C, the new bridge is more prominent in views from Downtown Stillwater and the rest of the Landscape District. Located only 1/4 mile from the southern edge of the District, the new bridge would be close enough to foreshorten views of the river from the District's southern end, at the Lift Bridge, and at Lowell Park. Views down the river from within the District would be marred by the new bridge. Views of the Wisconsin side of the District could be somewhat obscured by Alternative C. Views from either side across the river within the Landscape District would not be directly affected, but the bridge would provide a hard edge to the District as opposed to an open river view. From within the District, no major visual landmarks would be obscured by the new bridge. Reduced congestion would allow travelers to better experience the landscape. The sense of arrival into the Landscape District, following narrow two-lane roads lined with trees that suddenly open up to the river, would be retained.

Alternative C would change the perception of the river from the Landscape District, by foreshortening the view of the broad sweep of the river valley and bluffs with a bridge. In addition, the change in ownership and lack of assurances for long-term management of the Lift Bridge under Alternative C would have an adverse effect on the Stillwater Cultural Landscape District.

Alternative D: Under Alternative D, the new bridge would cross the river at an angle through the Landscape District, approximately 1,900 feet south of the Lift Bridge. The bridge deck would be about 68 feet at the Minnesota shore and 82 feet at the Wisconsin shore above the normal pool elevation of the river. Alternative D includes a three-level interchange and access ramps over the river within the District. Ramps and roadways would cover the river bank at the southern end of the District.

Under Alternative D, the new bridge reaches the Wisconsin bluff at the Lift Bridge causeway. The Lift Bridge would be used for bicycle and pedestrian traffic only. Ownership of the bridge would change from Mn/DOT and Wis/DOT to another owner with elements as noted above in Alternative B-1. Entries to the District change under Alternative D, with the vehicular approach across the Lift Bridge eliminated. In Wisconsin, the rebuilt STH 64 would be expanded and have no connection to the Lift Bridge. Almost 7 acres of land within Kolliner Park would be acquired for a trail connection from STH 35 to the Lift Bridge. Retaining walls would be added along STH 64 and the trail.

Wisconsin drivers would travel to Stillwater by crossing the new bridge and then turning north on TH 95. The TH 95 approach would change as well with separated lanes for TH 95 traffic and multiple turn movements possible. Retaining walls would be constructed along the east side of TH 36/95 and TH 95 north of the three-level interchange between the roadway and the shoreline of the St. Croix River. These changes would result in the loss of 28 curbside parking spaces in Downtown.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Alternative D would affect the immediate setting of the Landscape District, with the new bridge and its three-level interchange becoming a major visual element in the District. Views from Lowell Park toward the river and Wisconsin bluffs would have the new bridge in the foreground. Views from the Wisconsin bluffs toward Stillwater would be obscured by the new bridge and associated infrastructure along the shore of the river, both of which change the relationship of the historic bowl of Stillwater to the river. Both the TH 95 and Lift Bridge entries into the District would change and Lift Bridge ownership would change with potential effects as noted above in B-1. Vehicular access is eliminated from the Lift Bridge (bicycle and pedestrian use only), changing the driving experience that has been typical for travelers using the Lift Bridge from the east since its construction.

The TH 95 entry would be marred by major infrastructure construction and road changes that would alter the experience of arrival into the Cultural Landscape District. TH 95 is a two-lane roadway in a narrow corridor that currently winds between the river and bluff, with trees on the east providing an edge to the corridor. Under Alternative D, there would be additional traffic lanes, the bridge ramps and the bridge interrupting the narrow roadway winding into downtown.

This changes the perception of arrival on TH 95 from the current river corridor to a setting with heavy infrastructure improvements that are a major contrast with the scale of Historic District buildings.

While the *Economic Analysis* indicated that the loss of through traffic should not affect the destination shopping activity in downtown, the loss of 28 parking spaces could exert a negative effect on downtown retailing. Downtown Stillwater is a primary component in the Cultural Landscape District and its economic vitality is important.

The construction of the new bridge, with its touchdown point on the Lift Bridge causeway, changes the setting of the Lift Bridge and perceptions of bicyclers and pedestrians as they experience the Lift Bridge crossing. Recreational boat users would lose some of the openness that currently prevails in the Downtown area. The Lift Bridge rises to allow boats through, retaining a sense of open water. The new bridge, in close proximity to the Lift Bridge, would have piers in the river and provide a canopy with traffic activity and attendant noise that constrict the current openness of the river and the visual perception of it for boaters.

Alternative D would change the perceptions of the river, of the setting of the Lift Bridge, and views across the river from both Minnesota and Wisconsin. Loss of vehicular traffic on the Lift Bridge, roadway entrance alterations and loss of parking in downtown under Alternative D would have an adverse effect on the Stillwater Cultural Landscape District.

Alternative E: Under Alternative E, the new bridge would cross the river at an angle through the Landscape District, approximately 2,000 feet south of the Lift Bridge at the Minnesota side and only 200 feet south at the Wisconsin side. Alternative E includes access ramps over the river within the District. Both the bridge, which touches down at the east end of the Lift Bridge causeway, and entrance ramps would be prominent.

Access into the Downtown Commercial Historic District would change in this alternative. TH 95 south of Downtown would be altered with the bridge and bridge ramps. Retaining walls would be constructed along the east side of TH 95 north of the bridge entry ramps. TH 95 would include two lanes southbound from Downtown and one lane northbound into Downtown, requiring the loss of 49 curbside parking spaces. In Alternative E, the Lift Bridge is converted to two lanes of westbound vehicular traffic from Wisconsin. On the Wisconsin side, the rebuilt STH 64 would be expanded. Over 7 acres of land within Kolliner Park would be acquired for a trail connection from STH 35 to the Lift Bridge. There would be no vehicular access to the park. Retaining walls would be added along STH 64 and the trail.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Alternative E would affect the immediate setting of the Landscape District, with the new bridge and its bridge ramps becoming a major visual element in the Landscape District. Views from Lowell Park toward the river and Wisconsin bluffs would have the bridge in the foreground. Views from the Wisconsin bluffs toward Stillwater would be obscured by the new bridge and associated infrastructure along the shore of the river, both of which change the relationship of the historic bowl of Stillwater to the river.

Roadway changes to TH 95 would alter the experience of arrival into the Cultural Landscape District. TH 95 is a two-lane roadway in a narrow corridor that currently winds between the river and bluff, with trees on the east providing an edge to the corridor. Under Alternative E, there would be additional traffic lanes, the bridge ramps and the bridge interrupting the narrow roadway winding into downtown. This changes the perception of arrival on TH 95 from the current river corridor to a setting with heavy infrastructure improvements that are a major contrast with the scale of Historic District buildings.

While the *Economic Analysis* indicated that the loss of through traffic should not affect the destination shopping activity in downtown, the loss of 49 parking spaces could exert a negative effect on downtown retailing. Downtown Stillwater is a primary component in the Cultural Landscape District and its economic vitality is important.

The construction of the new bridge, with its touchdown point on the Lift Bridge causeway, changes the setting of the Lift Bridge and perceptions of travelers as they experience the Lift Bridge crossing. Recreational boat users would lose some of the openness that currently prevails in the Downtown area. The Lift Bridge raises to allow boats through, keeping a sense of open water. The new bridge, in close proximity to the Lift Bridge, would have piers in the river and provide a canopy with traffic activity and attendant noise that constrict the current openness of the river and the visual perception of it for boaters.

Alternative E would change the perceptions of the river, of the setting of the Lift Bridge, and views across the river from both Minnesota and Wisconsin. Traffic changes on the Lift Bridge, roadway entrance alterations and loss of parking in downtown under Alternative E would have an adverse effect on the Stillwater Cultural Landscape District.

11.3.14 The John Nicholas Thelen Farmstead, 132 CTH E, Town of St. Joseph

11.3.14.1 Affected Environment

The Thelen Farmstead was established in 1873 (see Figure 11-3). The farmstead site is located on the west slope of an oak-wooded ridge, known locally as Dahlman's Bluff. The Thelen House, a frame, two-story cube with Italianate features constructed in 1887, is set on a leveled terrace on the west slope of the bluff, which had been excavated to provide a flat place to situate the house. Overall, the Thelen House exhibits a high degree of historic integrity. The house faces west, with a stone smokehouse (c. 1873) a horse barn foundation (c. 1873), a windmill (c. 1883), and a barn (c. 1910) located in an area immediately adjacent to the house. A c. 1873 granary was recently demolished due to local road construction. A noncontributing fragment of an old stagecoach road lies behind the house to the east. The family cemetery (c. 1884) is located on the bluff behind and east of the house, in the wooded area outside the historic property boundary. Large white pines shade the lawn, and were apparently brought in from other parts of the county shortly after the house was built.

The Thelen Farmstead is eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C for its architecture. The Italianate style farmhouse is a good vernacular interpretation of this style in western St. Croix County. This house, and its accompanying outbuildings, represents the typical expansion of an early farmstead as the farmer became more prosperous. The boundary for the Thelen Farmstead encompasses the domestic space historically associated with the farmhouse and outbuildings, as separated from the surrounding fields.

11.3.14.2 Environmental Consequences

Alternatives B-1, C-Option 1, C-Option 2, D and E:

Based on its eligibility under Criterion C, it is recommended that the five alternatives as currently designed will have no adverse effect on the characteristics that qualify the Thelen Farmstead for the National Register.

Currently, the house, sitting on a terrace above the surrounding farmland to the west, the smokehouse, and the windmill are mostly hidden from view by pine trees. The silo is all but invisible behind the remaining barn. From the town road immediately in front of the house, it is difficult to get a good view of the house and its outbuildings, except for the one remaining barn, which is in prominent view. A town road has recently been graded in front of the house, and a granary building was removed for this town road. To the west of the town road, there is a corn field, with woods to the east and north of the Thelen Farmstead developed into the Settlers Glen Subdivision (residential). Therefore, the lands no longer contribute to the historic setting.

For purposes of determining effects, the property's visual setting is interpreted as the area which includes a recognizable view of the Thelen Farmstead. Thus, in the case of the Thelen Farmstead, the visual setting that allows it to "convey a sense" of a historic farmstead is rather narrow. Because of the topography and foliage, only the remaining barn is prominent on the landscape. To gain a real sense of the farmstead, that is, the residence and other outbuildings, one needs to be at least as close as Thelen Farm Road. From the distance of the proposed construction, one cannot make out any buildings other than the barn.

In terms of potential land use changes as a result of the proposed intersections, it must be noted that there are two impediments to commercial development here: the land is zoned agricultural/residential, and there is no sewer and water. If development were to occur in the vicinity of an interchange, the interchange for B-1 would be the closest to the Thelen Farmstead. Such development would need to come to the south end of the barn before it would block a view that would include a recognition of the farmhouse and open land to the west.

There will be no direct taking from or impact to the Thelen Farmstead or any of its buildings under any of the alternatives. For Alternative C-Option 2, Thelen Farm Road will be relocated to the northwest. The increase in noise from 6 dBA to 9 dBA is not deemed to be an adverse effect on the architectural significance of the Thelen Farmstead, under Criterion C.

11.3.15 St. Croix Hilltop Drive-In Theatre, 1433 STH 35/64 Town of St. Joseph

11.3.15.1 Affected Environment

The St. Croix Hilltop Drive-In Theatre was constructed in 1957 along STH 35/64 (see Figure 11-3 for site location). This entertainment facility includes five contributing resources: a screen tower, projection booth, parking area, concession and restroom building and ticket booth. As a property less than 50 years old, this resource was considered under Criterion Consideration G as well as NRHP criteria. The property has not operated as a theater since 1991.

The St. Croix Hilltop Drive-In Theatre retains the characteristics of a drive-in theater and represents a distinctly American property type that responded to post-World War II automobile culture. The property is recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C as an intact example containing the features common to 1950s drive-in theaters, and under Criterion Consideration G for properties that have achieved significance within the last 50 years. Criterion Consideration G is met in that the era of the drive-in theatre has clearly passed and there is sufficient context and scholarly work within which to assess the eligibility of the property.

11.3.15.2 Environmental Consequences

Alternative B-1, C-Option 1 and C-Option 2: Under Alternatives B-1, C-Option 1 and C-Option 2, the proposed STH 35/64 is a minimum of 2,000 feet east from the theatre (4,500 feet for Alternative C-Option 2). The property is not located within ½ mile of an interchange where development pressure may occur.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Under Alternatives B-1, C-Option 1, and C-Option 2, the road and interchange would be of sufficient distance so that there would be no adverse effect to the setting or views from the theatre. The distance from the proposed interchange should preclude potential development impacts related to that access point.

Alternatives D and E: Under Alternatives D and E, the STH 35/64 interchange would be located approximately 1,500 feet to the southeast, with a local road connection to existing STH 35/64 running approximately 1,000 feet east of the theater. The distance to the interchange (within 1/2 mile) could make the theatre more susceptible to development/redevelopment pressure.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: Although visible from the theatre site, the proposed interchange and local road are still distant enough to preclude any effect on the setting of the theatre. The proximity to the interchange could make the theatre property more susceptible to development/redevelopment pressure. Given that the property has not operated as a theatre since 1991, however, it does not appear that there has been pressure for development at this northern edge of Houlton. Alternatives D and E would have no adverse effect on the St. Croix Hilltop Drive-In Theatre.

11.3.16 Louis C. Kriesel Farmstead, 132 STH 35/64 Town of St. Joseph

11.3.16.1 Affected Environment

Louis C. Kriesel purchased this farm property in 1900 and by 1914 had built it into the Pleasant View Dairy (see Figure 11-3 for site location). The property includes a farmhouse and seven agricultural outbuildings that date to the early twentieth century. The farmhouse is a one-and-one-half story vernacular side-gable house with clapboard siding and two, open shed-roof porches. The gambrel-roof barn (c. 1900) rests on a concrete foundation and is clad in shiplap siding. Other structures dating from c. 1900 show evidence of farm operations, including the machine shed, the chicken coop, and a creamery and smokehouse for processing agricultural products. Structures housing animal feed included a granary, a corncrib and a silo.

The Kriesel Farmstead is accessed by a driveway approximately 840 feet long, off existing STH 35/64. The farmyard is buffered by trees on the perimeter. The farmhouse orients toward the farmyard and does not have direct views of existing STH 35/64. The Farmstead has remained in the Kriesel family to the present day. This property has been reviewed by Wis/DOT CRU and the WisSHPO. The WisSHPO has recommended the property potentially eligible under Criterion C based on its significance as an assemblage of historic farm buildings. WisSHPO has noted that the property does not appear to have agricultural significance and thus would not include surrounding fields. WisSHPO and Wis/DOT CRU have adopted a boundary for the property that extends out 75 feet from the buildings.

11.3.16.2 Environmental Consequences

Alternative B-1, C-Option 1, D, and E: Under these four alternatives, a new frontage road would be built north of the new 35/64 and the existing STH 35/64 roadway. This frontage road would continue to the east to Andersen Scout Camp Road. Access to the Kriesel Farmstead would be from this proposed frontage road, which would not have access to the new STH 35/64 except by going through Houlton. Under Alternatives B-1, C-1, D and E, approximately 11.5 acres of land north of existing STH 35/64 would be acquired for construction and would reduce the distance to the road from the Kriesel Farmstead from the current 850 feet to 620 feet.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: The siting of the farmyard, orientation of the buildings and windbreak on the property would ensure that farmstead views are not affected by the construction. Although access to new STH 35/64 would change and the new frontage road would be approximately 230 feet closer, the road would still be well over 500 feet from the farmyard area. No property within the farmyard would be acquired under these four alternatives, and no characteristics that contribute to its eligibility under Criterion C would be affected by Alternatives B, C-Option 1, D and E.

Alternative C-Option 2: Under Alternative C-Option 2, existing STH 35/64 would be a local road ending in a cul-de-sac east of Andersen Scout Camp Road. There would be no access to the new STH 35/64 except through Houlton. No property would be acquired near the Kriesel Farmstead.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects: The Kriesel Farmstead boundaries will focus on the farmyard and area 75 feet out and not include surrounding fields. The siting of the farmyard, orientation of the buildings and windbreak on the property would ensure that farmstead views are not affected. Alternative C-Option 2 would have no effect on the Kriesel Farmstead.

11.4 DETERMINATION OF EFFECTS

Formal determination of effects will be made by FHWA following completion of remaining information (Minnesota and Wisconsin archaeology), public input received throughout the comment period, and further discussion with consulting parties. See Table 11-3 for a preliminary summary of effects to NRHP-listed, determined eligible and potentially eligible properties.

**TABLE 11-3
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS TO NRHP-LISTED, DETERMINED ELIGIBLE, AND
POTENTIALLY ELIGIBLE PROPERTIES (Preliminary)**

Property Name	Potential Effects from each Build Alternative				
	Alternative B-1	Alternative C (Alternative C-Option 1 in Wisconsin)	Alternative C-Option 2	Alternative D	Alternative E
Log Cabin Restaurant (Club Tara)	Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect	N/A	Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect
Bergstein Shoddy Mill	Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect	N/A	Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect
Stillwater State Prison Historic District	No adverse effect	No adverse effect	N/A	No adverse effect	No adverse effect
St. Croix Overlook	Adverse Effect	Adverse effect	N/A	No adverse effect	No adverse effect
William N. Danforth House	No Effect	No Effect	N/A	No Effect	No Effect
Fairview Cemetery	Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect	N/A	Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect
Slab Alley	Pending Eligibility Determination	Pending Eligibility Determination	N/A	Pending Eligibility Determination	Pending Eligibility Determination
Hersey and Bean Site	No Effect	No Effect	N/A	Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect
Stillwater & St. Paul Railroad	No Effect	No Effect	N/A	No Effect	No Effect
St. Croix Boom Site	No Effect	No Effect	N/A	No Effect	No Effect
Stillwater Lift Bridge	Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect	N/A	Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect
Stillwater Commercial Historic District	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	N/A	Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect
Stillwater Cultural Landscape District	Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect	N/A	Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect
Thelen Farmstead	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect
St. Croix Hilltop Drive- In Theatre	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect
Kreisel Farmstead	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect

11.5 POTENTIAL FOR CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Although a final determination of effects to historic properties has not yet occurred, it is important to recognize the potential for cumulative effects to historic properties. Cumulative effects to historic properties are identified in conjunction with the criteria of adverse effect in 36 CFR 800.5 (a) (1), noting that adverse effects may include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance or be cumulative.

Increasing development pressures in the five-county area could encourage the demolition of vacant or under-utilized historic buildings and farmsteads if reuse of such properties is not found to be economically viable. Changes in land-use patterns associated with development would alter the setting of some historic properties. Development of parcels surrounding historic farmsteads could make it more difficult for farmers to continue active agriculture in close proximity to urban residential and commercial development. Further development of previously undeveloped lands may also disturb existing archaeological sites, both in rural areas and the historic archaeology in urbanized areas.

At the same time, increased access could result in increased property values that bring prosperity to residents in the St. Croix Crossing area. The potential for development may provide financial gain on properties that have languished or been unproductive. Increasing property values and desirability of the area could also provide economic incentives and market support for the rehabilitation and reuse of historic buildings.

Potential cumulative effects include the following:

- Land use changes occurring as a result of enhanced transportation accessibility.
- Land use changes occurring because accessibility was lost as a result of a project.
- Impacts to the setting and views of a historic property due to changed traffic patterns that result from new infrastructure.
- Changes to the uses of a historic property (and/or district) as the result of new infrastructure, changing traffic patterns, and altered settings.
- Because of the size and encompassing nature of the Stillwater Cultural Landscape District, it may experience cumulative impacts from a variety of activities in the surrounding area, including impacts to the natural and cultural landscape and the river.

Potential cumulative effects should be revisited when FHWA has made a final determination of effects and is developing an MOA to address adverse effects.

11.6 MITIGATION

11.6.1 Mitigation For Effects For Historic Properties

Mitigation measures are under discussion, which will continue throughout the comment period and in conjunction with any additional evaluation of historic properties. Because this chapter contains only a preliminary assessment of effects on properties, it is premature to determine

mitigation measures. A limited, preliminary list of measures has been identified (see Chapter 14), but will be the subject of consultation when final determination of effects on historic properties has been completed by FHWA. It is anticipated that additional mitigation measures will be identified through continued discussion with consulting parties as well as input received during the SDEIS public comment period. Mitigation measures will be documented and recorded in a MOA.

11.6.2 Assessment of Mitigation Measures Identified For Other Types Of Impacts

Chapter 14 also identifies a list of potential mitigation measures for other types of impacts. A final mitigation package for the project will be developed by FHWA, Mn/DOT and Wis/DOT following selection of Preferred Alternative from this list and others that may be identified by agencies or the public during the SDEIS comment period. The mitigation measures selected may involve activities outside of the APE described above, and/or may have further adverse impacts to historic properties within the APE. Following selection of the mitigation measures, further analysis and consultation will occur to address these potential issues.

11.7 MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT AND COORDINATION

Considerable consultation has occurred between the FHWA, Mn/DOT, Wis/DOT, Indian tribes, and federal and state agencies, as well as with the Stakeholder Group and the 106 Subgroup. These deliberations have been informed by public comments, which will continue to be solicited as the process continues. Consulting parties will be determined as discussed in Section 11.2.3 and in accordance with the guidance set forth in 36 CFR 800. Provisions in the 1994 MOA will be addressed in the consultation process (Appendix G) and incorporated into an updated MOA. The MOA will document mitigation measures for any adverse effects on historic properties.