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Executive Summary

This Historic Property Report documents the methodology and findings of eligibility as part of the Section 106 process for Section 2 of the Interstate 69 Tier 2 Study. Above-ground resources were identified and evaluated in accordance with Section 106, National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and CFR Part 800 (Revised January 2001), Final Rule on Revision of Current Regulations dated December 12, 2000 and incorporating amendments effective August 5, 2004.

Project historians identified and evaluated above-ground resources in consultation with the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer and the consulting parties for this project.

There is one property listed in the National Register of Historic Places in the Area of Potential Effects for Section 2:

- Patoka Bridges Historic District

As a result of identification and evaluation efforts for this project, two individual historic properties were determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places:

- Thomas C. Singleton Round Barn (Daviess 35005)
- Chapman-Allison Farmstead (Daviess 35001)
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Introduction

Above-ground resources were identified and evaluated in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, 36 CFR Part 800 (revised January 2001), the Final Rule on Revision of Current Regulations dated December 12, 2000, and incorporating amendments effective August 5, 2004.

Congress set forth the importance of historic properties upon the fabric of American life as part of the NHPA (1966), which states that “the historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as part of our community life and development in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people.” Further, the NHPA defines the federal government’s responsibility “to foster conditions under which our modern society and our prehistoric and historic resources can exist in productive harmony” [16 U.S.C. 470b(2)].

As a result of the NHPA, federal agencies are required to take into account the impact of federal undertakings upon historic properties in the area of the undertaking. Historic properties are buildings, structures, sites, objects, and/or districts included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

Description of Undertaking

Section 2: SR 65 (Princeton/Oakland City) to US 50 (Washington)

The 142-mile I-69 project corridor from Evansville to Indianapolis has been divided into six Sections of Independent Utility for the Tier 2 studies. Each section is being independently studied within a time frame of eighteen to thirty-six months.

Section 2 of the Tier 1 approved corridor begins at State Road (SR) 64 west of Oakland City in Gibson County, progressing north and east to cross the Patoka River into Pike County just west of SR 57. It continues north, crossing SR 57 north of Glezen at the old private coal road and proceeds toward Petersburg. The corridor skirts the south and east sides of Petersburg, crossing SR 61 and SR 356. It proceeds north and east past Alford to cross the East Fork of the White River into Daviess County about two miles upstream of the SR 57 bridge. It continues north and east to intersect US 50 on the east side of Washington.

The Gibson County portion of the project traverses predominantly agricultural land south of the Patoka River. At the Patoka River, the corridor passes through forest and wetland areas and is surrounded by the Patoka River National Wildlife Refuge. Residences are typically on large, divided agricultural lots along county roads.
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In Pike County, the corridor traverses a combination of agricultural and forest land with some wetlands. Portions of this area were previously strip-mined and have been reclaimed as either crop or pasture land. There are several large high-voltage electric transmission lines running through the corridor in Pike County due to the presence of two major coal-fired electric power plants near the corridor. There are also several large (10-inch and 30-inch) high-pressure natural gas transmission lines that run through the corridor along with an underground natural gas storage facility immediately adjacent to the corridor northeast of Petersburg. Residences are typically widely scattered along county roads except for a concentration of adjacent lots at Alford.

At the south end of Daviess County, the corridor passes for more than a mile through the floodplain of the East Fork of the White River, which drains a significant portion of south-central Indiana. It then passes through a hilly section of combined agricultural and forest land with some wetlands before giving way to predominantly agricultural land in the remaining portion of the corridor. The concentration of residences is a little higher in this area, with several subdivisions of homes on very large lots along with widely scattered rural residences along each of the county roads.

INDOT’s Section 2 project consultant team is conducting all necessary National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) environmental studies and engineering assessments to define a preferred interstate highway alignment within the approved corridor. Environmental work includes, but is not limited to, studies of the following items: farmland, water resources/quality, wetlands, floodplains, hazardous materials, threatened or endangered species, cultural resources, socioeconomic and land use, air quality, noise, and special lands (parks, wildlife areas, etc.).

As in the Tier 1 process, public involvement for Tier 2 will be an ongoing effort that will include information meetings, a newsletter, a project website, and a public hearing. In addition, a project office for Section 2, located in Petersburg, is open weekdays to provide current project information and receive public input. The Section 2 project consultant team includes project historians, who completed the work for this above-ground resources study.

**Scope of Work**

In accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA, its implementing regulations (36 CFR 800), and the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) Section 106 Compliance Plan, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and INDOT identified four major tasks to complete the Tier 2 Study of this Section 106 project. These tasks included:

1. Develop a historic context;
2. Identify and survey above-ground resources more than fifty years of age with sufficient integrity;
3. Hold consulting party meetings and consult with knowledgeable persons; and
4. Evaluate inventoried above-ground resources using the National Register criteria for evaluation.

Professional historians were engaged to identify eligible above-ground resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) established by the FHWA. The APE is “the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties. The area of potential effects is influenced by the scale and nature of an undertaking…” [36 CFR 800.9(a)].

For this project, the APE is centered on alternative 3C, a 2,000-foot wide corridor that was selected at the end of the Tier 1 Study as the preferred alternative to advance to the Tier 2 Study (Appendix A: Map 1).¹ In order to study all potential effects to historic properties by the proposed project, the length of the APE extends one mile past each end of the 28.5-mile long corridor, and the width extends one mile on either side of the 2,000-foot wide corridor. There are two exceptions where the APE is narrower, because of reduced viewshed.

The first exception in width is at the Patoka River Valley, where the preferred alternative is relatively limited because the alternative must cross the river between sections of the Patoka National Wildlife Refuge. Much of the river valley on either side of the proposed river crossing is densely wooded; hence, the line of sight to and from I-69 would be reduced considerably compared to other areas in the APE. The width of the APE in this area was reduced to about 3,000 feet on either side of the centerline of the preferred alternative. The second exception is at Petersburg, where the density of the built environment obscures views from the center of the town toward the proposed route of I-69. Only the buildings at the outer edges of Petersburg, which are still in the APE, are within the viewshed of the 2,000-foot corridor.

As part of the scope of work, project historians identified and evaluated above-ground resources one mile beyond the termini of Section 2’s 2,000-foot corridor. This resulted in an area of overlap with both Section 1 and Section 3. The overlaps allow the historians of each section to independently evaluate the above-ground resources that may be affected by that section of the undertaking. The Section 2 project historians coordinated survey efforts in the overlap areas with the historians of Sections 1 and 3 as necessary.

¹ Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT), I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis, 6-50.
Methodology

Eligibility Determinations

Above-ground resources within the APE were evaluated to determine their eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) based on their integrity and their ability to meet one or more NRHP criteria for evaluation. These criteria are:

a) associated with events that have made a contribution to the broad patterns of history;

b) associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;

c) embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant or distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; and

d) have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

An above-ground resource need only meet one criterion to be eligible for listing in the NRHP. According to the NRHP, “integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance.” There are seven attributes of integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.\(^2\)

As part of the evaluation process, historians took into account seven exemptions specified in 36 CFR 60.4. “Ordinarily cemeteries, birthplaces or graves of historical figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, properties primarily commemorative in nature, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years…” are not eligible for listing in the NRHP.\(^3\) Although the exemptions are applicable, the presence of documented cemeteries was verified whenever practical, and churches were included if they illustrated an architectural or historical theme.

The significance of an above-ground resource can only be determined when it is evaluated within its historic context. NRHP guidance defines historic contexts as “those patterns or trends in history by which a specific occurrence, property, or site is understood and its meaning (and ultimately its significance) within history or prehistory is made clear.”\(^4\) Historic contexts identify the trends, patterns, and themes that shaped the history of particular geographic areas and time periods, and the types of above-ground resources associated with them.

---

\(^2\) Andrus, How to Apply the National Register Criteria, 44.

\(^3\) Andrus, How to Apply the National Register Criteria, 25.

\(^4\) Andrus, How to Apply the National Register Criteria, 7.
A field survey of the APE and documentary research were conducted to collect all the data needed to develop a historic context and complete the eligibility determinations according to NRHP guidelines. The survey was completed in accordance with *Archeology and Historic Preservation: Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines*, the professional standards common to this type of above-ground resource identification and evaluation.\(^1\)

**Fieldwork**

Project historians drove all the roads in the APE to identify above-ground resources. All above-ground resources were evaluated to determine whether they were of a minimum age to be eligible for listing in the NRHP, i.e., at least fifty years of age. All above-ground resources were further evaluated to determine whether they retained sufficient integrity.

The NRHP aspects of integrity—location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association—were used to evaluate integrity. Several aspects of each above-ground resource were examined to determine the above-ground resource’s level of integrity. These aspects included, but were not limited to, the presence of replacement siding, windows, and/or doors; the removal of a porch; the alteration or replacement of a porch; changes in fenestration; the presence of additions; a change in massing; the removal of early trim; relocation from its original site; and alterations to the setting, including the loss of early outbuildings, the presence of non-period outbuildings, and the proximity of modern development. In addition to being evaluated for Section 106 compliance, above-ground resources not previously inventoried that retained integrity and displayed an association with a locally important theme that was identified in the historic context were inventoried for the Indiana Historic Sites and Structures (IHSS) Inventory. This process entailed completion of IHSS Inventory forms and photography with black-and-white film. Above-ground resources that were previously inventoried for the county surveys and included in the *Interim Reports* were updated with new inventory forms. Pike County does not have an *Interim Report*, so special care was taken to conduct the survey. As a result, IHSS Inventory forms were prepared on above-ground resources with integrity that were at least rated as Contributing. Complete survey forms will be on file at the Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR), Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (DHPA) in Indianapolis.

Above-ground resources that consisted of a house with a collection of outbuildings were evaluated for their integrity as a farmstead (residence and outbuildings) or as a farm (residence, outbuildings, and associated fields with distinctive, small field patterns and pastures). Houses within farmsteads that retained a collection of early outbuildings without a significant intrusion of non-period outbuildings were given greater leeway in the evaluation of integrity than other houses.

---

The location of each surveyed above-ground resource, whether previously or newly inventoried, was recorded using a global positioning satellite (GPS) unit. If an above-ground resource was thought likely to be eligible for the NRHP and eligible boundaries were evident in the field, then the boundaries were recorded using the GPS unit. The GPS coordinates were used to plot the inventoried above-ground resources on project mapping.

Project historians recorded field notes for each above-ground resource. These are part of the project files. Field notes included, but were not limited to, address or location, style and/or type, and comments regarding integrity. Above-ground resources that were judged to lack integrity were noted on field maps and photographed using a digital camera.

In addition to buildings and structures, the project historians documented cemeteries located within the APE. Cemeteries previously inventoried in county Interim Reports or designated during the Tier 1 study were recorded on an IHSS Inventory form and photographed using black-and-white film. All other cemeteries were recorded on a Cemetery Registry Survey form and photographed with a digital camera. Cemetery boundaries were recorded using a GPS unit if boundaries were evident; otherwise, a single point was recorded at roughly the center of the location. Information on the cemeteries will be provided to the project archaeologists for their subsequent archaeological survey of the preferred alignment. Cemeteries that were previously inventoried or that are contributing were given survey numbers. All other cemeteries will be given a cemetery inventory number. All cemeteries are part of the IDNR database.

Boundaries were recorded for the following cemeteries: in Gibson County: Forsythe; in Pike County: Wyatt, DeJarnett, Loveless (Pike 20004), Arnold, Anderson Chapel, Logan Public (Pike 20002), Knights Chapel (Pike 20003), Lick Creek/Twin Oaks (Pike 05013), Little Willis (Pike 05001), Johnson (Pike 05003), Old Union, Stuckey, Morrison, Miley-Tislow, and Butler; and in Daviess County: Mt. Olivet (Daviess 35004), Bethel (Daviess 35003), Union (Daviess 30034), New Veale Creek, Veale Creek (Daviess 30033), and Old Bethel (Daviess 30036).

Because all the gravemarkers in Brenton Cemetery in Pike County have been piled in one location at the site, the cemetery no longer has a boundary evident. One point was recorded for this cemetery. Only approximate locations could be obtained for some cemeteries, most often because no gravemarkers are extant. A point was recorded in the approximate location of the following cemeteries, all in Pike County: Family, Fulcher, Battles, and Miley. As Lett Cemetery in Daviess County could not be located, no point was recorded.

**Documentary Research**

Tier 1 project historians prepared a historic properties study in 2003. The tasks of the Tier 1 Study included identifying and documenting above-ground resources potentially eligible for the NRHP in each of the project alternatives and sub-alternatives that were then under consideration, conducting a general evaluation of said above-ground resources using NRHP selection criteria.
and developing historic themes/contexts for the region. The Tier 1 project historians viewed above-ground resources from public roadways and especially focused on above-ground resources rated Outstanding and Notable in the county Interim Reports. The Tier 1 project historians published a report containing the historic context and the results of their fieldwork.  

Prior to conducting documentary research, INDOT and the project historians of the Tier 1 Study provided the Tier 2 project historians with the data on all the potentially eligible above-ground resources that were identified during the Tier 1 Study for the project. Because the Tier 1 Study largely concentrated on Outstanding and Notable rated above-ground resources from the IHSS Inventory, the project historians of the Tier 2 Study conducted a literature review to also collect information on above-ground resources rated as Contributing.

In May 2004, the project historians conducted a literature review to identify previously inventoried above-ground resources located in the APE of Section 2. The project historians conducted the literature review at the DHPA in Indianapolis. Sources consulted included USGS 7.5′ topographic maps showing the locations of buildings, structures, sites, districts, and objects inventoried with DHPA, IHSS Inventory forms, the Interim Reports of Gibson and Daviess counties, the NRHP nomination files, and the Indiana State Register of Historic Sites and Structures files.

In July and August 2004, the project historians conducted supplemental research to gather additional information to develop the historic context for the APE and to gather information to help evaluate the significance of individual above-ground resources in the APE. Research was conducted at the Indiana State Library, the Indiana State Archives, and the Indiana Historical Society in Indianapolis. Sources examined at these locations included county histories, newspaper clippings files, censuses, historical aerial photographs, and Pike and Daviess county atlases and maps. The history and genealogical collections at the Barrett Memorial Library in Petersburg and the Washington Public Library were examined for county histories, atlases, and maps, newspaper clippings files, genealogy sources, cemetery surveys, and census records. In addition, deed research was conducted at the Pike and Daviess counties recorders’ offices.

Consultation

The consulting parties were contacted for assistance in identifying possible historic properties in the APE or for information on specific above-ground resources suspected to be eligible. Sandy McBeth of the Pike County Historical Society, a consulting party and the Pike County Historian, provided information on an above-ground resource in the APE and offered her assistance in additional research. Patricia Warner, a consulting party from Pike County, provided information on several of the properties inventoried in Pike County during the survey. Also, Ms. McBeth and Ms. Warner provided information while in attendance at a consulting party meeting on June

6 Weintraut & Associates, I 69: Evansville to Indianapolis Tier 1 Study.
25, 2004, which was held as part of the Section 106 review process. Mr. David Abel, mayor of Washington, and Mr. Hugh Wirth, mayor of Oakland City, provided information on possible above-ground resources in the vicinity of their respective cities. Mr. Harold Allison, a consulting party from Daviess County, offered to provide information on a potentially eligible above-ground resource in Daviess County. Mr. Joe Tamalavic, a consulting party from Pike County, provided information on an above-ground resource in Pike County, of which he is the owner. Mr. Robert Schmidt of the Canal Society of Indiana and a consulting party provided a copy of a Canal Society of Indiana publication that contains information on the Wabash and Erie Canal in the APE.

Two local residents with knowledge of cultural resources in the study area also were contacted for assistance in identifying possible historic properties in the APE or for information on specific above-ground resources suspected to be eligible. Michael P. Pelham, Pike County Highway Engineer, was contacted for information on the metal truss bridges of Pike County. Mr. Pelham reported that Pike County did not have early records or plans of the bridges, but he did supply the use of the most recent Pike County Bridge Inspection Report. The project consultant identified Marada Willis, a Petersburg resident, as a person knowledgeable about local cemeteries. The project historians contacted Ms. Willis, who responded with some information on cemeteries that the project historians had been unable to locate previously.

Comments on above-ground resources were received from several consulting parties during the second consulting party meeting, which was held on April 13, 2005. Several consulting parties provided comments on a number of above-ground resources during the second consulting party meeting, which was held on April 13, 2005. Mr. Harold Allison complimented the project historians on the excellent research that had been done on the Chapman-Allison Farmstead (Daviess 35001). Mr. Joe Tamalavic questioned the conclusion that the Lemuel Hargrave House (Pike 05011) is not eligible. Additionally, Mr. Tamalavic stated that his research indicated that there were never outbuildings on the site, which contradicts the conclusions presented in the Historic Property Report. Ms. Edith Sarra recommended augmenting the historic context with a discussion of ditching and dredging operations along the Patoka River and evaluating the significance of Houchins Ditch. Additionally, Ms. Sarra questioned the determination that the Logan Cemetery is not eligible.

Written comments were received from only one consulting party after the second consulting party meeting. Ms. Edith Sarra wrote a letter addressing several issues. Those related to the Historic Context and to the Findings of Eligibility were addressed by the project historians. Specifically, Ms. Sarra questioned the eligibility of the Lemuel Hargrave House (Pike 05011), Pike County Bridge No. 32 (Pike 20006), the Ropp Farmstead (Pike 20001), and the Loveless Farmstead (Pike 20009). In addition, she also recommended adding information to the Historic Property Report on agricultural practices in Pike County and on dredging, ditching, and erosion control projects (and Houchins Ditch in particular) in the Patoka Bottoms.
The project historians conducted additional investigations immediately after receiving the comments from the consulting parties to make a reasonable and good faith effort to identify historic properties. These investigations consisted of gathering additional historical agricultural data on Pike County, researching Houchins Ditch and dredging operations and erosion control efforts in Pike County, and re-examining the historical data on the above-ground resources in question. The project historians carefully considered the information gleaned from these investigations and incorporated new data into the Historic Property Report. However, no new properties were deemed eligible as a result of these investigations.

Over the course of the identification and evaluation phase, ongoing consultation occurred with the State Historic Preservation Officer on the APE and on the above-ground resources.

**Deliberation**

The final phase in evaluating the NRHP eligibility of above-ground resources combined the results of the fieldwork and the documentary research. During the deliberation phase all above-ground resources in the APE with a moderate level of integrity were evaluated in the following categories: buildings, structures, objects, sites, and districts. In the case of agricultural above-ground resources, both farms (residence, outbuildings, and associated fields) and farmsteads (residence and outbuildings) received detailed evaluation.

In evaluating the integrity of extant above-ground resources, the category of the above-ground resource weighed as a consideration. In single dwellings or residences, integrity was the single disqualifying factor in most cases. Allowances were made for non-period but historical alterations to period houses, but without any evidence of historical significance, these properties were deemed ineligible. Consideration of an above-ground resource’s rarity or uniqueness as a particularly excellent example of a style or type of building was included in this segment of the deliberation process. In addition to significance and integrity, a limited comparative study was made of similar types of above-ground resources observed in the APE to determine whether better or more intact examples of the type were present in the APE.

Integrity for farms and farmsteads was weighted differently, with the residence as one part of the farm property. More leeway was given to dwelling alterations if the building was one element in a collection of intact, period agricultural outbuildings.

Farms, farmsteads, or period residences with agricultural outbuildings were evaluated at two distinct levels: architectural and contextual. Farms and farmsteads deemed eligible for the NRHP contain a collection of period buildings, including a residence with a moderate level of integrity. The period buildings normally associated with an eligible farm or farmstead were barns, summer kitchens or smokehouses, granaries, privies, poultry houses, hog houses, and sometimes a few outbuildings. Eligibility did not hinge on a full set of outbuildings; some
Historic properties did not have every type of outbuilding extant. In addition to eligible farmsteads, which usually included only a residence and outbuildings, eligible farms also included distinctive, recognizable field patterns as well as a complement of buildings. Eligible farms and farmsteads also met a requirement to include a contextual setting, feeling, or association that evoked a sense of an agricultural property in Hoosier history; those that did not were eliminated from further consideration.

The APE also was evaluated as a rural historic landscape. The project historians examined the APE for the presence of a concentration of buildings, structures, sites, or objects that might represent a historic landscape. Project historians evaluated the integrity of the rural landscape to determine if any portion of the APE was relatively untouched by modern changes to the landscape. These modern changes could include, but are not limited to, modern roads, modern residential or commercial development, and strip mining.

No rural historic districts were identified in the APE. Changes to the historic landscape and the lack of a significant concentration of above-ground resources preclude the presence of such districts.
Historic Context

The study area for this historic context encompasses the three counties in the APE for Section 2: Gibson, Pike, and Daviess (Appendix A, Map 1). The APE extends from about Oakland City in Columbia Township, Gibson County, to about Washington in Washington Township, Daviess County. The Tier 2 historic context for Section 2 incorporates portions of the historic context developed for Tier 1. Because portions of the study area, particularly Pike County, have few comprehensive secondary sources for historical information and analysis, particularly of twentieth century history, not every theme below has information presented for all three counties.

Pre-Statehood History & Architecture

Pre-Territorial Period

Prior to the onset of Euro-American settlement, southwestern Indiana was a densely forested region with an abundance of wildlife and natural resources. Despite the proximity of present day Daviess, Pike, and Gibson counties to the French settlement at Vincennes, it is unlikely that any French families settled in these counties. Pre-territorial land grants were present from the French, British, and United States (for service in the Revolutionary War). In Daviess County, the donation lands were located north and west of Washington. In Gibson County, these lands were located in White River and Washington townships, just south of the White River. In Pike County, these lands were located in Clay and Madison townships.

Territorial Government

With the passage of the Land Ordinance of 1785, Congress created a survey system that set a rectangular grid system on the land. Pre-survey land grants did not follow the grid, but for the most part surveyors divided the land into townships and sections. In many cases, roads and field patterns developed in rectangular patterns that matched the survey system, but topography and waterways forced some roads to run counter to the grid. This is especially evident in the hilly portions of Pike County and Veale Township in Daviess County.

Knox County was organized in June 1790 and was eventually to become the parent county of Gibson, Pike, and Daviess counties. In 1800, with increasing population, Congress divided the Northwest Territory into the Ohio Territory and the Indiana Territory. Vincennes served as the capital of the Indiana Territory until 1810. In 1800, Vincennes became the site of the first post office in the territory. Mail was carried along the trace from Louisville to Vincennes (later to...
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become the Old Louisville Road). Hosea Smith kept a post office at White Oak Springs in Pike County beginning about 1811. In 1814, the post road that had followed the Buffalo Trace was rerouted and the White Oak Springs settlement bypassed, although a post office was re-established the following year. The post office remained at White Oak Springs until 1823 when it was moved to Petersburg.

Early Transportation

Animal migratory routes and American Indian trails formed the basis for many early roads and routes of migration into southwestern Indiana. The Buffalo Trace bisected the southwestern region of Indiana from Clarksville to Vincennes. Its full length extended for hundreds of miles from the salt licks in Kentucky to Illinois and was used first by soldiers in the region and later by settlers and travelers. The genesis of the trace is explained by its name—buffalo created and kept open a wide swath of relatively smooth ground during their annual migration from the salt licks in Kentucky to prairies in the west. It was so worn by the buffalo that in many places it was said to be twenty feet wide. One authority states that two-thirds of all early settlers in southern Indiana, west of Louisville, arrived via the trace. The earliest settlement in Pike County, White Oak Springs, was established along the trace, and Petersburg also is located along the former path of the trace. An American Indian trail, the west fork of the Yellow Banks Trail, passed through the eastern part of Pike County and crossed the Buffalo Trace in what is now Jefferson Township. In 1814, the post road was rerouted north of the Buffalo Trace.

Migration

There was little American migration into Indiana until after treaties with American Indian tribes were signed, the Federal survey of Knox County was completed, and the land office at Vincennes was opened. These elements combined to offer the prospect of personal safety and secure land titles and spurred an increase in the rate of settlement of the Indiana frontier during the first decade of the nineteenth century. Conflicts with American Indians slowed the influx of settlers between 1807 and 1810. After the Battle of Tippecanoe in 1811 the public perception was that the American Indian threat had ended, and migration into Indiana continued. The admission of Indiana as a state in 1816 further spurred settlement.

---

14 Jean and Trenor, “The First Families of White Oak Springs 1810 to 1817,” 244.
The first settlers in what is now Gibson County arrived as early as 1789 or 1790. John Severn, Sr., and his family settled along the south bank of the Patoka River at that time. Other early settlers also chose land near the rivers. Gervas and Daniel Hazleton settled along the White River in the 1790s and established a ferry. David Robb settled near the White River in 1800. Other settlers followed through the first decade of the nineteenth century. Many early settlers were from the south, including from the Carolinas, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia. Several towns formed during the Territorial period including Hazleton in circa 1810, Patoka in 1813, Princeton in 1814, and Owensville in 1815. Gibson County was organized in March 1813 in what had been part of Knox County. The county took its name from General John Gibson, a hero of the French and Indian War and the Revolutionary War, who had served as Secretary of the Territory of Indiana from 1800 to 1816. 

Settlement of Pike and Daviess counties began later than in Gibson County. The first settler in Pike County was Woolsey Pride, who settled at White Oak Springs, near present-day Petersburg, in 1800. Members of the Miley, Coonrod, and Tislow families entered the county in 1803. Some of the earliest settlers in Pike County, arriving before 1810, included several Pennsylvania German families (Tislow, Coonrod, Miley, and Coleman), several families from Virginia (Brenton, Arnold, and Pride), and one family from New Jersey (Risley), although they did not necessarily arrive in Indiana directly from those locations. Early leaders of the community centered around White Oak Springs included Woolsey Pride, James Brenton, and Henry Brenton. In 1810, a group of about twenty North Carolina Quakers arrived at White Oak Springs, including Hosea Smith, Moses Harrell, and Joab Chappell. Their relatives and neighbors from North Carolina would later make the journey to Pike County. Land claims in the county in 1816 were concentrated around White Oak Springs, along the White River in what is now Jefferson Township, and at the west edge of what is now Patoka Township just north of the Patoka River. The land claims in Jefferson Township were in the vicinity of the settlement of Highbanks.

William Ballows was one of the first, if not the first, settler in Daviess County. He settled in the Sugar Creek Hills in 1801. By 1803, a small village named Liverpool developed at the present site of Washington. This village was the site of a small fort for defense against American Indians during the War of 1812. Isaac Galland, George Curtis, and David Flora officially laid out the Village of Liverpool in 1815. Eli Hawkins settled near present day Maysville in 1806 and probably brought the first slaves into the county. Most early settlers of the county were from

---

16 Gibson County Warrick County Interim Report, xvii.
17 Goodspeed, History of Pike and Dubois Counties, 251.
19 Jean and Trenor, “First Families of White Oak Springs, 1810 to 1817,” 239.
the south, with the largest number from South Carolina and lesser numbers from Tennessee and North Carolina. By 1810, the county’s population numbered about 300.  

American Indian tribes relinquished claims to most of present-day Daviess, Pike, and Gibson counties in treaties at Fort Wayne, on June 7, 1803, and at Vincennes, on August 18 and 27, 1804. Relations with American Indian tribes remained uneasy, however, and many early settlers either built blockhouses or forts for protection from American Indian attacks or settled near forts erected by others. Woolsey Pride built a blockhouse at White Oak Springs in Pike County in 1807. In Gibson County, settlers built a fort in Johnson Township in 1811, which later gave rise to the town of Fort Branch. Also, a stockade was built south of Owensville the same year. Daviess County contained approximately ten forts, five built as early as 1812, and all were located in what is now Washington Township. Fort Flora was located in what is now downtown Washington.

Upland Southerners, so called because they came from the uplands of the South, made up the majority of migrants in the study area. Usually poor, Upland Southerners (as well as others who followed) built rudimentary human shelters at first, sometimes temporary dwellings with only three sides and a roof. As time passed, they constructed log cabins for themselves and other structures to shelter their animals. David Hackett Fisher has noted that the log cabin is “striking for its roughness and impermanence.” It could be erected relatively quickly with limited skills. Often consisting of only one or two rooms, it was a dwelling place for those who could not afford the time to construct a better abode. Families lived and slept in one room. Cattle were kept in “cow pens.” Sometimes fields were fenced to keep animals out while they foraged. There are no known surviving buildings or structures from this era in the APE, but documentary evidence, as well as later structures from the same building tradition, allows us to hypothesize on their likely appearance.

**Industry**

Early industry was local in scale and helped meet the subsistence needs of the settlers by processing agricultural products into usable forms. The earliest mills usually were gristmills for making flour and sawmills for creating lumber for buildings. In Pike County, Moses Harrell had set up a horse-powered mill by 1815, and possibly as early as 1812. In 1816, he applied for  
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permission from the Gibson County court (Pike County not yet having been set off) to establish a
dam on Pride’s Creek for a water-powered mill. In Daviess County, Obe Flint built a distillery
as early as 1810 in Veale Township. James C. Veale operated a sawmill on Veales Creek at an
ey date, but it was washed away in 1812. By 1815, Eli Chapman had a wool-carding machine
operating with a sawmill on Veales Creek. Several other mills were in operation in the county
by 1816.

Religion
The early settlers brought with them their religious traditions and institutions. The first
Methodist congregation in Daviess County was the Bethel congregation. The original Bethel
Church was a log structure in Washington Township built circa 1815. The Old Bethel Cemetery
(Daviess 30036) might mark the location of this church. A family of Cumberland
Presbyterians arrived at White Oak Springs in Pike County in 1810 and spread their faith among
other early settlers there.

Urban Settlement/Town Building
The settlement at White Oak Springs in Pike County was one of the most populous and
important settlements along the Buffalo Trace between Clarksville and Vincennes between 1807
and 1814. About a day’s journey from the territorial capital, the fort provided a safe refuge for
travelers and served as an outpost and powder-base for the militia. With the removal of the
territorial capital to Corydon in 1813 and the rerouting of the post road north of the Buffalo
Trace in 1814, both of White Oak Springs’ advantages disappeared. In anticipation of the
creation of Pike County, Hosea Smith, the owner of the land on which White Oak Springs was
situated, laid out a town called Alexandria hoping to gain the county seat for his settlement.
However, Peter Brenton also offered a piece of land a short distance to the east for the county
seat and was willing to donate the land. The honor of the county seat went to Peter Brenton, and
the new village was named Petersburg for him. The former settlement at White Oak Springs
disappeared and became part of Hosea Smith’s farm.

Conclusion
Survival is the main theme in the pre-statehood history of the Section 2 study area. Settlers
arrived in this area as early as the 1790s, but their numbers were few and the threat of American
Indian attacks was ever present. Settlers lived near one another both for companionship and for
mutual defense. It was not until Euro-American claims to the area were secure after 1811 that

26 Goodspeed, History of Pike and Dubois Counties, 251–52, 258; Jean and Trenor, “First Families of White Oak
Springs, 1810 to 1817,” 253.
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28 Myers, Daviess County, vol. 1, 84–85.
29 Jean and Trenor, “First Families of White Oak Springs, 1810 to 1817,” 251–52.
30 Jean and Trenor, “First Families of White Oak Springs, 1810 to 1817,” 231, 259, 267–70.
larger numbers of settlers began to arrive. The theme of survival is also evident in the reliance on simple, often primitive, log cabins for living space. More advanced economic and social institutions, such as mills, churches, and schools, did not arrive until rather late in the pre-statehood period.

**Pioneer Indiana: 1816–1850**

The years from 1816 to 1850 cover the pioneer era in Hoosier history. People living in and coming to the newly founded state of Indiana went about the business of establishing farms and communities, increasing and improving transportation routes, and developing commerce and industry, all as part of the process of creating a civilized place out of the wilderness. During these years, the state saw marked increases in population and a general shift northward of both influence and affluence.

During this period, the Indiana General Assembly was working to construct an infrastructure to help develop a market economy. The effect of this new and improved infrastructure would not be realized until after the Civil War, when the focus of life turned from the rumblings of war and the war itself and refocused on building an industrial state.

The change in the landscape of the Hoosier state and southwestern Indiana during this era was tremendous. The first settlers wrote of traveling along American Indian traces beneath a canopy of trees so dense they did not see the sun for days. The settlers cleared these trees for farming and to build homes and towns. By 1850, road clearing progressed and trains were traveling daily from the Ohio River to the capitol city of Indianapolis. In this era, the wilderness was civilized.

**Government and Politics**

*County.* During this era, county government was established in all of the counties in southwestern Indiana. Oftentimes, the first county offices, including jails, were located in log buildings that looked little different from other structures of the period. Courthouses, usually sited in the center of the town square, were built during this era, but few are extant, having been supplanted during the boom of the late nineteenth century by larger buildings.

The generally non-partisan politics of Indiana’s early years changed in 1824 with the establishment of a two-party system. With rising partisanship came patronage appointments and the alliance of newspapers with one party. The two-party system contributed to the rise of partisan newspapers within the state, not just as means of learning about national events, but also as a way of influencing elections.31

Daviess County was formed out of Knox County after statehood in 1816 and was the nineteenth Indiana county. The county took its name from a soldier killed at the Battle of Tippecanoe and
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initially included part of Martin County as well as Greene and Owen counties. However, by
1821, Daviess County had reached its present size. After its formation, the county was divided
into four townships: Washington, Veale, Reeve, and Perry. Washington Township attained
approximately its current boundaries by 1825. Veale Township received its current borders in
1840 when a portion was separated to create Harrison Township.

Pike County was formed from Gibson County in 1816. The county was named for Zebulon Pike,
the discoverer of Pike’s Peak in Colorado, who was killed in the War of 1812. Petersburg, the
new county seat, was surveyed into lots in 1817 and was named for Peter Brenton, an early
settler. The first four townships, all created in 1817, were Madison, Washington, Jefferson, and
Harbison. Logan Township was not created until 1846, when it was separated from Madison
Township.

Migration/Race/Ethnicity
The story of migration in Indiana is inextricably linked with that of race and ethnicity. From
1816 to 1850 the largest number of native-born migrants to southwestern Indiana came from the
Upland South, with smaller numbers from the Tidewater South, the Mid-Atlantic States, and
New England. The most dominant group of foreign migrants came from Germany.
Transportation routes, such as the Ohio River, determined the paths by which these migrants
entered the state. Intrastate settlement proceeded from south to north, from along the rivers and
streams and thence into the forested land. This story is written in the landscape and in the
architectural styles of southern Indiana.

Migration. In Daviess, Gibson, and Pike counties, a sizable percentage, between about one-
quarter and one-half, of migrants into these counties before 1850 came from elsewhere in
Indiana. The next largest source of migrants was Kentucky, with between about one-quarter and
one-third of migrants from that state. In all three counties, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North Carolina,
South Carolina, and Tennessee provided a lesser, but still significant, percentage of migrants.
Pike County saw the arrival of a particularly large percentage of settlers from North Carolina. A
lesser, but still important percentage of migrants arrived in Pike County from Virginia. In
Gibson County, more migrants came from Kentucky than from elsewhere in Indiana. Gibson
County also received a moderate level of migration from New York, Virginia, and Rhode Island.
In all three counties, the number of European immigrants was only a small percentage of the
total number of migrants into the counties. In Daviess County, European immigrants mostly
arrived from Ireland. In Gibson County, only Germany and Ireland contributed a significant
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percentage of European immigrants. Pike County received a significant percentage of European immigrants only from Germany.  

With such a large percentage of settlers originating in the southern states, southern traditions and culture naturally became predominant in the Section 2 study area and in southwestern Indiana generally. Southern farmers moving into the state brought with them the staples of Southern agriculture, including corn, cattle, hogs, and tobacco. Farmers of Southern origin also constructed the types of farm buildings with which they were already familiar. Early barns on these farms were log structures, usually single or double-crib. Later a farmer might construct larger barns, often of the transverse frame or three-portal barn types. These barns were distinctive to settlers of Southern origin and feature a single floor on level ground, a central driveway with entrances on the gable end walls, and often have an overhanging hay hood over an opening at the gable peak where hay was pitched into the loft. Early versions of these barns still had a structure of log cribs, but as sawmills proliferated, farmers began to construct frame barns. Single level, three-bay barns, although not distinctively Southern, also appear in southern Indiana in areas of Southern settlement. While transverse frame and three-portal barns survive in the APE, for instance at the Chapman-Allison Farmstead (Daviess 35001), none are extant from this period.

Southern settlers also brought with them familiar house types, such as log houses. Once more firmly established on their farms, these settlers typically constructed a more substantial house in one of the types common to prosperous farmers in the South. One such type was the I-house which is two stories tall, two rooms long, and one room deep. A less substantial type of house was the hall and parlor house, which was only one or one-and-one-half stories, two rooms long, and one room deep. These houses had a loft over the main floor and often had a rear addition containing the kitchen. Another rural house type of Southern origin, although less common than the I-house or hall and parlor, is a one-story house with a square plan and pyramidal roof. Common features on houses of Southern origin are front porches and basements that are raised to allow air flow beneath the house to prevent dryrot. An I-house survives in Pike County (the Hargrave House [Pike 05011]), but is from a later period. No houses of these types from this period are extant in the APE.

**African Americans.** African Americans migrated to Indiana as slaves, as fugitive slaves, and as free men and women. Slave owners sometimes brought slaves to the territory prior to statehood, even though the Northwest Ordinance, and later the first state constitution, expressly prohibited
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slavery. Free blacks sometimes settled on farms in rural communities located near a Quaker settlement because of the sect’s history of racial tolerance. In southwestern Indiana, they tended to settle along the rivers. At other times, they stayed in urban areas, occasionally living in homes of white Americans. Evidence suggests that blacks and whites were not segregated in Indiana towns even as late as the 1850s. In addition to slaves and free blacks, an unknown number of enslaved African Americans passed through the state to eventual freedom by following the Underground Railroad.

While the Northwest Territory and the states formed from it did not permit slavery, early legislation did allow slave owners to bring their slaves into the Northwest Territory and indenture them, essentially, for an average lifespan. According to the “Act Concerning the Introduction of Negroes and Mulattoes,” male children under age fifteen could be indentured until age thirty-five and females to age thirty-two.

The first Indiana constitution in 1816 forbade slavery and involuntary servitude in the state, but it did not free the indentured blacks already living in the state. Some Indiana residents expressed concern that slave owners were dumping slaves in the state once they were unable to work. In the 1820s, Governor James B. Ray spoke out against the “pouring in” of a “non-productive and in many instances, a super-annuated population.” An 1831 law required all blacks living in Indiana to register with the authorities of the county of residence and to provide bond as a guarantee against becoming a public ward.

Despite these roadblocks, free blacks established settlements in rural southwestern Indiana. These communities usually began with either a slave owner manumitting his slaves or with one person saving enough money to purchase his or her freedom and the freedom of other family members. As noted above, these families often lived near Quakers. While census takers recorded thirty slaves in Gibson County and three slaves in Pike County in 1820, they did not record any slaves in Daviess County that year, or any slaves in any of the three counties in 1830 or 1840. Gibson County’s free African American population rose steadily from forty-five in 1820 to 217 in 1850. Daviess County’s free African American population fluctuated over the years, rising from thirty-two in 1820 to forty-four in 1830, falling to twenty-five in 1840, and rising again to forty-four in 1850. Pike County had a much smaller free African American population than the other two counties, reaching its height at twenty in 1840. In 1850, twenty-five free black families lived near Lyles Settlement (later Lyles Station) in the vicinity of a
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Quaker settlement in Patoka Township of Gibson County. No buildings or sites in the Section 2 APE are known to be associated with free African-American settlement or Indiana slaveholders.

**Underground Railroad**

One chapter of the story of African Americans in Indiana went unrecorded in the census, because the presence of fugitive slaves was illegal and temporary. In Indiana counties bordering the Ohio River, oral tradition reports extensive involvement in the Underground Railroad, an organized movement that helped slaves to freedom.

With a high percentage of migrants from the South, nineteenth-century Indiana may have been the most “southern” in its attitudes of all the “northern” states. With these prevailing attitudes it is somewhat surprising that the Underground Railroad existed at all in Indiana. One historian wrote, “Militant, radical antislavery remained weaker in Indiana than perhaps in any other northern state”; however, he also noted that there were dozens of anti-slavery societies formed in the state in the late 1830s. The Anti-Slavery League and some churches, notably the Society of Friends (Quakers) and the New School Presbyterians, were active in the anti-slavery movement and the Underground Railroad. How these organizations managed to operate in the small towns and settlements of Indiana among unsympathetic or overtly hostile neighbors is a question that begs an answer.

Gibson County resident William Cockrum wrote a book about the activities of his father, James Cockrum, and other members of the Anti-Slavery League in Pike, Gibson, and other counties. Cockrum and other sources note three commonly used crossing spots for slaves coming into Indiana from Kentucky. These included routes across the Ohio River at Diamond Island in Posey County, at Rockport in Spencer County, and at or near Evansville in Vanderburgh County. After crossing into the state, fugitives, sometimes accompanied by Anti-Slavery League workers, might have taken a route that brought them into Gibson County, where they hid at James Cockrum’s barn in Oakland City. That barn no longer stands. From Cockrum’s place, fugitives might have traveled to Dr. John W. Posey’s coal mine in Pike County along the White River west of SR 57.

The most important Underground Railroad site in the Section 2 APE was the village of Dongola on the Patoka River in Columbia Township, Gibson County. Cockrum’s book contains numerous accounts of the activity of the Anti-Slavery League in the village, both smuggling slaves and driving off slave catchers. The covered bridge at Dongola was an important crossing
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through the wetlands along the Patoka River, and slave hunters often kept watch on the bridge to spot fleeing slaves. Cockrum credited the two proprietors of Dongola, William Carpenter and Isaac Street, with supporting the efforts of the League. Street, who was a Quaker, often hid escaped slaves in a cellar under his store in Dongola. On occasion, when the Dongola bridge was too closely watched, League members would ferry escaped slaves across the river on boats or use the canal aqueduct, which was approximately 1,000 feet east of the Dongola bridge. The bridge and store are no longer extant.

White families who sheltered slaves were part of a network that covered most of southern Indiana. From Vincennes to Terre Haute, Evansville to Gibson County, Boonville to Oakland City, to Petersburg and then on to Daviess and Greene counties, slaves trekked to safety, sometimes accompanied by Anti-Slavery Leaguers, sometimes traveling alone. In 1855, the Evansville Daily Journal reported that escaped slaves were captured at the home of John Carithers [or Carothers] near Princeton, Indiana. According to the article, Carithers was “at first not disposed to surrender them” but in the end he acquiesced. Carithers was lucky; there were no charges brought against him. Another man, Calvin Fairbanks, who lived near Evansville, was imprisoned for helping fugitive slaves. Peter Stephenson operated an Underground Railroad station in southwestern Daviess County along what is now SR 57. Other stations may have existed in the city of Washington in Daviess County.

Although their part is less celebrated, free blacks in Indiana are also known to have participated in the movement of slaves northward. According to some records, the home of William Hawkins, a free black living in the city of Washington in Daviess County, was a stop. Thomas Cole, an African American living at Lyles Settlement, also hid runaways, as did John Bundy from Evansville and Aunty Myears in Bloomington. These free blacks risked even more than their white counterparts with their Underground Railroad activity.

It is clear that the Underground Railroad was active in Indiana in the years prior to the Civil War. It is also true that the extent of activity is less than many current-day Indiana residents would like to believe. Nevertheless, slaves did enter the state by crossing the Ohio River and found a path to freedom. Extant above-ground resources positively identified as being associated with the Underground Railroad are few and written records of this movement are so scarce that some above-ground resources may remain unidentified. Still, enough locations of former barns, coal
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mines, and homes have been tracked so that the region can lay claim to its participation in this historic movement.\textsuperscript{55}

While the Underground Railroad movement was real, by the 1850s Indiana was not a friendly locale for free blacks or fugitive slaves. Indeed, the new state constitution of 1851 contained Article 13, which forbade blacks from settling in the state. This article was approved by a majority of Hoosiers. Hence, the presence of African Americans became much more fluid after 1851, with many blacks moving northward from Indiana to Canada.\textsuperscript{56}

Settlements/Town Building

The period from 1816 to 1825 was a period of unprecedented immigration into the state. Settlers came by way of or across the Ohio River, then moved up the south-flowing rivers into the center of the state. By the close of the period, the number of counties had climbed to fifty-two, almost all of the territory south of the Wabash River had been organized, and the line of settlement had reached the level of the future route of the National Road, roughly from Richmond to Indianapolis to Terre Haute.\textsuperscript{57}

Each county’s business was conducted at its county seat. Town builders coveted potential county-seat sites, for these were natural spots for people to carry out all kinds of commerce, in addition to governmental or political business. Every county in the southwestern region of Indiana, as well as throughout the state, established a county seat that became its administrative, political, and commercial center.

In almost every case, these seats of government developed in a predictable pattern beginning with the selection of commissioners to direct the process of governing the county. Oftentimes the county seat was platted with government buildings located at the heart of a center square and commercial buildings around them. The first log courthouses and jails of these county-seat towns no longer exist; most were replaced by more substantial brick or framed buildings as the communities grew and prospered. No examples of these early buildings are extant in the APE for Section 2. Gibson County completed a one-story brick courthouse in 1814. A larger brick courthouse replaced the first building in 1843. Daviess County did not complete its first courthouse until 1824. The county constructed a new courthouse in 1841. The first courthouse and jail in Pike County were log buildings. Completion of the first county jail was in 1819. The county’s first brick jail opened in 1853. The first brick courthouse was not built until 1868.\textsuperscript{58}
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In Daviess County, Washington Township contained the greatest concentration of early settlement because of the county seat at Washington. Early families and settlers in the township included those with the surnames Hawkins, Comers (or Commer), Coleman, Purcell, Ballow, Palmer, Flora, Jones, and Aikman. The new village of Washington was named the county seat in 1817 and the first lots sold the same year.59 Veale Township was named for James C. Veale, one of its early settlers and whose first land entry was dated 1807. Other early settlers in Veale Township included families with the surnames Palmer, Coleman, Lett, Chapman, Morgan, Wallace, and Goodman.60 The population of the region grew dramatically during the period of settlement. From an estimated population of 300 in 1810, Daviess County’s population grew to 3,432 in 1820, to 4,543 in 1830, and to 6,720 in 1840.61

In Pike County, with the county seat at Petersburg, early settlers in Washington and Madison townships included men and families with the surnames Ross, Arnold, Kruman, Lett, Brenton, Reading, Harrell, Coonrad, Miley, Campbell, Risby, and Tislow. The first settler in Jefferson Township likely was Richard Ainby, who arrived about 1815. The Hargrave, De Bruler, and Barret families were also early residents, and all came from North Carolina. Judge Hammond, who settled at Highbanks in 1819, was a rare migrant from New England. Names of other early families include Hays, Case, Miley, Hurst, Payn, Lacefield, Chappell, Shook, and Rowe. Early settlers in Logan Township included members of the Woodry, Kime, Knight, Johnson, McAtee, Barnes, Frederick, Snyder, and Loveless families.62 By the 1820 census, Pike County had 1,472 residents, and, by 1830, the population had grown to 2,464. In 1840, the population was 4,769.63

In Gibson County, Columbia Township, the only township from this county in the APE, was not created until 1825, although settlement of the township began about 1814. Early settlers included members of the Farmer, Dill, Harper, Barrett, Brown, Hargrove, Cockrum, and Wallace families.64 In 1820, the county had a population of 3,876. By 1830, the figure had grown to 5,417. In 1840, the population was 8,977.65

**Transportation**

River travel was the earliest means of transporting people and goods. The Ohio River and its tributary, the Wabash River, provided the main routes to export goods from southwestern Indiana to the Mississippi River and then on to New Orleans. River travel had provided farmers

---

60 Daviess County Interim Report, 60; Goodspeed, History of Knox and Daviess Counties, 591–92.
61 Fulkerson, History of Daviess County, 132. A source quoted in Esarey, History of Indiana, gives the 1820 population as 2,432 (p. 276) and the 1830 population as 4,512 (p. 315).
63 Esarey, History of Indiana, 276, 315; U.S. Decennial Census, 1840.
64 James T. Tartt and Company, History of Gibson County, 209–11.
65 Esarey, History of Indiana, 276, 315; U.S. Decennial Census, 1840.
with access to larger markets since the 1810s. By that decade, twenty-seven steamboats plied the Ohio River. In addition, individual farmers floated surplus crops via smaller waterways to the Ohio River on flatboats of their own construction. Once they reached the Ohio, they either made connections with a steamboat or continued down the Mississippi to New Orleans.  

Roads. In the 1820s, gains in population, surpluses in farm production, and the expanding trade of merchants made clear to political leaders that improvements in transportation facilities were greatly needed. Roads generally were in poor condition, full of obstacles such as stumps, impassably muddy in wet weather, and very dusty in dry weather. Overland travel was slow and often dangerous. State legislation gave authority to county commissioners for local roads and required males of certain age to perform road labor for a certain number of days a year.

The legislature also supported road construction with money from what was called the Three Per Cent Fund. The U.S. Congress set aside five percent of the net proceeds of land sold in Indiana for road building. Three percent of the money was placed at the disposal of the state legislature, which then disbursed it to the counties for road construction. Roads constructed with these funds were called “State Roads,” and the legislature designated their locations. The money provided to the counties usually was only enough to clear a rough path through the forest. This money also sometimes was used to build bridges. By the 1830s, counties had constructed several dozen state roads using money from the Three Per Cent Fund, with mixed results. Contemporaries observed that some of the roads were of great benefit to their users, while counties failed to maintain others, which became impassable and useless. Pike County made use of this money for roads at least as early as 1831 when Elijah Hammond was appointed commissioner of the Three Per Cent Fund for Pike County.

By 1828, several roads linked the main towns of the state. The road from Louisville to Vincennes passed through Washington in Daviess County. At Paoli in Orange County, this road crossed another road from Madison to New Harmony that passed through Petersburg in Pike County and Princeton in Gibson County. A road from Terre Haute to Evansville crossed the latter road in Princeton. Another road along the south edge of the state connected Louisville and Evansville.

Maps of the period show the network of roads linking different parts of the state. An 1831 map of Indiana shows a road from Washington, Daviess County, to Petersburg, Pike County, to Princeton, Gibson County, and a road from Princeton to Evansville. The map also shows a road
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leading south from Washington to about what is now Winslow in Patoka Township, Pike County, then continuing south to Booneville in Warrick County. The map does not show a road leading south from Petersburg to the future site of Dongola in Gibson County, although a State Road was constructed connecting these two points sometime in the first half of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{71} An 1852 map of Indiana shows a road from Petersburg to Dongola, although the road does not extend beyond Dongola. The map depicts a second road crossing the Patoka River a short distance west of Dongola that linked Petersburg and Evansville. Several other north-south roads are also depicted east of Dongola.\textsuperscript{72} The accuracy of this map may be somewhat in question, as just eight years later the same publisher issued another map of Indiana showing considerably fewer roads in the region than on the 1852 map. For instance, the road from Petersburg to Evansville is no longer depicted. However, the road from Petersburg to Dongola is still shown and still does not extend south of Dongola.\textsuperscript{73}

Private enterprise also played a role in developing transportation networks. Entrepreneurs in some locales helped the road-building process by establishing toll roads, operating ferries across rivers and streams to connect the few stretches of road available, and, for a short time at mid-century, operating and maintaining plank roads. Although they were the first really “smooth” surface roads encountered by many travelers, these plank roads did not last long because the green wood usually employed either did not cure well or rotted quickly and had to be replaced. Private enterprise also created stagecoach routes. One of the earliest routes, established in 1820, followed the Buffalo Trace or the post road to the north, passing through Washington on the latter, using whichever road seemed best before departure. This route continued in operation until it was superceded by the railroad just before the Civil War.\textsuperscript{74}

Canals. The financial success of the Erie Canal in New York State in the early decades of the nineteenth century initiated envy in neighboring states and prompted a move into programs of internal improvement. Along with Ohio and Illinois, Indiana was among the states that embarked on canal building.\textsuperscript{75} In 1827, Congress allotted a large land grant to Indiana for the purpose of building a canal that would eventually link the Great Lakes with the Ohio River. Construction on the Wabash and Erie Canal began in 1832 at Fort Wayne, Indiana; the state of Ohio was responsible for building a portion of the project from the Indiana state line, eastward,
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to the Lake Erie port city of Toledo. The canal made steady progress westward toward Lafayette and reached that village in 1842.\footnote{Gray, \textit{Transportation and the Early Nation}, 119.}

In 1836, the Indiana General Assembly approved the Mammoth Internal Improvement Plan with a goal of developing a profitable transportation infrastructure. Among the most costly and most difficult projects was the Wabash and Erie Canal (already in progress).\footnote{Esarey, \textit{Indiana Historical Society Publications}, n.p.; Fatout, \textit{Indiana Canals}, 72–73; Gray, \textit{Transportation and the Early Nation}, 116–18.} The Panic of 1837 and the subsequent financial uncertainty throughout the country put a damper on funding for large projects, and Indiana had difficulty selling bonds for its internal improvement program. Canal building in Indiana founndered for a number of years, but a second federal land grant helped to finance the continuation of the Wabash and Erie to Terre Haute, which it reached in 1849.\footnote{Warner, “Influence of the Wabash and Erie Canal,” vol. 5, 12–15.}

\section*{Agriculture}

Agricultural advancements in the antebellum era transpired slowly. While the earliest settlers continued to be primarily subsistence farmers, they gradually increased the acreage under plow and began to have some surplus crops to sell. The first crop usually was corn, which was used to feed both humans and beast. Agricultural production and methods began to change and improve slowly over this period, and pioneer houses were gradually replaced with more substantial dwellings.

As families arrived on the frontier, they immediately began to alter the landscape. They cut, slashed, and burned the forests in order to open sections for farming. This clearing occurred slowly, with families extending the tillable area on a field-by-field basis. Tilling was primitive, often with a farmer using a “jumping shovel” plow, which cut through small roots and jumped over large ones.\footnote{Nolan, “Agricultural Development,” 26.}

As settlers lived on, improved, and farmed the land, the early lean-to structures became animal shelters or raw materials for other buildings. The average farmer began building single- or double-pen log cabins. These log houses differed from their predecessors in that the logs were dressed and squared with chinking to fill the spaces between; the corners were joined using various methods of notching; and the roofs were shingled. There were windows, and a door led into the interior space. As the family grew, outbuilding additions or whole wings, often referred to as “ells,” were added to accommodate the newcomers. Chimneys during this period were sometimes constructed of a wattle-and-daub mixture, stone rubble, or a combination of both on the outside and a stone hearth on the interior. Some of these later log homes were covered with clapboard siding and became the structural basis for much larger frame-construction dwellings or...
service buildings. As time passed and more time and money became available, some very prosperous farmers shifted to brick as their choice of building material.

Only a few farmhouses from this early period survive in the study area. A log house, although heavily altered, still survives in the APE in Washington Township, Daviess County (Daviess 30031). Two brick houses of this period are located in southern Daviess County (Daviess 30030 [in APE], Daviess 35008 [in study area]). Several surviving houses of the period have a mix of Federal and Greek Revival stylistic elements, for example the Aikman House (Daviess 30008) or the Williams House (Daviess 30012), both located in the study area. Other houses of the period are vernacular, such as the house on the Chapman-Allison Farmstead (Daviess 35001), located in the APE.

Toward the end of the period, the typical farmstead included domestic buildings such as a kitchen, smokehouse, perhaps a washhouse, and privy, and agricultural buildings, including barns and occasionally outbuildings. Many barns were constructed of logs and other small log outbuildings held animals or tools. For the most part, chickens, hogs, and cattle foraged rather than being held in enclosures. Typically, tilled fields were fenced with brush or rocks to keep out foraging animals.

In 1850, the average size of the Hoosier farm was still relatively small at 136 acres. Owners and their families farmed the majority, although some farms were large enough to require hired help. Farmers sometimes built larger houses or separate quarters to accommodate hired help. To lessen the need for seasonal labor, neighbors sometimes cooperatively harvested crops and slaughtered meat.

Corn was the mainstay of much of the agricultural economy, a product for barter and cash crops. Early farmers converted corn to flour or to whiskey for transport to distant markets. Later, they fed corn to hogs and marketed the hogs. Farmers drove their hogs to town on foot, where they were sold for slaughter before being sent down the river to larger markets. This was the underpinning for what later became known as the corn-hog economy.

As the population increased in southwestern Indiana and the economy slowly changed from subsistence agriculture to commercial agriculture, pressure grew to reclaim otherwise uncultivable land, including the wetlands of the Wabash Lowlands. Up to this time, settlers had viewed wetlands as a hindrance to their farming and settlement and a source for disease. Unfamiliar with the techniques of artificial drainage, farmers initially were skeptical of such techniques. However, as growing pressure on the land increased the value of land above the cost

81 Thornbrough, Indiana in the Civil War, 369. According to one person interviewed by Linda Weintraut with Paul Schenk in Posey County, August 22, 2002, his family built a large house in 1864 to house hired help when necessary.
of drainage and as a few successful drainage projects created precedent, farmers’ changed their attitudes toward the idea of drainage.\textsuperscript{82}

Individual farmers carried out the earliest drainage projects, but inadequate capital and the distance to outlets for the water hindered large-scale projects. The ditching of public roads in some areas led to improvements in the productivity of adjacent fields, providing an object lesson about the benefits of larger drainage projects. The state legislature authorized the first large-scale drainage project in 1807 in Knox County. Between 1807 and 1848, the legislature authorized three countywide drainage acts (Vigo, Spencer, and Vanderburgh counties), as well as drainage projects in seven smaller areas. None of these were in Section 2. Finally, the legislature passed a general drainage law in 1852.\textsuperscript{83}

**Industry**

Local industry initially focused on transforming raw materials into finished products easily shipped to markets outside their immediate vicinity. In addition, local blacksmiths, tanners, coopers, and millers processed raw materials for use by local citizens. Hence, agriculture-related industries—distilleries, milling, pork packing—and extractive industries, such as localized mining, were most prevalent in southwestern Indiana.

Distilleries, woolen mills, and gristmills were located in and around many towns in the study area during this era. Many were small. As milling grew, warehouses and other buildings were needed; this growth, along with a greater demand for clapboard siding to cover log buildings, created demand for local lumber cut at sawmills.\textsuperscript{84} In Pike County, Thomas Milbourn operated a sawmill on Pride’s Creek in 1822. Henry Miley built a horse-powered gristmill in 1824. Jacob Stuckey built a saw and gristmill in 1830, but the mill was only in operation to 1838. In 1826, John Youngman built a mill and distillery in what is now Petersburg. Fire destroyed these buildings in 1831. John Graham built the first steam-powered mill in the county in 1838 in Petersburg. Samuel Stuckey opened a tannery in Petersburg in 1828. The tannery operated for about fifty years. Isaac Loveless built a mill in Logan Township in 1830.\textsuperscript{85} In Daviess County, a mill in Washington operated under oxen power at an early date.\textsuperscript{86} Larger towns in Gibson County often boasted flourmills, tanneries, sawmills, and blacksmith shops in addition to gristmills and distilleries.\textsuperscript{87} None of them are extant due to fires and deterioration over time.
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Some were razed for residential development. No industrial buildings or structures of this period are known to be extant in the APE.

Education
When Indiana became a state in 1816 the first state constitution called for the proceeds of land sold from Section 16 in each township to pay for common schools. Although this means of funding education would prove insufficient, some Indiana pioneers began schools as they settled in the fledgling state. Early educational experiences also occurred in homes, where parents taught children to read.

Although the constitution called for common schools, they were rare; “subscription schools,” one for which parents paid a small tuition for their children to attend, were more typical. Subscription schools were open to all for the price of a small tuition or for in-kind goods or services. Private schools were another means of educating children in early Indiana. Many children in southern Indiana got their first learning experience outside their homes in a Sunday school. Privately funded and often taught by the area’s leading citizens, Sunday schools were an important aspect of early Indiana’s ad hoc educational system. There were one hundred Sunday schools in Indiana by 1829.  

By 1840, schools were being established wherever there was settlement. While the 1840 Census showed that less than one-quarter of Indiana’s school-aged children attended school, new schools continued to spring up across the land.

A school operated in Veale Township, Daviess County, in 1819. This school served students from both Veale and Washington townships. Veale Township’s first permanent school building opened in 1828. A second school district in the township was established as early as 1822. A third school district was established in 1839. In Washington Township, schools were constructed as early as the 1820s. District 1 in Maysville used a school constructed in 1840. District 2 had a school building as early as 1823. District 3 had a school built in 1840. Lettsville received a school in 1840. District 6 at Sugarland used a school built in 1820. Other districts’ schools also dated to this early period. Most of these early schools used log buildings, some of which were reused from earlier functions, such as churches. By mid-century, some districts were able to replace their log buildings with frame buildings.

In 1840, Gibson County had one academy/grammar school and seventeen primary and common schools and Pike County had one academy/grammar school and twelve primary and common schools. By 1850, there were sixty-one public schools in Gibson County, but only eleven in Pike County.
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Religion

Constitutional freedom guaranteed Indiana pioneers the right to choose their religion without governmental interference. This created a veritable marketplace of denominations available in southwestern Indiana.\textsuperscript{91} Those denominations that evangelized renewal and God’s grace, the Methodists and Baptists, appealed more to Hoosiers than did most other denominations. The Presbyterians, although generally a more staid group, sent more than three hundred missionaries to Indiana, and those numbers paid off for them in church plantings.\textsuperscript{92} By 1850, Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian churches accounted for 1,488, or 73 percent, of the 2,032 churches in the state.\textsuperscript{93} Despite the presence of a large group of early Quaker settlers in Pike County, these Quakers could not sustain a congregation and converted to other denominations.\textsuperscript{94}

The dominance of the Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian churches also reflects the Southern origins of many of the early settlers. The Presbyterian church already had a strong presence among the Scotch-Irish settlers from the Upland South. Many other Southern settlers were of mixed ethnic background with no common religious identity and with a strong love of independence and distrust of authority. Less centrally organized denominations like the Methodists and Baptists held greater appeal for such settlers than other more established Protestant religions.\textsuperscript{95}

Besides being religious centers, churches were also community centers. Church services, at first held in the homes of settlers, offered respite from toil and a reason for pioneers to come together. They presented opportunities for young people to meet and court “neighbors” who might live miles away. They also provided town fathers a forum in which to discuss solutions for problems and offer thanks for blessings. Churches were important elements in town building. By the 1820s and 1830s, towns were competing for residents and county offices. Sometimes churches, following their congregants, abandoned failing towns. Oftentimes a cemetery was established on church property. Long after congregations have abandoned the physical church, cemeteries speak of their importance to the settlement of the area. No churches of this period are known to be extant in the APE.

Early Methodist congregations, like those of other denominations, initially met in private homes or public school buildings until a church could be erected. Early churches often were of log construction and were located on land donated by a church member. A circuit rider served the early Methodist churches. The Reverend George Wallace, the first circuit rider in this part of the
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state, had a circuit more than four hundred miles in length. In between visits of the circuit rider, local preachers served the congregations.

A Methodist congregation, Bethel Church, formed in Washington Township, Daviess County, early in the nineteenth century. However, the bulk of the local Methodist population eventually settled in Veale Township. Due to the poor roads, the original site of the Bethel Church became inaccessible and a new church was constructed in Veale Township. This second church was completed in 1840. An adjacent cemetery (Daviess 35003), located in the APE, was established shortly after completion of the building. In 1860, a Washington Circuit was organized consisting of several local churches, including Bethel.⁹⁶

Methodist congregations also formed in Pike County at an early date, although none were in the Section 2 APE. The first Methodist Episcopal Church in Pike County was in Jefferson Township. A band of settlers from North Carolina established a log church for that denomination in the east part of the township in 1822. Settlers from Kentucky founded another early Methodist congregation in eastern Jefferson Township in the early nineteenth century.⁹⁷ A Methodist congregation formed in Petersburg in 1828.⁹⁸

A Baptist congregation was formed in Daviess County in July 1823, now the Veale Creek Baptist Church. At first, members met in the homes of other members. Like the Methodists, this congregation had to share the services of a circuit rider with other churches. Although the congregation decided to build a church as early as 1825, the building was not completed until 1839. By the 1840s, other Baptist congregations were splitting off from the initial group. The Veale Creek Baptist Church completed their second church building in 1851.⁹⁹ A cemetery (Daviess 30033) was established with the church. This cemetery is located in the APE of Section 2. A Baptist minister served congregations in Pike County beginning in 1825.¹⁰⁰

The Cumberland Presbyterian congregation in Pike County formed a church in Petersburg in 1821, reportedly the first in the state. A mainstream Presbyterian Church formed in Petersburg in 1848.¹⁰¹

Conclusion
The period from statehood to 1850 in the Section 2 APE was one with a general trend of organization. Two of the three counties (Pike and Daviess) had been established in
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1813]) and many of the townships were established during this period. The numbers of settlers expanded rapidly, and villages began to form. The county and state governments focused attention on infrastructure improvements. The counties built courthouses and jails and later replaced them with new buildings. The state provided money to the counties to build roads and attempted to finance construction of a canal system, although ultimately the canal would only be completed on a reduced scale, after this period ended, and with private funding. While agriculture remained primarily a subsistence activity, farms were able to generate some surplus for export, and many farmers were able to build more substantial, even more fashionable, houses. Industries, educational efforts, and religious institutions became somewhat more prevalent and began to have a larger, although still limited, impact on the study area.

The Civil War Era: 1851–1880

No event so dominated the history of southwestern Indiana, the entire state, and the nation, as did the Civil War. The period preceding the war was filled with tension and debate over the meaning of nation and republic. The nation was consumed by war news; death tolls staggered the imagination and touched nearly every segment of society. Even Indiana, a state that experienced only a few minor skirmishes within its borders, was focused on its contribution to the war effort. Moreover, the effect of the war was felt beyond the years of the actual conflict. In the postwar world Hoosiers faced a financial boom and then panic. Of course, these national and economic events affected the built environment of Indiana.

Despite national turmoil over slavery and state’s rights, the future for Hoosiers appeared bright in 1851. For the state of Indiana, that year marked a milestone—the revision of the state constitution. The new document was a forward-looking constitution tempered by past mistakes. Fiscal restraint was incorporated into the document—no longer would deficit spending be part of the state’s budget—and education for all children was its promise.

At the same time, farmers were selling surplus crops and looking for ways to increase production. The first Indiana State Fair took place in 1851. Two years later, the Wabash and Erie Canal was finally completed to Evansville, and Union Station opened in the capital; the era of the railroad began.

As one might expect, the Civil War halted most building projects and changed the function of some sites, structures, and buildings to fit wartime needs. By war’s end, the country was caught in the midst of a postwar boom as the survivors fervently sought to return to normal life. Normal life included adjustment to the gradual industrial growth of the state and the mechanization of farming. The next thirty years witnessed transformations in the economic, social, and cultural life of southwestern Indiana. A network of railroads provided access to distant markets for local farmers and artisan workshops gave way to the factory system. These changes were reflected in the buildings and the landscape that people created.
Settlements/Town Building

In addition to the political need for county seats, entrepreneurial endeavor often sparked town building in southwestern Indiana and throughout the state. Many towns grew from settlements along well-traveled transportation routes or at the convergence of two or more routes of transportation for the commercial advantages that they afforded. These routes were navigable waterways, roads, railroads (later in the period), or some combination of these. Large waterways, such as the White, Patoka, and Wabash Rivers, as well as the Ohio River on the state’s southern border, served as thoroughfares for flatboats and keelboats, and by the 1830s steamboats plied the rivers, taking people and goods around the entire region. Along rivers, streams, rivulets, and later canals, people gathered at post offices, stores, stage depots, churches, and inns to socialize. Commercial settlements often grew around mills, which served as meeting places for locals. Roads, and later railroads, radiated from and ran between these locations.

William Carpenter and Isaac Street laid out the village of Dongola in Columbia Township, Gibson County, in March 1851 on the south bank of the Patoka River close to where the Wabash and Erie Canal would soon cross the river. A “state road,” called such because it was constructed with state funding, leading south from Petersburg also crossed the river at this location on a covered bridge. The village became a shipping point for the surrounding area, by boat on the canal and by flatboat on the river. Pork packing was prominent in the village during its height in the 1850s. Boats also carried tobacco, corn, and flour from Dongola. Isaac Street operated a store in the village, in which he would hide runaway slaves on the Underground Railroad. When the canal ceased operation, the village lost most of its economic base and slowly died. By 1881, the village contained only a school, a sawmill, and a small handful of houses. By 1903, Dongola only existed as a place name on a map and was no longer recognizable as a village on maps.

James W. Cockrum and Warrick Hargrove filed a plat for Oakland, now Oakland City, in Columbia Township, Gibson County, in January 1856. At the time, the Straight Line Railroad was under construction and was to pass through the vicinity. However, in 1856 the railroad company went out of business and the railroad was left unfinished. Merchants and craftsmen slowly began to congregate in the village even without the railroad. A blacksmith shop opened in 1856, and both a carriage and wagon shop and a cooper shop opened in 1857. A school opened in the village in 1860. A subscription school called the Oakland Institute opened in 1867. The school reorganized as Oakland City College in 1885. A railroad finally arrived in Oakland City when the Louisville, Evansville and St. Louis Railroad was constructed in the 1870s. The Indianapolis and Evansville Railroad followed before 1881. By 1884, several
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gristmills, a barrel factory, and a tile and brick works were in operation in the town, and the town was prosperous enough to support a photographer, attorneys, several hotels, and a newspaper.\textsuperscript{105}

Elijah, Nathaniel, and Samuel Alford laid out the Pike County village that bears their name in November 1856. As with Oakland, its founders expected Alford to be on the route of the Straight Line Railroad, for which the men were contractors. The village had started as a camp for men employed in constructing the grade for the railroad. However, work on the railroad ceased for a period of years, and, when work resumed, the route of the railroad had changed to go north through Petersburg, rather than northeast through Alford and Highbanks. As a result, the village never lived up to its grandiose seventy-four-block plat, although it survived with a moderate prosperity. At one time, the village featured a school, church, livery stable, hotel, gristmill, blacksmith shop, two stores, and a poultry-packing business.\textsuperscript{106}

Stephen R. Hosmer laid out a village on lands he owned along the Wabash and Erie Canal in Pike County in February 1854 and named the village for himself. Although some early improvements, including a steam-powered mill, were made to the village, the failure of the canal stifled the growth of the village. In 1882, the Evansville and Indianapolis Railroad passed just east of the village, inaugurating another period of growth. Initially lumbering provided work to residents of the village and later coal mining was the primary occupation. During the early twentieth century, a pioneering businesswoman from Petersburg, Mary Glezen, traveled to Hosmer every Sunday to teach Sunday School in one of the village churches. In 1939, the town was renamed Glezen in her honor.\textsuperscript{107}

More ephemeral communities developed as well. In 1850, A. J. Johnson discovered a mineral spring in the northwest corner of Logan Township, in Pike County, which developed into a small resort named West Saratoga Springs. By 1881, the location was prominent enough to have a post office, store, hotel, and school.\textsuperscript{108} Rumbletown, also in Logan Township, developed in the late nineteenth century and had two stores, a school, a church, and a cream station. Strip mining caused the community to be abandoned.\textsuperscript{109} Willisville was little more than a cluster of houses and a grocery store along SR 57 in Washington Township, Pike County, and was not officially named until 1962.\textsuperscript{110}
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In addition to Dongola and Hosmer/Glezen, the canal spurred the founding or growth of a number of other towns, such as Maysville, Plainville, and Elnora in Daviess County.\textsuperscript{111} Many, like Plainville, Maysville, and Dongola, declined rapidly after the canal closed.\textsuperscript{112} Coal mines also created villages, such as South Washington, which was laid out in 1874 in Daviess County.\textsuperscript{113}

**Race/Ethnicity/Migration**

The population of all three counties in the Section 2 APE doubled during this period, although Daviess and Gibson counties grew more than Pike County. The population of Daviess County in 1850 was 10,352. This figure grew to 13,325 in 1860, to 16,747 in 1870, and to 21,552 by 1880.\textsuperscript{114} The population of Gibson County grew from 10,771 in 1850 to 14,532 in 1860. By 1870, the county’s population was 17,371, and ten years later, it reached 22,742. The population of Pike County grew from 7,720 in 1850, to 10,078 in 1860, to 13,779 in 1870, and to 16,383 in 1880.\textsuperscript{115}

Foreign-born residents made up only a small part of the population of these three counties. Despite the large ethnic German presence in parts of southwestern Indiana, the numbers of Germans in the Section 2 study area were relatively small. In 1870, Daviess County had far more residents of Irish birth than residents of German birth. Pike and Gibson counties each had more residents of German birth than Daviess County, but their numbers were still small compared to the overall population.\textsuperscript{116}

**Transportation**

*Roads.* Poor roads inhibited the state’s development in the mid-nineteenth century. In the 1850s, roads were in some cases little more than a flattened stretch of ground, sometimes still dotted with stumps, linking two or more points of settlement. As the population increased in southwestern Indiana, the number of roads grew and to some extent they improved.

An 1860 map of Indiana shows that a network of roads crossed the region, linking many of the various settlements by that year, although many roads certainly were present earlier. County seats, such as Petersburg and Washington, served as hubs in the road system. Eight roads met at Petersburg, and seven roads met at Washington. One of these roads connected the two cities and
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then continued south to Dongola on the Patoka River. Not all roads passed through a county seat. One road crossed central Pike County just north of the Patoka River and connected Patoka in Gibson County with what is now Winslow in Pike County.\(^\text{117}\)

In the 1870s, the general assembly passed an act giving the county commissioners responsibility for improving and maintaining free turnpikes. County commissioners were responsive to local requests for additional roads and maintained them as well as possible by continuing to use the corvee, or “shared labor” system, which required landowners to work on the roads a certain number of hours per year. Commissioners also worked with owners of ferries and toll roads to determine reasonable fares. Irrespective of improvements and advances in technology, road construction remained primitive, and surfacing was still limited to gravel, rock, or a waterbound macadam surface that required frequent and extensive repairs.\(^\text{118}\)

The 1876 state atlas is an early detailed source for road locations.\(^\text{119}\) Columbia Township, Gibson County, was well supplied with roads at that time, most of which ran with the cardinal directions. Roads provided access to most of Pike County as well, although many of these roads zigzagged or ran at angles to the grid of the land survey system. A road led from Petersburg, Pike County, to Dongola, Gibson County, at that time, and what is now Meridian Road ran from Petersburg straight south over the Patoka River to the south line of Patoka Township. The alignment of the road through Dongola is roughly the same as that of the present-day County Road 300 West. Furthermore, the Dongola crossing is part of a route leading roughly southwest from Petersburg to Evansville, although a large gap in this road exists south of Dongola through much of Columbia Township, Gibson County. Possibly, these were two separate segments of road that happened to coincide and may well have been portions of the two roads in the area depicted on the 1852 map. The atlas shows five other roads in Pike County crossing the Patoka River east of Dongola.\(^\text{120}\) A road comparable to today’s SR 57 runs northeast from Petersburg to the White River. A road comparable to today’s SR 61 leads southeast from Petersburg to Winslow. The map of Daviess County shows only a few roads in Veale Township, one of which is comparable to SR 57 leading to Washington. As in Pike County, few roads in the south part of Daviess County are based on the section lines.\(^\text{121}\)

**Bridges.** By 1852, the Indiana General Assembly had enacted a statute allowing companies to incorporate to erect and maintain private toll bridges in the state. Three years later, the authority and responsibility for public bridge building and repair was transferred from township trustees to

---

the county commissioners. The first substantial bridges were covered timber-truss bridges; if maintained these bridges were long-lived, though expensive. Covered wood road bridges remained popular in use and design until the last decade of the nineteenth century when iron-truss bridges became the standard. No covered bridges are present in the APE, and few of these bridges remain in southwestern Indiana.

Canals. In 1850, the state relinquished ownership of the Wabash and Erie to a consortium of businessmen. The new owners pushed the lower portion of the canal south, and it reached Evansville in 1853. This final section completed the project, and for seven years the canal was fully operational from Toledo, Ohio, to Evansville, Indiana. In 1860, the Terre Haute-to-Evansville portion of the canal closed, and with the exception of point-to-point operations between towns, the canal ceased to exist as a link between the Great Lakes and the Ohio River. The owners of the canal officially ended operations in 1874.

The portion of the canal from Petersburg to Evansville was expected to be the portion that would be most expensive to construct, due in large part to the crossing of the Patoka River valley. Operation of the canal required the construction of earthen embankments to raise the canal above the floodplain of the river. The embankments were as high as thirty feet in some locations. In addition, the canal would cross the river on an aqueduct. An aqueduct also carried the canal over the White River and into Daviess County northeast of Petersburg.

Canal workers, mostly Irish immigrants, performed most of the excavation work on the canal. These workers were housed in diggers camps along the canal. These camps consisted of temporary, flimsily built boarding shanties, the largest of which could house bunks for fifty or more men. Because of the extensive excavation and embankments required at the Patoka River and through the northern part of Gibson County, this area had a larger than average number of workers present. At least one hundred shanties lined the canal between Hosmer in Pike County and Francisco in Gibson County. Unscrupulous locals operated drinking dens in small cabins or on boats in the river close to these camps.

The close quarters and unsanitary conditions led to outbreaks of disease, especially cholera. A cholera outbreak in the summer and fall of 1850 killed at least one thousand people along the canal from Patoka Summit in Pike County to Pigeon Summit in Gibson County. The ensuing panic created by this and other outbreaks caused workers to flee the area and delayed the completion of the canal. A cholera outbreak in 1852 killed a number of canal workers in the camps near Plainville and Sandy Hook; many victims were buried near Sandy Hook, although
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the location is unknown today. Nature also played a role in delaying the completion of the canal. A flood along the White River in 1852 damaged the portion of the canal between Newberry in Greene County and Maysville in Daviess County. The banks of the canal between Maysville and Petersburg in Pike County proved to have inadequate strength and had to be reinforced and consolidated.

The Wabash and Erie Canal was given land grants through the Vincennes Land Office to help fund construction through Daviess County. The Washington Canal Land Office was authorized to sell more than fifty thousand acres of land. About thirty miles of the canal were constructed through the west edge of the county along the White River. The canal was about forty feet wide and four feet deep, plus two feet above the water line to the top of the banks. Six canal locks, all of the Timber Crib plan, were located along the canal in Daviess County, including one at Sandy Hook. In addition to the aqueduct over the White River, an aqueduct carried the canal over Prairie Creek northwest of Washington. Only one canal lock, a Timbercrib lock at what is now Glezen, was present in Pike County. There were two aqueducts in Pike County, crossing the Patoka and While rivers.

Almost immediately after beginning operation, the southern division of the canal, as well as the canal as a whole, faced strong competition with the railroads. In March 1859, the canal was divided into three sections and leased to private companies. The Southern Indiana Canal Company, headed by Ziba H. Cook, Marvin A. Lawrence, Goodlet Morgan, and others, leased most of the southern division (Point Commerce to Evansville). However, in 1860, the lessees of the Terre Haute to Newberry section of the canal abandoned that section, cutting off the southern division from the rest of the canal. Limited travel on the canal between Petersburg and Evansville continued through the 1860 season before ending for good in 1861.

The canal created a boom and bust situation for many communities. The prospect of the canal created high hopes and led to the formation of many villages along its path. These same villages tended to mostly, if not entirely, disappear after the canal closed. Even established communities felt the effects. The building of the canal brought an economic boom to Petersburg. Warehouses for shipping on the canal were constructed, and pork packing and produce shipping became important industries. With the demise of the canal and no immediate railroad connection, Petersburg’s flush times disappeared. No buildings directly associated with the canal are
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known to survive in the Section 2 APE. Some houses and commercial buildings in the study area display the wealth and prosperity that the canal brought to the region.

Although few canal period above-ground resources survive in or near the Section 2 APE, canal sites in other areas help illustrate typical building or structure types that might have been found along the canal in Daviess, Pike, and Gibson counties. Small mills generated power from the water in the canal, especially at canal locks. Villages might contain small commercial buildings, often with Italianate-style details and sometimes with false fronts. Villages might also contain hotels or inns to provide lodging and meals for travelers on the canal. Generally, houses would have been vernacular or would have displayed elements of the Greek Revival or Italianate styles.¹³¹

None of the locks or aqueducts in Daviess County survives, although remnants of the stone abutments of the aqueduct reportedly can be seen during low water at the base of the railroad bridge that occupies the site today. During construction of the Evansville and Indianapolis Railroad, most of the track was laid along the towpath of the canal between Petersburg and Newberry in Greene County. Some portions of the canal profile can still be seen north of Washington, but the construction of SR 57 alongside the railroad destroyed the canal profile through Veale Township in the APE.¹³²

A few traces of the canal are still visible in Gibson and Pike counties. In Gibson County, a portion of County Road 50 North east of County Road 950 East is raised above the level of the surrounding land, and, according to a 1903 map, this portion of the road corresponds to a road alongside the canal.¹³³ This section of road may be part of the raised bed of the canal. Part of the raised bed of the canal survives in Pike County between SR 57 and the Patoka River north of the site of the aqueduct and is marked by a historical marker. A portion of the canal survives as wetlands along County Road 125 West in Pike County south of Willisville.¹³⁴

**Railroads.** Railroads became a functional part of the transportation landscape during this era, allowing towns and villages in southwestern Indiana to grow as centers for importing goods and exporting coal, agricultural surplus, and limestone to regional markets. Engineers, politicians, and railroad financiers alike sought ways to push railroads. Track mileage in the state grew from an initial 228 miles in 1850 to 2,163 miles by 1860, and reached 6,471 miles by 1900.¹³⁵ The
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Ohio and Mississippi Railroad was constructed through Washington in Daviess County in 1857. The railroad connected St. Louis and Cincinnati and brought rapid growth to Washington.\footnote{Taylor, \textit{Indiana: A New Historical Guide}, 262.}

Although a few short lines were built prior to the Civil War, the major push to build rail lines came in the 1870s and 1880s. The development of these lines in southwestern counties (such as Daviess, Greene, Gibson, Knox, and Vigo) provided a means for mines to transport coal to local and distant markets. Small regional companies operating under names such as the Evansville and Terre Haute Railroad, the Ohio and Mississippi Railroad, the Terre Haute and Southeastern Railroad, and the Louisville, Evansville and St. Louis Railroad, made the mining and shipping of coal, and later, limestone, a profitable business. (Many of these smaller companies were absorbed into larger ones in a massive consolidation period in the late nineteenth century.) By 1880, the major towns in southwestern Indiana were linked by rail, and the steam railroad was the most important form of contemporary transportation.\footnote{Phillips, \textit{Indiana in Transition}, 224; \textquotedblleft Map - Railroads in Indiana in 1880.	extquotedblright http://php.iupui.edu/~kmbeidel/Indiana/images (accessed 2003; site now discontinued).} In addition, railroad machine shops provided one of the few industries in the area. In 1862, the Ohio and Mississippi Railroad constructed machine shops in Washington.\footnote{Taylor, \textit{Indiana: A New Historical Guide}, 262.}

Railroads also provided farmers with quicker access to distant markets and the state’s citizens with a relatively rapid way to travel. Railroads transformed the landscape of southwestern Indiana with the construction of completely new features, such as the rail lines themselves, bridges, tunnels, depots, water towers, spurs to mines and quarries, as well as raised sections of right-of-way when later rail lines were removed. Towns were established at points along the lines to take advantage of rail travel.

Railroad bridges are particularly noteworthy symbols of the rail landscape. Early railroad bridges in the state were covered wood; however, it became apparent that the combination of a spark-spewing engine and a wood-truss bridge was antithetical to safety and a long life span for the bridges. After 1870, railroads opted for the new lighter, stronger iron-truss bridge to serve their needs.\footnote{Cooper, \textit{Iron Monuments}, 5–7.}

\textbf{Agriculture}

By the 1850s, improvements in farm equipment and the widening markets afforded by railroads were beginning to change farming in some areas of southwestern Indiana. Yields increased in the flatlands and new farm buildings were built. At various times during this era new equipment was introduced to help the farmer reduce workload and increase yield. Powered by either teams of mules or horses, the walking gang plow, spring tooth harrow, and hay loader helped to better prepare the soil, plant seeds, and harvest hay. Farmers celebrated their prowess at county fairs;
the first state fair was held in Indianapolis in 1851. However, in areas of hilly, rough terrain farming did not significantly change during these years.\textsuperscript{140} Corn had long been a mainstay of the economy and a cash crop, but farmers also raised other grain crops, including oats and wheat. By 1880, Gibson County ranked first in the amount of wheat grown in Indiana.\textsuperscript{141} Farm animals consumed grain. Hence, after 1870, granaries were constructed to hold grain for farm use. Barns grew in size to shelter the growing numbers of horses, mules, and cattle as well as to provide storage space for the hay and straw that was not stacked outside the barn in a haystack. No barns from this period are known to be extant in the APE.

Although widespread skepticism of drainage existed prior to 1860, by 1880 it was clear to most farmers that wide-scale drainage was economically feasible. There were two categories of drainage efforts: preventive and remedial. Preventive drainage sought to keep excess water from reaching the reclaimed land. Remedial drainage sought to increase the speed with which excess water was cleared from land. Both surface and subsurface techniques were used in the Wabash Lowlands to achieve these goals. Surface methods of preventive drainage included holding back water with a levee, diverting water with a ditch, or a combination of the two. Subsurface methods included tile interceptor drains and physically breaking up impermeable layers in the subsoil. Ditching was also used for remedial drainage. Ditching efforts ranged from clearing obstructions from natural drainage channels to deepening and straightening such channels, as was attempted with Houchins Ditch along the Patoka River in Pike and Gibson counties. The size of ditches ranged from a single plow furrow to ditches large enough to contain the flow of a river. Where natural channels were unavailable, large dredged ditches were constructed as an outlet for tile and surface field drains.\textsuperscript{142} Farm buildings increased in number, with individual buildings accommodating specific activities on the farm. Prior to the Civil War, farm buildings were constructed of undressed logs. Later barns were built of hewn logs and sided with sawn lumber. The growing inventory of new farm machinery brought about a change in size and, to some extent, a change in purpose for farm buildings of the period. As the number of work animals increased, the need for stabling facilities grew. Barn floors also served some farmers as the site for threshing activities.

Domestic outbuildings also increased in number in this era, as farm families constructed buildings to serve different farm functions. These outbuildings included summer kitchens, smokehouses, washhouses, privies, and storage buildings or structures, such as root and fruit cellars. Most domestic outbuildings were small rectangular structures of log, and later, frame
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construction with gable or shed roofs. Gardens and orchards were also typically part of the farmstead.\textsuperscript{143}

Farmhouses gradually underwent a transformation during this era as well. In the 1850s and 1860s, the round-log or hewn-log cabins of the frontier era gave way to timber-framed buildings covered with clapboard siding. Porches served to shelter entrances and to provide outdoor living spaces in the warm seasons. Toward the end of this era, the lighter and less expensive balloon-frame construction began to be used, especially in additions to the primary log house.\textsuperscript{144}

Popular house styles of the period include the Greek Revival and Italianate. Interest in the Greek Revival style was stimulated not only by the availability of architectural handbooks promoting the style, but also by patriotic associations with the birthplace of democracy and identification with the Greek struggle for independence. Carpenter-builders and masons appreciated the Greek Revival because it is based on the column and lintel and did not use the arch or vault seen in Renaissance and Roman inspired architecture. However, carpenter-builders and masons were limited in knowledge and example to what they saw in builders’ manuals; as a result, they sometimes constructed houses in vernacular adaptations of the style rather than in full-scale examples. Often an older farmhouse might be updated into the Greek Revival style by applying wide entablature boards, reducing the pitch of the roof, accenting the corners with pilasters or wide boards, and/or adding a paneled door.\textsuperscript{145}

As the picturesque movement became fashionable closer to the middle of the century, the Italianate style became one of the leading styles for farmhouses and most other buildings. Like the Greek Revival, the Italianate style was spread largely through plans in builders’ guides and other publications. Although ideally the Italianate style was to display the picturesque through informal design and application of ornament, many early Italianate houses displayed a lingering preference for simple and symmetrical forms similar to those of the earlier Federal and Greek Revival periods. Such houses were more practical, familiar, and economical than the high style Italianate houses. However, instead of the entablature of the Greek Revival, Italianate houses had a cornice board and conspicuous brackets. Taller and narrower windows and picturesque porches also distinguished the two styles.\textsuperscript{146}

Surviving houses of this period in the APE include the vernacular John A. Horrall House in Daviess County (Daviess 35002), the Italianate Bradfield House in Pike County (Pike 05008), and the Lemuel R. Hargrave House in Pike County (Pike 05011), which displays Greek Revival elements. Unfortunately, there are few extant examples of complete farmsteads in the study area.
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from the years prior to 1880; many were updated during the golden age of agriculture, which occurred between 1881 and 1920.

**Mining**

*Coal.* As early as the 1850s, one million tons of coal was mined per year in Indiana; some served local needs and the rest traveled by rail to market. As the rate of rail building rapidly increased across southwestern Indiana after the Civil War, it became much easier to transport coal. Towns were established where coal mines and rail lines intersected. Washington in Daviess County had the good fortune to already exist where a railroad and coal seam would meet. In 1857, a vein of coal was discovered in a grade cut for the new Ohio and Mississippi Railroad near the city. The discovery caused a population boom in the city as miners flocked to the area for work. Officials of the Ohio and Mississippi Railroad tested the coal for its steam-producing qualities and soon converted their wood-burning locomotives to coal. Mines in Daviess County were worked either by shafts or by tunneling into the bank of a hill.\(^{147}\) In Daviess County, Levi Colbert laid out the village of South Washington in 1874. Coal miners made up most of the population, reflecting the mining activities present near Washington in this period.\(^{148}\)

Coal mining in Gibson County reportedly began in 1833 in Barton Township.\(^{149}\) Early Gibson County mines were small-scale operations usually employing fewer than ten men. More intensive mining began after the railroads entered the region. Underground mines were worked by hand in the nineteenth century and generally machine-mined in the early twentieth century. There were coal mines active in Pike County before 1881.\(^{150}\)

Operations at a mine might cease for a variety of reasons. One reason was that a more productive mine under the same owner might open nearby. As strip mining came into practice, surface mines would prove to be more cost effective than underground mines. The cost of complying with federal safety regulations made some underground mines economically unfeasible. After mines closed, they sometimes were used as garbage dumps; eventually, many were sealed for safety reasons. Surface remains, such as tipples, sometimes were salvaged for metal or were destroyed by fire.\(^{151}\) No surface remains are evident in the APE.

The middle decades of the nineteenth century brought about many technological changes that directly affected coal supply and demand. The arrival and proliferation of coal-fed trains created a ready market even for the less desirable high sulfur coal, which resulted in a brittle iron end

---

147 Daviess County *Interim Report*, xvi–xvii; Fulkerson, *History of Daviess County*, 64.
151 Alano et al., *Mining History*, 11, 17, 20, 27.
product, mined in the state. As the number of trains and miles of track increased rapidly in the 1870s and 1880s, the demand for coal increased, and mines in the region became a mainstay in the economy of many small towns. Almost simultaneously, the demand for coal for use in smelting iron ore and producing cast iron (and later steel) raised the economic worth of every acre of land that contained any grade of coal.\footnote{Thornbrough, \textit{Indiana in the Civil War}, 414.}

After meeting local fuel needs, producers shipped their block coal by recently built rail lines to population centers around the Midwest, including St. Louis and Chicago.\footnote{Clipping File: COAL, “Hoosier Scrapbook,” Indiana Historical Society, Indianapolis.}

By the 1870s, land that once sold for $20 per acre in the coal-producing areas of southwestern Indiana now commanded $200 per acre, making some citizens and industrialists very wealthy. By the end of this period, they were apt to spend their wealth on the construction of fashionable high-style Greek Revival or Italianate houses in the region’s cities and small towns.

\section*{Commerce}

Commerce was highly dependent on transportation and a stable money supply. Transportation was necessary to market products, and with the proliferation of rail lines distant markets were becoming more accessible. The stable supply of money was difficult to secure, however, because most people were opposed to centralized control of money. Financial panics and booms governed the economy. During good times, businesses flourished and buildings were constructed; during bust times, unemployment rose and few buildings were constructed.

Towns grew as centers of trade in this era, especially those towns located on a rail line. Stations were natural collecting points as farmers brought grain to mills along tracks either for storage, to be ground for local use, or for transport. While at the station, farmers spent money at local inns and taverns and bought goods from local merchants. In the antebellum era, many of the commercial buildings resembled the large Greek Revival houses of the era, featuring symmetrical fenestration, prominent cornice returns, and pilasters. Few of these buildings survive.\footnote{Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana, \textit{Victorian Commercial Architecture}, n.p.}

Not until the decade after the Civil War did a building boom occur on main streets across southwestern Indiana as the railroads brought increased commercial interaction. Inspired by the architecture of the Italian city-states, the dominant style of architecture was the Italianate-influenced commercial building. These two- and three-story commercial buildings featured quoins, belt courses, decorative brackets, and a wide cornice supporting a sloping flat roof. Hoods topped tall, narrow windows, and the first floor façade was usually arcaded.\footnote{Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana, \textit{Victorian Commercial Architecture}, n.p.} Large
numbers of these buildings are extant in southwestern Indiana; indeed, they can be found in towns from Gosport in Owen County to Vincennes in Knox County. This architectural style continued to be popular throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century. However, the storefronts of many surviving examples were altered in later years. Although no examples of these buildings are present in the APE, many such buildings likely are present in the downtown commercial districts of Petersburg and Washington adjacent to the APE.

Merchants displayed their wealth not only through the building of new commercial structures, but also by constructing large homes. In cities and towns across Indiana, fashionable Greek Revival, Italianate, and sometimes Second Empire homes were built from 1850 to 1880, indicative of the rising middle class. A good example in Petersburg is the Italianate house of Goodlet Morgan (Pike 05006). Note that extant Second Empire homes are rare because of roofing problems that arose over time.

At the same time that some merchants along routes of transportation were profiting, smaller commercial endeavors also prospered at crossroads throughout southwestern Indiana. These stores were vital connections between the area farmers and a distant world. According to one merchant in Martin County, a local store carried “silk dress pattern or a fish hook, quinine or a Webster spelling book, sugar or cream of tartar.”

Religion
A diversity of denominations were present in southwestern Indiana during this period, including Baptist, Baptist Dunker, Christian, Episcopalian, Lutheran, Methodist, Roman Catholic, Union, Universalist, Quaker, Presbyterian, African Methodist Episcopal, and Amish. By 1850, there was even a Jewish synagogue in Evansville.

As rural settlements gave way to settled towns and cities, church buildings became more impressive—visual proof not only of the growing wealth of their congregations, but also of the success of their towns. No urban examples are extant in the APE.

Many small churches remained in the countryside to serve rural areas where residents could not easily make their way to churches in urban locations. A good example from this period is the Arnold Church in the APE in Jefferson Township, Pike County (Pike 00001). This small vernacular church stands at the intersection of two rural roads and has few neighboring houses. The wood frame church was constructed circa 1875. The church received its name from its
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association with nearby residents, many of who were members or descendents of the Arnold family, among the early settlers of the county.  

The 1876 state atlas shows the locations of churches, among other things. Only two rural churches appear in Columbia Township, Gibson County. In Pike County, three rural churches are located in Logan Township, six in Patoka Township, three in Jefferson Township, and two in Washington Township. In Daviess County, three rural churches appear in Veale Township and two appear in Washington Township. Other than the Arnold Church, few, if any, of these churches are extant today, although in some cases more recent church buildings are on the same site.

Education

With the adoption of a new state constitution, 1851 brought significant changes to Indiana education as legislators made public schools a priority. The new constitution required the Indiana General Assembly to create a uniform system of common schools and called for the election of a state superintendent of public instruction to oversee the state’s schools. William C. Larrabee, a professor at Asbury College (now DePauw University) in Greencastle, was the first superintendent. While the new school law did not immediately improve the overall education system in Indiana, it did encourage school building throughout the state and region. However, with so many resources devoted to the resolution of the war, improvements in education had to wait. In the late 1860s with further revision of school laws, Hoosiers finally seemed comfortable with the ideal and idea of a tax-funded school system.

As the nineteenth century progressed, schools in urban areas began to outpace those in rural locales. As late as 1879, most Indiana school enrollment was in rural townships (72 percent), but urban schools, with a greater tax base, naturally benefited over rural schools. In 1874, Washington, the county seat of Daviess County, had a school enrollment of 827 children. Two years later, the town spent $40,000 to construct an impressive three-story brick school building, “the pride of Washington citizens.”

Rural school districts built and upgraded schools during this period. School buildings of frame or brick replaced the primitive and poorly lighted log schoolhouses of the early nineteenth century. In Veale Township, Daviess County, District 1 received a new building in 1859, and District 2 received a new building the following year. In Washington Township, Daviess County, District 1 received a new building in 1859, and District 2 received a new building the following year.  
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County, Lettsville replaced its old schoolhouse in 1869. District 3 received a school in 1874. District 2 and the Sugarland school each received a new building in 1881. New school districts also were organized during this time in Washington Township, including District 7 in 1880, District 11 in 1856, District 14 in 1878, District 15 in 1880, District 17 in 1870, District 18 in 1870, District 19 in 1880, and District 21 in 1870. The same general pattern is also true of the other two counties in the study area. The first schoolhouse in Oakland City, Gibson County, was built in 1860. In Logan Township, Pike County, the first frame schoolhouse in the township was built in circa 1854. No school buildings from this period are extant in the Section 2 APE.

Conclusion
The period between 1851 and 1880 was a period dominated by the theme of expansion in most areas of society, particularly after the Civil War. The population in each county of Section 2 doubled during this period, and many more villages were established. The road network expanded, as did the railroad system. However, the portion of the canal that ran through the APE did not prove to be the success the people had envisioned. A railroad reached the APE only a few years after the canal opened for use, and the canal’s costs outpaced its revenues. On farms, outbuildings grew in size and number, and farmers planted a greater variety of crops. Coal mining expanded greatly after railroads came through the study area and increased the economic base of the counties in Section 2. The expansion of the railroad system also brought increased opportunity for commerce and variety of products. The number of commercial buildings and fashionable houses for merchants grew in the cities and towns in the study area. The number of schools and churches and the variety of religious denominations in the study area also increased during this period.

Indiana’s Golden Age: 1881–1920
The years from 1881 to 1920 marked a great transformation in the lives of ordinary Americans. On a national level, the consequences of industrialization were felt as transportation and communications underwent a revolution: factories grew in size and number, migrants flooded the cities, and, especially after the U.S. entered the first world war, nationalism was on the rise. In cities and towns, people struggled to adapt to the increasing depersonalization of society and to exert some control over the world around them and its unpredictability.

In Indiana history, the years from 1881 to 1920 are known as the “golden age.” Although this period was not without its ups and downs, generally this was a time of innovation, expansion, and prosperity. Farms grew in size and productivity as machines began to do some of the work of farm families. New ideas were developed in industry, and the economy evolved from one

---

164 Penrod, Educational History, 70–77.
165 Stormont, History of Gibson County, 360.
166 Pike County Historical Society, History and Families, 32.

October 18, 2005
based mostly on agriculture to one with a strong industrial component. Indeed, industrialization became the main force in Hoosier’s lives, but it was not without cost.

As in other areas of Indiana, industrial growth came to the cities, if not always the towns, of southwestern Indiana. There was an exodus from farms to the cities of Evansville, Terre Haute, Indianapolis, and to a lesser extent, Washington, for employment opportunities. However, many towns in the hilly areas of southwestern Indiana stagnated during this era. Towns tied to the coal industry boomed and died prompted by the discovery of coal veins and their eventual depletion. The growing cities in southwestern Indiana were located not in the center of this region, but on the fringes, and were connected by rail to the world outside.167

Much of southwestern Indiana retained its rural character during this golden age. In the fertile flatlands, farm families built “German T” houses, Italianate dwellings, Queen Anne residences, and Folk Victorian and National-style houses, as well as large barns and a multitude of outbuildings needed to house horses, cattle, and farm tools and implements. Most of the above-ground resources in the APE date from this period.

**Demographics/Race/Ethnicity**

In 1920, the population of Indiana (2,930,390 people) was more than 92 percent white and native born, only a slightly lower percentage than was recorded forty years before.168 In an era characterized by eastern European immigration nationally, few towns and cities of the twenty-six counties of southwestern Indiana experienced such an influx. The large cities of Evansville, Terre Haute, and Indianapolis received newcomers primarily from other states in the Midwest or elsewhere in Indiana. The number of African Americans living in urban areas increased, but again, these were migrants from Indiana, states in the Midwest, or Kentucky. By 1920, Indiana’s population had flowed northward and toward urban areas from the southern rural areas.

The population of Daviess County climbed from 21,552 in 1880 to 26,227 in 1890 and then to 29,914 in 1900, before declining over the next decade to 27,747 in 1910, and then to 26,856 in 1920. Veale and Washington townships are the only two in this county in the Section 2 APE. Both townships saw an increase in population from 1890 to 1900, then a mild decline from 1900 to 1910. The population of Washington Township was about ten times greater than that of Veale Township (11,994 versus 1,125 in 1900), due to Washington Township’s much greater size and possession of the county seat. After 1910 and until the middle of the century, Veale Township continued to lose population and Washington Township continued to gain population.169
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Gibson County’s population grew to 24,920 in 1890, then reached 30,099 in 1900, but increased to only 30,137 in 1910. Over the next decade, the population dropped to 29,201. In Columbia Township, which contains most of the Section 2 APE in Gibson County, the population change mirrored that of the county as a whole, increasing from 3,014 in 1890 to 3,588 in 1910, before dropping to 3,296 in 1920. Oakland City had a population of 1,991 in 1900, but grew to 2,370 in 1910 and was the second largest town in Gibson County.\textsuperscript{170}

In Pike County, the population rose from 18,544 in 1890 to 20,486 in 1900 before declining to 18,684 by 1920. Of the four townships in the Section 2 APE, two mirrored the trend of the county and two ran counter to the trend. Jefferson Township reached a maximum population of 2,792 in 1900 before declining to 2,068 in 1920. Likewise, the population of Logan Township rose to 1,293 in 1900, only declined to 1,278 in 1910, then declined to 988 in 1920. In contrast, the population of Patoka Township rose steadily from 3,095 in 1890 to 4,738 in 1920. Washington Township, the location of the county seat, saw an increase from 3,557 in 1890 to 4,966 in 1920.\textsuperscript{171}

The population in each of the three counties was almost entirely native born by 1900. In most cases, the number of foreign-born residents declined from 1870 to 1900, although the number of German-born residents in Daviess County actually rose from 1870 to 1890 before dropping by 1900.\textsuperscript{172}

**Transportation**

The years from 1880 to 1920 were a transitional period in the history of transportation. Horse-drawn buggies traveled the roads alongside bicycles and motorized vehicles. Roads remained primitive, with a majority of rural roads being dirt or gravel, although towns began upgrading their streets to gravel and brick. Railroads commanded passenger traffic and transported the majority of goods to and from distant markets.

**Roads.** Maps of the period show changes in the road networks from earlier years. The 1881 atlas of Gibson and Pike counties shows three roads crossing the Patoka River, all in Patoka Township in Pike County, in addition to the road through Dongola. By this time the Evansville and Indianapolis Railroad was in operation and likely was people’s first choice for transportation between Petersburg, Oakland City, and Evansville.\textsuperscript{173} By 1903, seven roads crossed the Patoka
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River in addition to the road through Dongola, two west of Dongola and five east of Dongola. The northeast-southwest road between Petersburg and Dongola had largely disappeared by that time.\footnote{United States Geological Survey, “Boonville quadrangle;” United States Geological Survey, “Petersburg quadrangle;” United States Geological Survey, “Velpen quadrangle.”}

By 1888, some roads in southern Daviess County followed section lines, but many continued to meander across the landscape. Some of these undoubtedly were remnants of the old state roads from the early part of the nineteenth century. The hilly areas of Veale Township also hindered the development of roads based on the section lines.\footnote{Griffing, Dixon & Co., \textit{Atlas of Daviess County}, 51.} In contrast, most roads in Columbia Township, Gibson County, followed section lines.\footnote{Griffing, \textit{Atlas of Gibson and Pike Counties}, 48.} While many roads remained in poor condition by modern standards, they did improve. According to a number of authorities, the major impetus for formal programs of “good roads” building and maintenance was twofold: the rapid growth in popularity in bicycle use in the 1890s and the desire for rural free delivery of the U.S. mails that swept the hinterlands at the turn of the century. The corvee system of road maintenance and repair remained in use until the early twentieth century in many counties, when county commissioners took over this function.

After 1900, the popularizing of the automobile drew demands from the motoring public and automobile manufacturers for more and better roads. Surprisingly, the farm-to-market needs of the farmer did not provide as strong a stimulus to road-building efforts as might be expected. Before the 1890s, many of the roads used by farmers to reach markets or rail shipment points were well-maintained toll roads operated by private individuals.\footnote{Phillips, \textit{Indiana in Transition}, 261–64.} No known examples of tollhouses remain. By 1914, Daviess County had 325 miles of county gravel and macadam roads completed.\footnote{Fulkerson, \textit{History of Daviess County}, 133.}

Southwestern Indiana’s agricultural and coal production was hindered by bad roads. State legislators answered public demands for action on roads in 1919–20 with the establishment of the Indiana Highway Commission. The commission was given the responsibility for operating and maintaining a projected 3,200-mile network of state highways created from existing public roadways. Roads and bridges that the state inherited from the counties were generally in deplorable condition.\footnote{Phillips, \textit{Indiana in Transition}, 269; Cooper, \textit{Iron Monuments}, 11.} One of the first state highways was the road that is now US 50, which runs east-west through Daviess County and passes through Washington.\footnote{Myers, \textit{Daviess County}, vol. 2, 82.}
Bridges. It was necessary to construct bridges in order for roads to be functional in all seasons of the year; regional bridges were key elements in the eventual success of the road network. In the early to mid-nineteenth century their design and materials ran the gamut from early log structures built by locals to wood-truss covered bridges built by professionals. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, iron- and steel-truss bridges were constructed of materials shipped to the bridge site from distant fabricators, and in the twentieth century bridge building turned to concrete and steel spans, many of which still function on county roads. As late as the 1880s, road crossings over the White River into Veale Township, Daviess County, were still made by ferry. However, by this time there were four bridges crossing the Patoka River in Logan and Patoka Townships, Pike County. By 1903, two additional bridges crossed the river.

The importance of metal bridges is apparent in the care and attention to detail demonstrated by various county commissions as they deliberated over the best possible bridge for the least amount of money. These metal bridges became common to the landscape of every county in southwestern Indiana. There were isolated metal-truss bridges built in the region prior to 1890. For instance, Pike County Bridge No. 246 (Pike 20005) replaced the covered bridge over the Patoka River at Dongola. Early metal bridges, including the one at Dongola, were iron, but later the use of steel made larger and longer bridges possible. In Greene, Daviess, Gibson, Vanderburgh, and Sullivan counties, the heyday of metal bridge construction occurred during the period from 1890 to 1915. Counties continued to build metal truss bridges well into the twentieth century. As late as 1932, metal truss bridges were constructed to carry US 50/150 over the White River in Daviess County (Daviess 30025 and 30026). Although some of these metal bridges remain, they have, by and large, been replaced by more modern structures, such as the Gil Hodges Bridge over the White River from Pike County to Daviess County. Although a railroad bridge crossed the Ohio River at Evansville as early as 1895, no bridge for any other vehicles crossed the Ohio River in southwestern Indiana until 1932. Until this time, ferries shuttled people and goods across the Ohio’s expanses.

Railroads. By 1880, railroads linked major towns in southwestern Indiana. The Baltimore and Ohio, originally the Ohio and Mississippi and the only line running completely across southern Indiana, linked the state of Ohio to Lawrence, Martin, Daviess, and Knox counties. Daviess County had the additional benefit of repair shops located in Washington (Daviess 33001–33007). In 1889, when the railroad shops were built, they were the largest in the state. In 1975, after
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years of abandonment, the Historic American Engineering Record surveyed the shops.\(^{185}\)
Princeton also had the economic benefit of railroad shops, those of the Southern Railroad, which were constructed 1891–94.\(^{186}\)

In 1888, the Ohio and Mississippi Railroad and the Evansville and Indianapolis Railroad served Washington. Maps of the period label buildings and structures along the latter railroad, mostly outside the APE. Sandy Hook Station in the southwest corner of Veale Township was the site of a depot. Jacob’s Station in the northwest corner of the same township was the site of a water tank, but no other buildings were nearby. In the southwest corner of Washington Township, Daviess County, Thomas’ Station likewise was in a mostly isolated location. Jordan Station north of Washington was located at a road crossing. A water tank was located along the railroad some distance to the north, but no station was marked at that location.\(^{187}\) None of these buildings or structures are extant in the Section 2 APE.

The Chicago, Terre Haute and Southeastern Railway brought connecting service to Lawrence, Martin, Daviess, Greene, and Vigo counties. Sometimes known as the “mineral route,” the Southern Railway linked coal- and limestone-rich counties of the southwest with Louisville and points south. The Evansville and Indianapolis Railroad was constructed through Daviess County in 1885. Like the canal, railroads also spurred the creation of villages. Elnora was laid out along the Evansville and Indianapolis the same year of the railroad’s construction.\(^ {188}\)

By 1920, all counties in the southwest had access to rail transportation and the consolidation of the steam railway system was under way. Across southwestern Indiana, remnants of this transportation system, such as rail lines and depots, remain in the landscape.\(^ {189}\) Few depots from this era still stand; the Classical Revival Princeton L & N Railroad Depot (Gibson 24020), built around 1895, is a rare survivor.

**Agriculture**

The years between 1880 and 1920 are generally recognized as an era of prosperity for farming. Production increased, and, especially after 1900, commodity prices rose. Innovations in machinery propelled the new prosperity in farming. This new machinery helped increase production in the fertile lowlands, although it really did not aid those in the hilly uplands where machinery was difficult to use. It was during this era that many of the farmsteads associated in the public’s mind with Hoosier farming were being built. Ironically, as the farm’s physical environment was being transformed, rural demographics began to change as youth left rural
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areas and farm work for city jobs. By 1920, more people in Indiana lived in urban areas for the first time in the state’s history.

Corn remained the main crop grown on southwestern Indiana farms, although some farms in the region produced specialty crops. In the lowlands of Daviess and Gibson counties and other counties of the Wabash Valley, farmers raised watermelons and cantaloupes on scattered farmsteads. Almost every farm continued to grow fruit and its own vegetables. However, with the introduction of the canning industry in Indiana around the turn of the century, vegetables, especially tomatoes, corn, and peas, began to be grown for outside production. So common and widespread were orchards that it was difficult to grow fruit for sale. Farmers also raised cattle, hogs, sheep, chickens, horses, and mules.190

This era saw a transformation of the landscape of the farm in the fertile lands of southwestern Indiana. Elegant new farmhouses were built in Queen Anne, Italianate, and Stick styles (Middleton House, Pike 05009), and a host of vernacular dwellings with basic forms, such as the German-T and gabled ell, were ornamented with simple Victorian or classical trim (Shanks Farmstead, Daviess 30037; Loveless Farmstead, Pike 20009). Toward the end of this period, bungalow houses became a popular choice for farmhouses. Some are small, simple, one-and-one-half-story, front-gabled buildings, such as a farmstead in Columbia Township (Gibson 30001) or the Joe Minnis House (Gibson 30002), while others are more developed examples with Craftsman-style features (Helfenbein Farmstead, Pike 05005). Summer kitchens, where cooking occurred during warm months, were located behind the farmhouse, conveniently near the well and smokehouse. Windmills and hand pumps brought water to the surface. Granaries, large dairy and storage barns, along with outbuildings and orchards, were located in a separate area of the farmyard. Farmsteads that illustrate this era in the history of Indiana agriculture have a definite internal pattern of use and appearance. The main outbuildings on the Chapman-Allison Farmstead (Daviess 35001) and the Ropp Farmstead (Pike 20001) date to this period.

Agricultural buildings in particular reflect the major changes that took place in farming during this era. Farmers constructed larger framed stock barns with shelter and feeding facilities for their animals all placed under one roof and with breeding facilities nearby. Barns from this period survive at the Chapman-Allison Farmstead (Daviess 35001), the Shanks Farmstead (Daviess 30037), the Ropp Farmstead (Pike 20001), and the Loveless Farmstead (Pike 20009). Most are transverse frame or three-portal barns. As livestock and dairy farming grew and the demand for silage and fodder increased after the turn of the century, the need for storage increased. While there were only about fifty silos in the state in 1892, this number increased dramatically after the turn of the century. The earliest silos were rectangular, but they later assumed their familiar cylindrical shape. Silos normally were built adjacent to stock or dairy barns for efficiency in feeding animals. Extant examples often have metal bands and turnbuckles

190 Phillips, Indiana In Transition, 164.
to help maintain the integrity of the structure.\textsuperscript{191} No inventoried properties in the APE retain a silo.

Other farm buildings also signaled changes in farming in southwestern Indiana. With more equipment, the farmer needed buildings for storage and repair of his growing inventory of machinery and tools. Specialization in crops, better breeding practices for animals, better hybrid seeds for higher yields, and a division of labor in agriculture called for specialized buildings and storage facilities.

Two particularly noteworthy barn types arose during this era. The first is the rare polygonal barn, at least one of which still exists in Vigo Township, Knox County. Round barns are another unusual property type. According to John T. Hanou’s \textit{A Round Indiana}, there were only twelve extant in southwestern Indiana in 1985. There are fewer still today; two of those identified by Hanou are gone. The Thomas Singleton Round Barn (Daviess 35005) is located in the APE.

The desire for agricultural education grew around the turn of the century. Farmers’ associations were founded and educational journals were published. In addition, 4-H groups were established as a way to educate the youth about innovative means of farming.\textsuperscript{192}

In 1919, as this era of prosperity drew to a close, farmers organized the Indiana Federation of Farmers’ Association, later the Indiana Farm Bureau. The working class had already been organized into labor unions for decades and businessmen had commercial clubs, employers’ associations, and other similar groups. The Farm Bureau became an educative and lobbying association for farmers.\textsuperscript{193}

In Daviess County, farmers during this period drained swamplands in the west and southwest parts of the county and cleared sandy lands in the west part of the county to bring the land into agricultural use. The formerly little-regarded sandy lands proved to be fertile land for production of cantaloupes and watermelons. However, in the early twentieth century, Daviess County mostly was recognized for corn production. Stock raising also was significant in the county. In 1912, the greatest number of acres in the county was dedicated to wheat, corn, oats, and timothy hay. The county had a greater production of tomatoes than any other county in the region. Cattle and hogs held the greatest value among livestock in Daviess County, with sheep, horses, and mules also raised.\textsuperscript{194} Among the largest farm operations in the county at this time were those of the Graham family, one of the oldest and wealthiest families in the county.\textsuperscript{195}

\textsuperscript{192} National 4-H Council, “4-H Centennial,” http://www.4hcentennial.org/history/main.asp.  
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\textsuperscript{194} Fulkerson, \textit{History of Daviess County}, 131–33.  
\textsuperscript{195} Griffing, Dixon & Co., \textit{Atlas of Daviess County}, 32–33, 36–37, 51.
In Gibson County in 1910, most farms were less than 100 acres in size. The largest category of farms (841) was those fifty to 100 acres, followed by those twenty to fifty acres in size (655). No other size category had more than 175 farms. The most productive crops in the county in 1910 were corn, oats, wheat, potatoes, and hay and clover. Some farmers also grew tobacco or sorghum or engaged in stock raising. The county was considered part of the wheat belt.196 The leading crops in Pike County during this period were corn, wheat, and hay. Pike County farmers grew more tobacco (271 acres in 1910) than many of their neighbors (15 acres in Gibson County in 1910), although not nearly as much as the major tobacco-growing counties in the area (3,688 acres in Warrick County in 1910). Swine and cattle were the most common livestock. Although in 1880 Pike County generally was comparable to its neighbors in farm production, by 1910 it was well behind its neighbors in the number of livestock in the county, the total value of crops, and the number of acres cultivated in corn, hay, and wheat.197

Between 1900 and 1920, the amount of land in farms and the number of farms generally declined in all three counties, while the average size and value of farms generally increased. The number of farms in Daviess County declined from 3,003 to 2,602 during the two decades, and the amount of land in farms declined from 259,644 to 256,892 acres out of a total of 275,677 acres in the county. This decline in land was rather small compared to the decline in Gibson and Pike counties. In Gibson County, the amount of land in farms fell from 278,830 acres to 260,532 acres, out of a total of 312,867 total acres in the county. In Pike County, the decline was from 200,724 acres to 185,994 acres, out of 215,163 total acres in the county. In Gibson County, the number of farms fell from 2,973 to 2,563, while in Pike County, the number of farms fell from 2,685 to 2,159.198

As noted above, the average size and value of farms in the three counties generally increased from 1900 to 1920. The average farm size in Daviess County grew from 86 to 99 acres. In Gibson County, the average farm size grew from 94 to 102 acres. Pike County saw an increase in average farm size from 75 to 86 acres. Both Daviess and Gibson counties were near the average for southwestern Indiana farms during this period, although they were a little below the state average. Pike County was well below both the state and regional averages.199 The average dollar-per-acre value of farms rose greatly between 1900 and 1920. The increase in Daviess County was from $25.38 to $91.32. In Gibson County, the increase was from $32.60 to $99.81. Pike County saw an increase from $19.24 to $61.56 just from 1900 to 1910. The counties

196 Stormont, History of Gibson County, 110–11.
generally remained below the state average, but above the average for southwestern Indiana during this period. This period was generally a prosperous one for farmers, with the average size of farms and their value increasing, even as the number of farms and the amount of county acreage in farms decreased.

Industry

In the 1880s, small-scale industry in the form of mills and kilns was scattered throughout the countryside, both in towns and in rural areas. Many mills were steam powered by this time. A few brick kilns were also scattered around Pike County. Sawmills were found in Dongola in Gibson County and in Logan, Patoka, and Jefferson townships in Pike County. Jefferson Township, Pike County, also had two gristmills. A gristmill also was located just outside the west edge of Petersburg. In the southern part of Daviess County, most industries were located in or near Washington, including a manufacturer of drain tile, two brick makers, the City Foundry and Machine Works, a manufacturer of marble and granite monuments, and two gristmills.

Coal. By the mid-1880s, coal was being mined throughout the southwestern region of Indiana. As one deposit was mined out, either by the shaft, slope, or stripping method, producers moved on to already acquired land in other counties of Indiana. In 1880 the state geologist noted that the “promise for the future from these treasure houses [coal mines] is grand.” Indeed, the Indiana coalfield stretched across much of southwestern Indiana. Railroad spur lines in Washington Township, Daviess County, linked coal mines south and west of Washington to the Ohio and Mississippi Railroad in the city.

Mining was prominent enough in Pike County by 1881 that a number of mines appear in the county atlas. In Patoka Township, several mines are located in the southwest corner of the township, one north of the Ingleton Post Office and the other just south of the Patoka River on land owned by G. W. Massey. The Patoka Valley Coal Company owned a great deal of land east and south of Winslow. In Logan Township, two mines appear, one in the center of the township and the other in the southwest corner. Only one coal bank is depicted in Jefferson Township, in the southwest corner of the township. Several coal banks are labeled in the area north of Petersburg. Many coal mines are depicted around the city of Washington and in the south half of Washington Township in the 1888 Daviess County atlas. A 1903 topographic map labels
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four mines in Patoka Township. The Klondike Mine is in the same location as the former Ingleton Mine, the Massey Mine was still active, and two mines, the Aberdeen Mine and Ingle Mine, were located farther to the east and south of the Patoka River. Other mines likely were active as well.

At times coal was found near the surface, but sometimes the seams ran as many as 300 feet below the surface. Shafts were sunk into the ground where miners worked the seam with pick and shovel. Safety became a concern with men working so far below the surface.

Sometimes towns were established to support the coal industry. Littles, a community in the northwest corner of Patoka Township, Pike County, was a company town active from about 1900 to 1920. The focus of the village was a coal mine belonging to a Mr. Little of Evansville. In addition to the coal tipple, mule barns, and other mine buildings, the village also had company houses, a school, a store, a post office, a hotel, a church, and a railroad depot. After the mine closed, the village had little reason to exist, and, by the 1970s, only a few houses and the church remained. The village of Ayrshire, southwest of Winslow in Pike County, also was close to several mines and likely depended on them for employment.

Strip mining began around 1904. As more and more producers opted to strip mine, the face of the landscape changed significantly. While the recognizable image of the coal tipple and the associated powerhouse around those areas mined by the shaft- or slope-mining methods became less prevalent, the scars associated with strip mining increased in number and degree.

Running parallel with the history of coal mining in Indiana was the growth of the rail system that made possible the transportation of coal and limestone from southwestern Indiana sources to markets around the country and the world. Railroads such as the Monon, which owed much of its prosperity to freight hauling of coal and limestone, merged, consolidated, and grew aggressively.

Oil. The discovery of oil in Terre Haute in 1865 motivated more drillers to broaden their search for other deposits in the region. The development of the oil industry in Indiana grew at a relatively slow pace for another few decades until the demand for oil and new technology hastened growth.

207 McClellan, Pike County History, 195; United States Geological Survey, “Petersburg quadrangle.”
The oil industry rose and fell during the four decades of this era. In 1891, William Wright drilled the Evans Gas Well north of Princeton, but it was not until 1902 that a consortium of local businessmen put together the Interstate Oil and Gas Company to drill a number of wells on 3,000 acres of leased land around Princeton in Gibson County. The very next year a major strike in Princeton marked the beginnings of the heyday of commercial oil production in Indiana. The find in Gibson County spurred the search for oil in portions of Daviess, Martin, Pike, and Sullivan counties. By 1904, the state produced a peak of 11 million barrels. However, the numbers steadily decreased thereafter and Indiana oil fields were near depletion in 1920. No above-ground resources associated with the oil industry are extant in the APE.

**Commerce**

The buildings of Main Street reflect the prosperous golden age for many cities and towns. County-seat towns had a commercial advantage because people coming to transact political business often shopped at area stores. Other towns grew as centers of trade due to transportation advantages, proximity to natural resources, or because they were centers of commerce controlled by the coal companies. In larger towns and cities, small suburban trade centers developed outside the primary commercial areas.

The commercial centers of towns throughout the region usually featured at least one or two blocks of two- and three-story commercial buildings, primarily of brick construction. Larger towns and cities boasted substantial commercial districts. Sometimes very utilitarian in design, but often embellished with Queen Anne, Italianate, Romanesque Revival, or Neoclassical Revival details, commercial buildings housed a variety of businesses. These included dry goods, general merchandise, professional offices, hotels, banks, and, by the first decade of the twentieth century, chain stores such as five-and-dimes. In addition, mills and other industrial businesses often grew up along railroad tracks and near waterways, usually housed in large, utilitarian buildings. No examples of such buildings are present in the APE, but likely are present in Oakland City, Petersburg, and Washington adjacent to the APE.

Approaching the turn of the century, the skyline-dominating edifices of fraternal orders signaled the popularity of these organizations in small towns and large cities in Indiana. Fraternal orders met in upper-floor lodges and often rented out the lower storefronts of their buildings to shopkeepers. No examples of such buildings are present in the APE, but likely are present in Oakland City, Petersburg, and Washington adjacent to the APE.

**Religion**

According to historian Clifton Phillips, there were many religious sects in Indiana in the era 1880–1920, but most of those sects were Protestant. Settlements had given way to “settled”
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towns and cities and more ornate churches replaced modest buildings, a reflection of the general prosperity of the golden age. In many towns, church buildings offered impressive visual proof not only of the wealth of their congregations, but also of the success of the town. A General Baptist church was built in Oakland City in 1894. Two churches were constructed in Oakland City in 1906, the Oakland Methodist Episcopal church and a Primitive Baptist church.\(^{212}\)

In some rural settings churches did not fare so well. A study made by the Presbyterian Church in Indiana found that in Daviess County, half of the rural churches were failing and most had no resident pastor.\(^{213}\) Nevertheless, new churches were constructed and old churches replaced in rural areas during this period. Knights Chapel in Pike County, a vernacular frame building, dates to the latter part of this period (Pike 20003). Rural churches that received new buildings in this period include Bethel United Methodist Church in Veale Township, Daviess County (Daviess 35003), a vernacular frame building, and the Veale Creek Baptist Church, which replaced their 1851 frame building with a new vernacular brick building in 1883.\(^{214}\)

**Education**

By the turn of the century, the Indiana General Assembly had passed both compulsory education and school consolidation laws.\(^{215}\) The latter law, in particular, changed the landscape by making local, small schools, especially those in rural areas, obsolete as new and larger consolidated schools served expanded areas. These consolidated schools had a larger tax base from which to gather funds and could therefore afford better teachers and equipment. The buildings were also bigger and more notable in the community. One-room schools did not yet disappear, however, especially in some rural areas. A new one-room school, the Lett School (Daviess 35006), was constructed about 1890 in Veale Township, for instance. This frame school has a Classical Revival doorway.

In 1886, Daviess County had 116 schools, all but five of which were wood frame buildings. Washington Township had nineteen frame schools and two brick schools. Veale Township had six frame schools.\(^{216}\) In 1897–98, Veale Township still had eight school districts.\(^{217}\) In 1913, Gibson County had nine frame schools in Columbia Township. Oakland City had two brick schools.\(^{218}\) In Pike County, many school districts began to construct frame schoolhouses in the 1880s, particularly in Logan and Jefferson townships.\(^{219}\) The 1881 atlas of Pike County depicts
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seventeen schoolhouses in Jefferson Township, in both rural locations and villages, twelve in Washington Township, outside of Petersburg, eleven in Patoka Township, outside of the villages, and only six in Logan Township.  

Conclusion

In contrast to the previous period of expansion, the period from 1881 to 1920 was more a period of maintenance and improvement of existing conditions and institutions. The counties in the study area saw only modest gains in population during this period, mostly before 1900. While efforts began to improve and modernize roads, great progress was made in replacing wood bridges with metal, and later concrete, bridges. This was a period of prosperity for agriculture, with the average size of farms and their value increasing, even as the number of farms and the amount of county acreage in farms decreased. A number of small industries, increasingly steam powered rather than water powered, were found throughout the study area. Coal mining also remained a prominent industry in the three counties. The prosperity brought by farming and mining is reflected in the fashionable architecture and the size of the downtown commercial districts in the study area. Many churches constructed new buildings during this period, and school consolidation resulted in some new schools, even as the number of schools decreased. Although World War I took place during this period, it had little effect on the built environment of the counties in the study area.

Depression and War: 1921–1954

The Great Depression and World War II defined a generation of Hoosiers in southwestern Indiana and the world they built. For many, the onslaught of depression was not apparent until the stock market crashed in October 1929. For farmers, however, hard times began much earlier. Agricultural prices had been depressed for nearly a decade before the crash and remained so until World War II helped spend the country into prosperity.

The Roaring Twenties were defined by extremes: modernism and anti-modernism as well as industrialism and anti-industrialism, but the era was also marked by reform, especially Prohibition. Indeed, the call for Prohibition and later its repeal dominated public dialogue even in the 1933 presidential election, so much so that Franklin Delano Roosevelt complained that all people wanted to talk about was “booze.”

The Great Depression affected every facet of American life, sapping energy from the economy and draining the citizenry’s ability to build. A few banks optimistically constructed Beaux Arts and Classical Revival buildings that were designed to inspire ill-placed confidence. While the wealthy continued to build large homes, the promise of home ownership may have seemed unattainable to those who lived in rented shacks and doubled up with family members. Although

no unemployment figures were kept, it is generally thought that the jobless rate hovered around twelve percent in Indiana; in parts of southwestern Indiana it may have been higher. Other new construction arose from the “make work” programs of the New Deal era. Roosevelt’s New Deal provided work for the unemployed at a time when there was no other work to be had. Thousands of southern Indiana residents benefited from the “alphabet soup” programs of the Roosevelt administration. As a lasting heritage, the physical environment of the area retains much of the sweeping ecological and architectural transformations brought about by these programs.

World War II affected the built environment of southwestern Indiana as well. Factories geared up for war production and military installations were built. More importantly, both men and women found jobs in war industry. With war’s end came the promise of a return to “normal” living—for the most part this meant single-family homes kept by housewives whose husbands earned the entire family income. Indeed, abundance would characterize the post-war world. The post-war building boom was just beginning at the end of this period.

**Government and Politics**

New Deal programs put together by the Roosevelt administration in the 1930s changed the face of southwestern Indiana. Born of the economic desperation of the Great Depression, the New Deal implemented work programs that provided paying jobs for the unemployed. The Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), Works Progress Administration (WPA), Public Works Administration (PWA), Civil Works Administration (CWA), and Resettlement Administration created a new built environment.

The financial condition of much of southwestern Indiana was precarious even before the Great Depression; however, this part of the state suffered terribly when the economy went into a downward spiral. New Deal programs brought financial relief and were welcomed in these areas.\(^{221}\) Works projects included, but were not limited to, tree plantings, public building construction, public art, communal farming, home building, irrigation system construction, and bridge and road building.

As the Great Depression broke out, Washington City officials initially permitted the homeless to sleep in the basement of city hall. Both private charities and public poorhouses could not keep up with the needs of the unemployed. Despite being in a predominantly agricultural region, the Daviess County chapter of the Red Cross had to bring in train car loads of flour for distribution to the needy. In 1931, the leaders of Washington announced that they had established a fund to create work relief jobs in the city. This program was extended into 1932. By fall, eight of the townships in Daviess County had halted poor relief due to lack of money. In 1934, the city of
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Washington received money from the Public Works Administration (PWA) for a work relief project to clean and improve Hawkins Creek in the city.\footnote{Myers, \textit{Daviess County}, vol. 2, 260–62.}

The Civil Works Administration (CWA) was able to provide work to 126 men in Daviess County beginning in November 1933. CWA projects included improvements to ditches and roads, repairs to the Washington city hall and library, painting public buildings, and a levee and ditch project in Elnora. By the end of December 1933, 767 men from Daviess County were at work on CWA projects. The CWA also built an airport north of Washington.\footnote{Myers, \textit{Daviess County}, vol. 2, 274–75.}

The Works Projects Administration (WPA), founded in 1935, also operated in Daviess County. WPA projects included road and sidewalk improvements, repairs to the county hospital and county farm, schoolhouse repairs in Harrison Township, clerical work in the Washington City Schools, and construction of low log dams. In 1936, a project was approved to pave SR 57 from the Pike County line to the Greene County line. In August 1937, the WPA approved a countywide sanitation project to replace unsanitary privies with a new more sanitary type of privy. The WPA also worked on recreational facilities, including creation of Pioneer Memorial Park, a city swimming pool in Washington, a high school football field in Washington, a band stand at East Side Park, and a ten-acre lake for the Odon-Madison Conservation Club. Similar types of projects continued into the early 1940s. As late as 1939, 800 men were still on the WPA rolls in Daviess County.\footnote{Myers, \textit{Daviess County}, vol. 2, 277–80.}

\textbf{Demographics/Race/Ethnicity}

Southwestern Indiana demographics began to demonstrate greater homogeneity between 1920 and 1952. Most Hoosiers were native-born, white, and after 1920, lived in urban areas (defined by the census as having a population of 2,500 or more). Except during the deepest years of the Depression, the number of people living in rural areas declined. During those years, the back-to-the-land movement temporarily drew many urban dwellers back to family homesteads.

In Daviess, Gibson, and Pike counties, the population declined or held steady from 1920 to 1930, then rose in each county from 1930 to 1940. Daviess and Gibson counties each saw a very small increase in population from 1940 to 1950, while Pike County’s population declined by more than two thousand residents. In Daviess County, Veale Township’s population remained in steady decline during this period, while Washington Township continued to gain population. Columbia Township in Gibson County also steadily gained population between 1920 and 1950. In Pike County, only Logan Township saw a decrease in population in each census. In Jefferson,
Patoka, and Washington townships, the population dropped between 1920 and 1930, rose between 1930 and 1940, and declined again between 1940 and 1950.\textsuperscript{225}

**Transportation**

This era marked the growth in air and vehicular traffic and the continued use of railroads, primarily for commercial and industrial purposes. Roads were improved throughout some of southwestern Indiana where traffic was greatest, but in other areas there was scant improvement.

*Roads.* The Good Roads Movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries did much to motivate legislators at all levels to take action for comprehensive road construction and maintenance. The relative affluence of the 1920s and the arrival of the family automobile put added pressure on government to improve roads. The establishment of the state highway commission, the institution of gasoline taxes to finance improvements, and the growth of the trucking industry after World War I further encouraged development of state and county roads.

Much road building and improving were carried out during the Great Depression as work relief. SR 57 in Daviess County was paved in 1936 as a WPA project. Road widening, culvert building, and ditch clearing projects of the WPA further improved roads in the APE.\textsuperscript{226} A few houses of a suburban nature appeared along the new highways, but most suburban expansion, especially in the form of ranch houses, did not occur until the 1950s and later.

County commissioners and state officials took on the task of improving roads and bridges throughout the region. In most cases, farmers could now get their products to the elevators and shipping points in the area. Slowly but surely, new roads were laid out and paved. In time the more frequently traveled roads became state roads, connecting all the major towns and cities in the region. Old wood and metal bridges were gradually replaced by a combination of concrete culverts and bridges. The maintenance and replacement of metal bridges was the responsibility of each county. As time progressed the more affluent counties replaced their turn-of-the-century metal-truss bridges with concrete structures, while the poorer counties, such as Pike, retained more of their older bridges. The result of this disparity is visible today.

As mentioned in the previous section, state legislators answered public demand for action on roads in 1919–20 with the establishment of the Indiana Highway Commission. The commission was given the responsibility for operating and maintaining a projected 3,200-mile network of state highways created from existing public roadways. The roads and bridges that the state inherited from the counties were generally in bad shape and hindered commerce.\textsuperscript{227}

\textsuperscript{226} Myers, Daviess County, vol. 2, 278, 280.  
\textsuperscript{227} Phillips, Indiana in Transition, 269; Cooper, Iron Monuments, 11.
By the end of this period, state and federal roads in Indiana improved, and even some county roads were paved. However, in a number of remote counties, such as Pike, many miles of roads still remain unpaved and many pre-1954 metal bridges survive, probably due to limited development in the area. Four metal truss bridges from this era and earlier survive in the APE in Pike County: Pike County Bridges Nos. 81 and 246 (Pike 20005), Bridge No. 32 (Pike 20006), and Bridge No. 175 (Pike 05002).

**Railroads.** Even with the growth of the truck industry, railroads remained an important means of moving cargo efficiently and transporting passengers quickly. Spur lines to the coal mines and limestone quarries in southwestern Indiana carried raw and finished materials to the main lines, such as the Baltimore and Ohio, the Illinois Central, and the Chicago, Terre Haute and Southeastern railroads. These long-haul railroads also transported the grains, animals, and finished agricultural products of regional farmers to the growing markets in Chicago, Louisville, St. Louis, and points east. After World War II, railroads in the region continued to serve the various communities but in lesser numbers. Economics halted service to smaller communities. By the 1950s, rail service was limited to major centers in southwestern Indiana.

**Agriculture**

The new science of agriculture was applied unevenly across the face of southwestern Indiana. Years of drought conspired to make the 1930s dire times for farmers. The corn-hog economy continued to be the underpinning of the region’s economy, although it fared poorly and minimal changes were made to the built environment. By the mid-twentieth century, traditional farms from the nineteenth century commingled with more modern farmsteads.

Some farmers in the Wabash Lowlands sought to protect their fields from flooding during this period through the use of levees. Prior to 1944, 32 levees in the Wabash Lowlands protected 63,610 acres of land. Of these thirty-two levees, ten extended for 50.9 miles along the Wabash River and protected 30,192 acres. Other significant levee systems were located along the West Fork of the White River and along the Eel River. In and near the APE, a more modest project along the Patoka River was only three miles long and protected a mere 700 acres of land.

The primary drainage project of this period in the Section 2 APE is Houchins Ditch, constructed in the early 1920s. Between the 1910s and the mid-1940s, both individuals and groups took steps to improve drainage and flood control in the Patoka River bottomlands. A successful effort to dredge a portion of the Patoka River in Monroe Township, Pike County, in the 1910s inspired more ambitious efforts to dredge a new straight channel for the river from Winslow in Patoka.

---

Township, Pike County, to Wheeling in Gibson County, and eventually west to the Wabash River. The Houchins’ Ditch Association petitioned for this project in 1915, but protests by landowners delayed onset of the project until 1920. A dredge began at each end and worked toward the center. The dredged material was used to create a berm on either side of the channel to contain the high water of floods. Houchins Ditch was completed in 1924.230

The project proved to be a failure for several reasons. Although the project originally was intended to extend to the Wabash River, it never extended beyond Wheeling. A bottleneck developed there where the Ditch met the original river channel, causing floods from the rapid runoff from upstream. The Ditch was not extended to the Wabash River because of the high estimated cost, and project engineers did not foresee that the failure to extend the Ditch would cause its overall failure. A second problem was that the east dredge created a deeper channel than the west dredge, causing a reverse fall of water. Instead of draining an anticipated 100,000 acres, only 5,000 were reclaimed, and many farmers lost their bottomland to delinquent ditch assessments. For six miles below Winslow, the bottoms reverted to brush and swamp.231

During World War I and for a few years afterwards, farmers increased their output by nearly fifteen percent. As Europe recovered from the war, foreign demand for food declined. Changing domestic eating habits further lowered demand for farm products. The decline in demand, coupled with drought and erosion, caused a depression among farmers. The outbreak of the Great Depression further lowered farm product prices in the 1930s. Farmers sometimes found it easier to burn crops than to deliver them to market.232

Despite a general downturn in prosperity, the number of gasoline-engine tractors and automobiles on Hoosier farms increased significantly during this period. Although costly in dollars, the return on investment in a tractor was high and these new machines initiated a number of changes on the farm. In the 1920s and 1930s, advances in farm implements available to the farmer, such as the rotary harrow, four-row cultivator, soil pulverizer, and ensilage harvester, reduced the time required to accomplish many tasks, and improved the efficiency of the individual farmer.233

By 1940, thirty-nine percent of all Hoosier farmers had traded their animal power for the flexible power alternatives of the gas or diesel engine tractor. In southwestern Indiana, the farmer’s transition to tractors varied greatly by county. The single unifying statistic among all counties

---

233 Latta, Indiana Agriculture, 372.
was the high percentage of farms by this same period that had automobiles. By 1950, the mule and horse as sources of motive power had almost disappeared from the fields.  

The evolution from animal to engine power changed the face of farming, reducing the need for farmers to raise fodder for their animals and freeing up those acres for the production of commercial crops. Buildings once committed to animal shelters became the parking and maintenance places for new farm equipment; garages for the family car and fuel storage tanks became commonplace on many farms. For example, the Shanks Farmstead (Daviess 30037), the Chapman-Allison Farmstead (Daviess 35001), and the Ropp Farmstead (Pike 20001) all have garages. The transition to mechanization in the 1940s and 1950s also set the stage for changes in the size—and sometimes the shape—of fields being plowed. Small pastures were converted to crop production in some cases. Farmers could do more in less time and with the increased use of scientific farming methods could increase the yield per acre.

During the second quarter of the twentieth century, Daviess and Gibson counties began to rebound from losses in the amount of land in farms that occurred during the first quarter of the century, but Pike County continued to lose farmland. There were more than 72,000 fewer acres used for farming in Pike County in 1950 than in 1900. However, each county generally saw a decline in the overall number of farms during this period. Each county saw an increase from 1930 to 1935, and Pike County saw an increase between 1940 and 1945, but otherwise the number of farms declined steadily in each county between 1920 and 1950.

Average farm size generally increased in Daviess, Gibson, and Pike counties between 1920 and 1950, just as it did in the state and region. Pike County farms remained well below the average sizes for Indiana and southwestern Indiana and did not reach an average size of more than one hundred acres until 1950. In contrast, Gibson County’s average farm size never fell below one hundred acres during this period, and the county’s average farm size was above the state and regional average by 1945. The average size of Daviess County farms, close to one hundred acres through most of this period, was below that of the state throughout this period, but was slower to fall behind the average of southwestern Indiana.

The average value of farms in Daviess, Gibson, and Pike counties fell steadily between 1920 and 1935, just as it did for the state and region. The average values then increased steadily between 1935 and 1950. The average value of Pike County farms consistently remained below that of Daviess and Gibson counties, as well as the state and southwestern Indiana. The average for Daviess and Gibson counties generally remained between the averages for the state (at the high
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234 Farm Journal Inc., *Indiana County Basic Data*, passim.
end) and for southwestern Indiana (at the low end). While Gibson County farms maintained a higher average value than Daviess County farms through the first quarter of the century, the reverse was true through the second quarter. After the slump in farm values due to overproduction after World War II, farm sizes and values continued to increase as mechanization and scientific farming allowed farmers to work more productively with less labor. Despite the rebound, the number of farms continued to decrease as the younger generations moved to urban areas.

The benefits of a more scientific approach to farming were introduced in southwestern Indiana by the county agents of the Purdue Extension Service. The agents, in conjunction with Purdue’s Agricultural Experiment Station, brought the latest information on agriculture and home economics directly to the farm families.

Few new farmhouses were constructed during this era; new ones were usually Bungalows or were Craftsman or Colonial Revival in style. The Jones House (Daviess 30035) and the house of the Ashton Farmstead (Pike 00002) date to this period. Occasionally farmer families updated their traditional farmhouses with porches or other elements from these styles. There was a move away from cooking in the summer kitchen to that of a year-round kitchen within the house. Summer kitchens still provided the latitude to do some tasks outside, such as canning, but many became storage buildings. Summer kitchens are present at the Loveless Farmstead (Pike 20009) and a farmstead in Washington Township (Pike 05015). Privies remained a mainstay of the farmstead environment well into the twentieth century. While many farmers were able to introduce running water into their homes after the institution of the Rural Electrification Act, sanitary plumbing lagged far behind. For that reason, many privies survive and are in good condition on farms in the region. In the Section 2 APE, privies survive at the Shanks Farmstead (Daviess 30037) and the Loveless Farmstead of circa 1915 (Pike 20010).

Generally, with the exception of silos and the new milk houses, little construction on farmsteads occurred during this era. Silos were normally built adjacent to stock barns to allow efficient feeding of stock and work animals. The earliest silos were constructed from a variety of materials, including wood, tile, and concrete. A common type was the wood stave silo, which was held together with metal bands and turnbuckles that could be tightened to maintain the integrity of the structure. Another type common to southwestern Indiana was the concrete stave silo. After World War II, the ubiquitous blue Harvestore silo replaced these earlier silos.
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Near the end of the 1930s, dairy farmers, in response to new laws concerning sanitary conditions around dairies, constructed milk houses, usually right next to their large barns, to process the daily milk production. These milk houses are readily distinguishable from the older barns by virtue of their construction materials, generally a combination of concrete block and/or wood. No milk houses are extant in the APE.

Electric service poles appeared on the rural landscape in the late 1930s as a result of the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) in 1935. The general purpose of electrification on the farms was to lighten the farm family’s workload, which was accomplished in a number of ways. One recipient of the new source of power remembered that the first thing his father did once service was established was to set up a grinder to sharpen all his tools. Farm families went on buying sprees to acquire appliances such as ranges, refrigerators, and hand irons. In addition, Farm Bureau Cooperatives extolled the virtues of electric feed grinders and pumps for running water systems, cooling milk, and drying hay.241

As the era closed, more and more Hoosier farmers moved into town and began to share in some of the benefits of urban life while continuing to earn their livelihoods from farm incomes. Some farmers leased out portions of the farm, occasionally including the residence, to others. Others left the farmstead and all its buildings to nature while continuing to till the fields. Still others used their barns to store large equipment on-site because of a lack of space near their urban residences. This movement to the city in some ways accounts for the many isolated and deteriorated farmhouses, barns, and other outbuildings that are scattered across the landscape in the counties of the study area.242 Examples in the APE include the Joe Minnis House (Gibson 30002), a farmstead in Washington Township (Pike 05015), the Loveless House (Pike 20007), the Loveless Farmstead of circa 1880 (Pike 20009), and the Loveless Farmstead of circa 1915 (Pike 20010).

**Industry**

Coal. The coal-mining industry suffered greatly during this period. Indiana remained the sixth largest producer of coal, but its sales shrank as a result of competition from coal mines in West Virginia and Kentucky. After World War I, the supply of coal exceeded the demand, causing the closure of mines and the displacement of miners in Pike and Gibson counties.

When mining resumed in the post-World War II world, it focused on strip mining rather than shaft mining. Strip mining, which had been used since the 1920s, eventually resulted in the removal of farm buildings and associated structures from agricultural land, most notably in Pike and Gibson counties. Strip mining also robbed the soil of productivity. To counter these effects,
the Indiana Coal Producers first began voluntary tree plantings on strip-mined lands; later state
law mandated the planting of grass and trees.\footnote{Madison, Tradition and Change, 225, 237.} Most of the coal mines in Daviess County went
out of business in the 1960s; by 1975, only one mine was still in operation.\footnote{Myers, Daviess County, vol. 1, 9.} Coal mines are
still active in the APE in Gibson and Pike counties.

**Commerce**

For several reasons, commerce changed only slightly during this era. Due to economic
difficulties, farmers were spending less money and little commercial expansion occurred.
Although there was abundant employment in defense industry, government propaganda during
World War II encouraged the delay of spending and the investment of surplus cash in
government bonds. As noted previously, however, a few commercial endeavors grew during this
era. These included the sales of automobiles, communications equipment, and movie tickets.

**Religion**

The early part of this period first saw growth and then stability in church membership. In 1926,
Indiana ranked thirteenth in church membership among all the states in the union, down slightly
from its previous ranking of twelfth.\footnote{Madison, Tradition and Change, 293.} In the decade of 1926 to 1936 small rural churches
decreased in numbers from 4,579 to 3,716, but the number of congregants rose.\footnote{Madison, Tradition and Change, 296.}

The same Protestant denominations continued to be important, but by the 1930s the Pentecostal
and Holiness movements had generated new church plantings. Bloomington, for example, had
three new Pentecostal assemblies, two Nazarene churches, an Assembly of God and a Church of
God, all relatively new in 1940.\footnote{Madison, Tradition and Change, 305.} The Maple Grove Pentecostal Church was built in Glezen in
Pike County. The churches built and occupied by these Holiness congregations were often
smaller and less significant on the visual horizons of Indiana towns than those of earlier, now
mainstream, denominations. In general, little church building occurred in this era, due to the
lack of funds. Only in cases of necessity, such as a fire, were new facilities built.

**Education**

In response to national concerns over the state of education, the Department of Public Instruction
commissioned a study of Indiana’s school system in 1920. It found that there were still 4,500
one-teacher schools in rural Indiana. Especially during the Depression years, local school
systems kept one-room schoolhouses open to serve children in rural communities. These small
community schools met the needs of those who could not travel to consolidated schools in the
absence of school transportation that local educational systems could not afford. As might be
expected, the compulsory consolidation efforts of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were stymied during this era. Still, more children were in school than ever before and schools were being constructed.\(^\text{248}\) Stumpburg School (Gibson 30003) in Columbia Township, Gibson County, was one of the one-room schools that remained open during the Depression.\(^\text{249}\)

Funding continued to be an issue for rural school districts. This was especially true in the hilly regions of southwestern Indiana, and it soon became a widespread problem as the agricultural crisis deepened in the 1920s and 1930s. The Great Depression halted educational improvements, and the small pool of available money for schools and teachers’ salaries shrank even further.\(^\text{250}\)

The build-up for World War II began to pump money into the economy even before the United States entered the conflict, which had a positive effect on funding for education. There was not much in the way of school construction until near the war’s end, but by 1945 new consolidated schools were built and the number of one-room schools in use in the state was reduced to only 616.\(^\text{251}\) By the early 1950s the first effects of the baby boom were beginning to be felt. The following years would witness massive school construction. Consolidation on an even wider level occurred after the Indiana General Assembly passed appropriate legislation in 1958. No consolidated schools of the period are present in the APE.

**Conclusion**

Due in large part to the effects of the Great Depression, as well as other demographic changes, the period from 1921 to 1954 generally was a period of decline in the otherwise dominant institutions in the study area. The population of two of the counties declined between 1900 and 1950 and it barely held steady in the third county. Many roads were paved and modernized during this period, but many more miles of road remained in an unimproved state. Rail service declined after World War II as the truck industry grew. The number of farms continued to decline as young people left for the cities and factory jobs, although farm sizes continued to increase as increased mechanization allowed farmers to work more land with less labor. Coal mining stagnated between the two world wars, but resumed after World War II with a focus on strip mining, which left large scars on the land until a combination of voluntary efforts and state law led to reclamation efforts. The number of one room schools continued to drop, but it was not until just after this period that massive school construction began due to the baby boom.


\(^{249}\) Woolsey, *There Really is a Stumpburg*, n.p.

\(^{250}\) Indianapolis State Teachers Association, *Advancing the Cause of Education*, 27.

Summary and Conclusion, 1816–1954
As this context demonstrates, the three counties in the Section 2 study area developed in a similar fashion. All three historically have been rural with an economy based largely on agriculture and mining. Industry has had relatively little presence in most of the study area. Few towns of any significant size have developed outside of the county seats, which themselves are only small cities. While immigrants have had a presence in the population of the three counties, no ethnic group dominated the history of the counties, unlike the German presence in some parts of southwestern Indiana. Never an area of notable prosperity, high-style buildings are uncommon outside of the larger towns. Strip mining and demographic changes in the mid-twentieth century have resulted in the loss of many pre-1954 buildings, even entire villages, in the APE.

Findings of Eligibility
National Register Properties
No above-ground individual resources located within the APE of Section 2 are listed in the NRHP.

National Register Districts
Pike County Bridges Nos. 81 and 246 (Pike 20005) and the portion of County Road 300 West connecting the two bridges are listed in the NRHP as the Patoka Bridges Historic District.
Site Plan 1
Patoka Bridges Historic District
Patoka Bridges Historic District
County Road 300 West just north of Gibson County line

The Patoka Bridges Historic District is listed in the National Register of Historic Places under Criteria A and C for its association with local transportation history, for its association with local Underground Railroad history, and for embodying two stages of through truss bridge design and fabrication. The district was listed on March 25, 2005.

Description: The Patoka Bridges Historic District consists of Pike County Bridge No. 246, Pike County Bridge No. 81, and the stretch of County Road 300 West between the two bridges (Site plan 1).

Bridge No. 246 is an 1884 variation of a Pratt through truss. The single-span, single-lane bridge spans the original course of the Patoka River. Bridge No. 246 sits on concrete-encased cut-stone abutments. The truss has nine panels, is composed of wrought and cast iron, and has pinned connections. The bridge’s diagonal elements extend across two panels when angled toward the span’s end and only one when angled toward the span’s center. This use of double-intersecting braces is the patented variation of the Pratt truss design. The bridge’s portals feature latticed bracing, a nameplate that reads “Wrought Iron Bridge Co. Canton, O/Builders/Patented Nov. 21st, 1876,” and a decorative crest above the nameplate. The bridge has a wood floor deck. Major repairs to the bridge were made in 1910.\(^{252}\)

\(^{252}\) Sarra, Patoka Bridges Historic District National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, 7-4.

October 18, 2005
Pike County Bridge No. 81 is a Camelback through truss. The bridge was erected in 1924 to span Houchins Ditch, the new channel of the Patoka River, which had been completed in March of that year.253 The single-span, single-lane bridge rests on concrete abutments and wingwalls and has a concrete deck. The truss is divided into eight panels. The center panels have crossed diagonals, while the side panels have diagonals angled toward the center of the span from the top chord. The truss members are steel and are bolted together.

County Road 300 West is a narrow road that has an average width of 14.5 feet.254 The road skirts an oxbow of the Patoka River and curves to allow the two bridges to span intervening water bodies at right angles. The gravel road is paved with asphalt, although the pavement is deteriorated. The road has been repaved at the bridge approaches. James T. Tartt and Company’s History of Gibson County states (p. 213) in regard to Dongola “it was here that the old Wabash and Erie Canal and state road crossed the Patoka River.” County Road 300 West was part of this state road. In the 1820s and 1830s, counties constructed roads using state funds earmarked specifically for road construction. Roads constructed with these funds were called “State Roads.”255 Exact dates of construction of this state road are uncertain, but it could have been built as early as 1825.256

253 Sarra, Patoka Bridges Historic District National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, 7-5.
254 Sarra, Patoka Bridges Historic District National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, 7-2.
255 Esarey, History of Indiana, 289; Donald F. Carmony, Indiana, 1816–1850, 131–35, 177.
256 Sarra, Patoka Bridges Historic District National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, 7-2, 8-8.
Context/Significance: The Patoka Bridges Historic District is listed in the NRHP under Criterion A for its association with the patterns of transportation in the Wabash Lowlands of southwestern Indiana and for its association with the Underground Railroad and under Criterion C for the engineering significance of the two truss bridges. The important themes represented by this district include transportation, engineering, social history, and ethnic heritage. The period of significance is 1851–1936.\(^{257}\)

The two metal truss bridges illustrate the use of metal truss bridges from the late nineteenth through the early twentieth centuries, before the use of concrete and other more modern materials became common for bridge construction. The bridges were constructed forty years apart and illustrate the changes in technology and materials in bridge construction over that time.

According to the NRHP nomination, Pike County Bridge No. 246 is significant in the area of transportation as an important crossing on the state road (County Road 300 West) that linked Petersburg to Oakland City and as an illustration of the continuing evolution of transportation systems in the Patoka Bottoms area. The bridge is significant in the area of engineering as an outstanding representative of Pratt truss highway bridge design in the 1870s and 1880s, for being the work of the Wrought Iron Bridge Company, one of the most important American bridge fabricators of the time, for using a rare patented design element found in only one other surviving bridge in Indiana, and for being one of few extant Indiana bridges with cast-iron elements.\(^{258}\)

Pike County Bridge No. 81 is significant in the area of transportation as a crossing over Houchins Ditch, allowing continued use of the state road after construction of the ditch. In the area of engineering, the bridge is significant as an excellent example of a Camelback through truss bridge.\(^{259}\)

The state road (County Road 300 West) meets NRHP Criterion A in the themes of transportation, social history, and ethnic heritage. The road served farm to market and farm to mill traffic needs of southern Pike County and northeastern Gibson County. Construction of the road began perhaps as early as 1825. The village of Dongola was established in 1851 where this road and the Wabash and Erie Canal crossed the Patoka River. Underground Railroad operatives were active in Dongola and, according to local lore, hid under the former covered bridge over the river and used the road north of the river as a route for escaped slaves between Oakland City and Petersburg. Pike County Bridge No. 246 replaced the covered bridge in 1884.
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\(^{257}\) Sarra, Patoka Bridges Historic District National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, 8-8.

\(^{258}\) Sarra, Patoka Bridges Historic District National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, 8-10.

\(^{259}\) Sarra, Patoka Bridges Historic District National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, 8-11.
The canal towpath was also a route for escaped slaves until it became too dangerous, and the canal aqueduct, approximately 1,000 feet east of the former covered bridge, provided another route when the covered bridge was being watched. Even after the canal closed and the Civil War ended the Underground Railroad, the state road continued to serve the transportation needs of local farmers.

**Boundary Description:** The boundary of the Patoka Bridges Historic District follows the path of County Road 300 West from bridge to bridge. The boundary extends twenty-five feet north of Bridge No. 81, twenty-five feet south of Bridge No. 246, and fifteen feet beyond the road’s right-of-way on either side.

---

261 Sarra, Patoka Bridges Historic District National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, 8-8, 8-9, 8-10.
State Register Properties

There are no properties listed in the Indiana Register of Historic Sites and Structures within the APE of Section 2 that are not also listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

Eligible Properties

The project historians examined all above-ground resources more than fifty years old in the APE of Section 2 and surveyed and inventoried fifty-one above-ground resources associated with a locally important theme and with at least a moderate level of integrity (Appendix A, Table 1). Twenty-three building locations originally identified during county surveys in Gibson and Daviess counties are within the APE of Section 2, but the present survey found that five of these buildings are no longer extant (Appendix A, Table 1). The eighteen surviving previously inventoried above-ground resources were reinventoried to reflect their current condition and are included in the count of fifty-one above-ground resources. The present survey newly inventoried thirty-three above-ground resources, consisting of one in Gibson County, twenty-seven in Pike County, and five in Daviess County.

Of the fifty-one extant above-ground resources surveyed in the Section 2 APE, the project historians concluded that two meet the NRHP criteria and are eligible for listing in the NRHP (Appendix A, Maps 2 and 3).

---

262 Gibson County Warrick County Interim Report, Daviess County Interim Report.
Site Plan 2
Thomas C. Singleton Round Barn (Daviess 35005)
Thomas C. Singleton Round Barn (Daviess 35005)

Located at southwest corner of intersection of SR 57 and County Road 450 South
Criteria: A and C

The Thomas C. Singleton Round Barn is eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and C for its associations with agriculture and architecture. The barn is eligible under the Multiple Property Documentation Form Round and Polygonal Barns of Indiana.\textsuperscript{263} The Singleton Round Barn was designed by Benton Steele, one of the most significant designers and promoters of round barns in Indiana. The barn retains a high level of integrity.

Description: This barn is rated outstanding in the Daviess County Interim Report. The Thomas C. Singleton Round Barn is the only building on this piece of land (Site plan 2). The barn sits alone in a pasture located at the southwest corner of the intersection of SR 57 and County Road 450 South. A wire fence lines the pasture along the two roads. A gate in the fence along County Road 450 South provides access to the pasture. Non-period and period residences line SR 57 in the vicinity, except along the pasture. Agricultural fields mostly line County Road 450 South in this vicinity.

The barn is sixty-four feet in diameter and eighteen feet to the eaves.\textsuperscript{264} The barn sits on a concrete foundation and is built of wood frame construction clad with board and batten siding. The gambrel roof is covered with asphalt shingles. A ventilator with louvered vents tops the roof.

\textsuperscript{263} McMahan, “Round and Polygonal Barns.”

\textsuperscript{264} Hanou, \textit{A Round Indiana}, 67.
Lightning rods have been installed around the roof where the gambrel changes pitch. A lightning rod also sits atop the ventilator. “Thos. C. Singleton. 1908” is painted on boards fastened above the north door. The north door is a sliding door set on a track. The door and most of the track are missing from the south doorway. Smaller sliding doors are located on the east and west sides. Small window openings, some of which retain four-light sash, circle the ground level of the barn; the loft level also has window openings, but fewer. The two main doors open to a center driveway. Semi-circular storage areas are located on either side of the driveway. The barn has space for cattle at the ground level, above which is a hayloft. A corncrib lines about a quarter of the outer wall.

**Context/Significance:** The Thomas C. Singleton Round Barn is a highly intact example of this barn type, built from the design of Benton Steele, one of the most prominent round barn promoters and designers in Indiana. The productivity of Indiana farms during the golden age of agriculture created a need for new building types to house the improved agricultural equipment of the period and to increase efficiency on the farm. The flush times provided farmers with sufficient capital to risk on new and unproven barn designs, such as round barns. Also, the barn is illustrative of the experimentation in barn construction and function that was prevalent in the early twentieth century. The barn’s period of significance is 1908–1920; the former is the year it was built and the latter corresponds to the end of Indiana’s golden age of agriculture.

Thomas C. Singleton was born on June 24, 1873, in Veale Township. He was the son of Hunley Singleton, a carpenter and farmer, who moved to Indiana from Kentucky. Thomas Singleton through his mother was a descendent of James C. Veale, the early settler for whom the township was named. Singleton attended Vincennes University and taught school in Veale Township for several years before taking up farming. As of 1915, he owned 175 acres of land and was a general farmer and stock raiser, known for success in raising cattle and hogs. He also held public office, having been elected county recorder in 1913.

In the 1888 Daviess County atlas, the site of the pasture was the possession of L. B. and D. Griffin. Members of the Singleton family lived to the north and east. Singleton was not a common name in the township at that time. Thomas Singleton built his round barn in 1908 according to plans that he had ordered from Benton Steele, one of the most prominent designers and promoters of round barns in Indiana. The builders of the barn were G. Scudder, A. Ragsdale, and a man named Bugler. Scudder and Ragsdale were names found in the neighborhood in 1888, so local carpenters likely assembled the barn. However, Thomas
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Singleton did not purchase the 40-acre parcel until 1909. Singleton submitted a description of his barn and an endorsement of the round barn type to the *Indiana Farmer* in 1909. The article was Steele’s last promotion in the journal before he moved to Kansas the same year. In 1977, Inez Singleton owned the piece of land containing the barn and pasture. In 1989, K. S. and P. Ward owned the portion of the pasture containing the barn, while Anna L. Ward owned the rest of the land containing the pasture.

The early farmers of Indiana practiced agriculture primarily on a subsistence basis. As more settlers entered the state and the number of farms grew, the means of transporting surplus goods to outside markets was also improving. The completion of the National Road through the state, the completion of the Michigan Road, the opening of the southern division of the Wabash and Erie Canal, and the establishment of early railroads were the main transportation improvements allowing commercial agriculture to take hold in Indiana. During the second half of the nineteenth century, various efforts were established to improve the quality of farming in Indiana. The Indiana General Assembly established the State Board of Agriculture in 1851, which in turn began publishing the *Indiana Farmer* in 1874 to disseminate information on new agricultural machinery and practices. In addition, university-associated agricultural experiment stations formed during this period and placed a more scientific focus on agriculture.

These efforts culminated in a period from about 1881 to 1920 called Indiana’s golden age of agriculture. Improvements in farming practices and machinery allowed more efficient and productive cultivation of the land without an increase in the labor expended. The value of farm property increased dramatically during this period without a substantial increase in cultivated acreage. Subsistence agriculture required few outbuildings, but as farm productivity increased farmers added outbuildings, which often were small and built for a single purpose. However, scientific farmers and agricultural researchers began to advocate consolidating these various small buildings into single large barns, both to promote efficiency and to allow storage of the improved, and often large, new equipment becoming available.

As the economic and scientific influences on farming increased, farmers and researchers sought innovations to improve efficiency and productivity, and therefore profits. Among other areas, these efforts focused on the design and construction of barns. Innovations such as the use of balloon framing, self-supporting roofs, and the development of the circular silo allowed barns to be constructed more quickly and at lower cost and to be more functional in use through the
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269 Daviess County deed book 26, page 186. The deed was notarized and recorded in November 1909.
272 Daviess/Martin Counties, Indiana, Plat Directory, 34.
elimination of obstructing posts and by ensuring a year round supply of silage. The development of the round barn is illustrative of the efforts to improve the efficiency and productivity of farm operations during Indiana’s golden age of agriculture. That wealthy progressive farmers generally were the first purchasers of round barns in Indiana is reflective of the fact that farmers with capital were the most likely to experiment with new barn types. Among the earliest round barn owners were a University of Chicago professor, a banker, a congressman, an attorney, and state legislator.

The rise and fall of the round barn occurred during a period of great experiment in farm building design from the 1890s to the 1920s. Beginning in the 1890s, a variety of factors came together to generate interest in improvements to the traditional design and construction of barns. The increasing scarcity of heavy timbers for traditional timber frames was one factor, as well as the need for a more open loft to take maximum advantage of the use of the hay carrier. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, the state agricultural colleges, popular agricultural journals, and mail-order building catalogs began to have an influence on the thinking of some farmers. Finally, a shortage of labor and capital made farmers more open to barn designs that were less expensive to construct and less labor intensive to operate. Among the innovations of the period were the plank frame and its successor the balloon frame, greater adoption of the gambrel roof, development of the open loft gothic roof and curved roof forms, and the use of concrete and hollow tile to increase sanitation and reduce fire risk.

The earliest round and nonorthogonal barns were experiments by gentleman farmers, such as George Washington. A New York scientific agriculturalist and editor of an agricultural journal named Elliot W. Stewart advocated the use of octagonal barns beginning in the 1870s and caused a mini-boom in construction of the type. However, it was not until Franklin H. King, an agriculture professor at the University of Wisconsin, constructed and began publicizing a balloon-framed round barn in 1889 did the idea of the round barn begin to take hold in the Midwest. Previously, the technical skill necessary to construct a round barn with timber framing limited its appeal and led to the use of nonorthogonal barns as a compromise between the familiar rectangular barn and the ideal of a round barn. However, King showed that balloon framing could be used to construct a round barn that was just as strong as a timber-framed barn, but was less expensive and easier to construct.

Despite several successful experiments and some limited publicity, it was not until several carpenter-builders in Indiana adopted the round barn as the main focus of their business that the

idea of the round barn began to get more general attention from farmers. Isaac and Emery McNamee were hired to build a round barn in Rush County, Indiana, in 1900, which inspired them to try to sell the idea to others. For their second round barn, in Hancock County, they collaborated with Benton Steele, a carpenter and self-taught architect. Working with the McNamees and Samuel Detraz, another carpenter, Steele was able to market the round barn idea to two prominent businessmen in 1901. These two commissions led to still more orders for round barns. By 1902, Steele had begun to publish round barn plans and advertisements in the *Indiana Farmer*. In 1905, Isaac McNamee, Horace Duncan, a carpenter who had been working with McNamee, and attorney Frank Littleton patented the design of a self-supporting conical roof, which essentially gave them the rights to the design of the round barn. Despite this, Steele continued to design and promote round barns in Indiana. Steele was able to interest the University of Illinois Agricultural Experiment Station in the round barn design, and the university published a book of plans and building instructions in 1910. However, Duncan eventually began to pressure Steele for royalties on the round barn designs that Steele sold, so Steele moved to Kansas in 1909 and continued to design round barns.

Without Steele’s promotional efforts, interest in round barns began to decline in Indiana. The increased use of round barns also began to highlight flaws in their design, such as poor lighting and ventilation. Also, there was much waste material generated in construction of the barn. The number of round barns constructed in Indiana peaked in 1910, and few were built after 1918. Although the round barn boom began in Indiana, round barns were built throughout the country, with the greatest concentration in the Midwest.279

Despite the short-lived period of round barn construction, round barns are a highly visible example of the type of experimentation occurring in agricultural building design in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century. This experimentation transformed the standard barn design from a barn with a heavy timber frame and a gable roof, which had been ubiquitous in the east half of the country through much of the nineteenth century, to a light-framed building with a prominent roof housing ample loft space, which became widespread in the twentieth century. In Indiana, Benton Steele was an important designer and proponent of the round barn. Adding to its significance is that it is one of Steele’s designs.

*Conclusion:* Constructed in 1908, the Singleton Round Barn is an excellent example of its type and retains a high level of integrity. The barn meets the registration requirements established in the MPD “Round and Polygonal Barns of Indiana,” and is eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and C for its associations with agriculture and architecture.

---

Boundary Description and Justification: The eligible boundary of Daviess 35005 is a polygon that follows the fenceline along SR 57 and County Road 450 South to arbitrary points, then proceeds west and south to enclose the portion of the pasture containing the barn. No other buildings are present or appear to have ever been present in the pasture so the boundary only encloses the barn and enough of the pasture to convey its agricultural setting. The house across the street to the north is no longer associated with the barn and does not retain integrity. As a noncontributing resource, it is excluded from the eligible boundary of the barn.
Chapman-Allison Farmstead (Daviess 35001)
Northwest and southwest corners of intersection of County Road 50 East and County Road 400 South
Criterion: A

The Chapman-Allison Farmstead is eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A for its association with agriculture and early settlement. The Chapman-Allison House (circa 1845) is significant for its association with the early settlement of Veale Township. It is an example of early housing in the township and the process of expansion and remodeling that early houses underwent during the period after the end of the wilderness period. The farmstead is an excellent example of a turn of the twentieth century livestock farm and has one of the largest and most intact collections of outbuildings observed in the APE.

Description: The Chapman-Allison Farmstead is not evaluated or rated in the Daviess County Interim Report, although the Chapman-Allison House, which is a part of the farmstead, was rated Contributing. The farmstead contains a total of twelve contributing buildings or structures, including the vernacular Chapman-Allison House (circa 1845 [in its current appearance]), a transverse frame barn (circa 1900), a three-portal barn (circa 1900), a machine shed (circa 1940), a granary (circa 1900), two agricultural outbuildings of uncertain use (circa 1900), a well house (age unknown), a garage (circa 1940), two sheds (age unknown), and a concrete block outbuilding (circa 1940) near the house (Site plan 3).
Most of the agricultural outbuildings, including the barns, are located south of County Road 400 South. These buildings have a courtyard layout, with the barns parallel and set back from the road in the center and flanked by two of the smaller buildings closer to the road. One small agricultural outbuilding is located opposite the end of County Road 400 South. Fences, gates, and driveways among the agricultural outbuildings help define patterns of circulation. A lawn slopes down to County Road 400 South in front of the house and opposite the barns. Much of the surrounding land appears to be, or to have been, pasture land. Modern residential development is occurring along County Road 400 South west of the farmstead.

The two-story, side-gabled house is vernacular and asymmetrical in orientation and has a few elements of the Greek Revival style. The house is clad in wood clapboards and has an asphalt shingle roof. Several window types are present. The second floor windows generally are short two-over-two double hung sash. The first floor windows generally are four-over-four double hung sash. A six-over-six double hung sash is present in the west gable end. The two front doors are early and possibly original. The doorways, both with transoms, are asymmetrically placed on the façade. The house has pilaster corner boards and a wide frieze under the eaves. The front porch has a rock-faced concrete block foundation and walls.

An early ell with a lower roof line projects north from the east end of the north wall. Stairs and a patch in the siding show where a window has replaced a doorway in the north wall of the ell. Screened porches line the remainder of the north wall of the house and most of the east side of the ell. A small shed roof non-period addition projects from the west side of the house and ell.
This addition has a concrete block foundation and two small four-light windows.

The house retains most of its integrity. The design has been altered somewhat by the addition of later porches on the front and rear, although the front porch is well over fifty years old and contributes to the history of the house. The front porch does not obscure the massing or asymmetry of the house, and so is not a serious detriment to the integrity of the house. Also, a small addition has been made on the west side of the house. However, the addition is small enough that it does not change an observer’s impression of the plan or massing of the house.

The garage is located northeast of the house. The front-gabled building has a sliding door on the south wall, an asphalt shingle roof, and vertical wood siding.

Two front-gabled sheds are located north of the house. The east shed has a corrugated metal roof and board and batten siding. The west shed has an asphalt shingle roof, board and batten siding, and an overhang over the door in the south wall.

A front-gabled concrete block outbuilding is located west of the house. This outbuilding has a standing seam metal roof. The east half of this building is a partially screened enclosure.

The well house is located at the east edge of the pasture west of the house and is a small shed roof building with vertical wood siding.

The building on the east side of County Road 50 East is a front-gabled machine shed with vertical board siding, exposed rafter tails, and double hinged doors in the west wall.
Fencing and loose cattle in the barnyard prevented a close examination of the agricultural outbuildings. The easternmost outbuilding of those south of County Road 400 South is a front-gabled building set on piers, possibly a granary. The building has a corrugated metal roof and vertical wood siding. Double hinged doors are in the north wall.

The east barn is the three-portal barn. This barn has a metal roof and a mix of vertical board and board and batten siding. This barn has a large gabled hay hood with an owl hole.

The transverse frame barn is west of this barn. The transverse frame barn has a metal roof and a mix of vertical board and board and batten siding. A triangular hay hood shelters the hayloft doors in the gable end. A shed roof extension has been added along the west side of the barn.

A front-gabled outbuilding, parallel to the road, is located west of the barns. This building has a corrugated metal roof and vertical board siding.

The westernmost outbuilding is a front-gabled building with vertical wood siding and a shed roof equipment shelter along its east side.

**Context/Significance:** The period of significance of the Chapman-Allison Farmstead (Daviess 35001) is 1845–1955, the years of its historic use. The property has two areas of significance: Exploration/Settlement for the house and Agriculture for the farmstead.

The Chapman-Allison House is significant as an early- to mid-nineteenth century house reflective of the second generation of farm housing after farmers had expanded their farms enough to think about replacing their early primitive log cabins.
The house shows the expansion and stylistic updating that was once a common practice among early settlers, and is likely one of few surviving houses that display such changes in Veale Township. The house was the home of Elijah Chapman, a prominent early settler who was a farmer, politician, and entrepreneur.

Elijah Chapman was one of the first settlers in Veale Township and entered a tract of land in 1813. He owned mills and a pottery kiln, was proprietor of a village (no longer extant), and was active in the Methodist church. Chapman served as a representative to the state legislature from 1844 to 1846 and served two terms as associate judge of the Daviess County circuit court. The Chapman-Allison House locally is attributed to circa 1813 based on Chapman’s acquisition of the land, although the house’s current form likely dates to the 1840s. If the house truly dates to circa 1813, then it likely has a log core in half of the house (probably the east half since it would be more difficult to add ells to the log section and both additions extend from the west half of the house). Chapman moved to Illinois in 1854 and died in 1855.

Around the turn of the twentieth century, a descendent of Elijah Chapman, visiting the old farm in Veale Township, reported that the only improvements made to the house by the Allisons up to that time were new kitchen verandas and a new roof. Assuming that this information is accurate, the Chapman-Allison House was largely in its existing form by 1854 when Chapman left for Illinois.

As antebellum settlers lived on, improved, and farmed the land, their early temporary log cabins became animal shelters or raw materials for other buildings. The average farmer built a new, larger house when time and resources permitted. The new house had doors and windows, unlike the early cabins, and eventually, if not right away, received clapboard siding. As the family grew, additions or whole wings, often referred to as “ells,” were added to accommodate the newcomers. The accretion of rooms, wings, and additions gave many early houses an asymmetrical appearance.

The Chapman-Allison House has an asymmetrical façade that may represent two major periods of construction, possibly circa 1813 and circa 1845. Stylistic elements have been applied to the house to provide a more fashionable appearance, namely the wide frieze and the capitals on the cornerboards. These elements suggest the influence of the Greek Revival style of architecture, a style popular in the rapidly expanding U.S. frontier during the 1830s through the 1850s. The use of such stylistic elements on the house may reflect Elijah Chapman’s political and economic success during the 1840s, when he served as a state legislator. Also, the establishment of sawmills in the township, including one owned by Chapman, enabled improvements to the

280 Williams, Chapman-Johnson-Wallace-Palmer Family, 10–14; Goodspeed, History of Knox and Daviess Counties, 591; Myers, Daviess County, Vol. 1, 85.
housing stock of early Veale Township, such as the expansion of Chapman’s own house, which reflects the growing stability and prosperity of the settlers in Daviess County.

The Chapman-Allison Farmstead is one of the largest and most intact period farmsteads observed in the APE and is illustrative of a turn of the twentieth century livestock farm in Daviess County. County histories indicate that livestock raising was an important agricultural activity. Veale Township’s hilly terrain may have made livestock a more appealing option than crops.

In a deed recorded in November 1854, Elijah Chapman sold the farm to Joseph Allison for one hundred dollars. The farm consisted of the south 110 acres in the southeast quarter of Section 14 and 11.5 acres at the north edge of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of Section 23. Joseph Allison was born in Pennsylvania in 1792 and later moved to Kentucky with his parents.


William A. Allison was born in 1826, John A. Allison was born in 1838, and Joseph C. Allison was born in 1842. William A. Allison made his home at the “Homeplace” received from his father. Allison was one of the first people to bring Shorthorn cattle to Indiana and eventually was named to Purdue University’s Livestock Breeders Hall of Fame. John A. Allison taught school for five years before becoming a farmer and stock raiser. He also apparently lived at the Homeplace, having settled there in 1877. Joseph C. Allison served in the Civil War. He settled on a farm a short distance north on County Road 50 East from his brothers in 1873 and mixed farming and teaching. He was elected township trustee in 1874 and 1876. The 1888 county atlas shows John A. Allison living at the Chapman-Allison House and William A. and Joseph C. Allison living almost opposite one another a short distance to the north. Various members of the Allison family owned land throughout the northeast corner of Veale Township, including in Sections 14, 23, 24, 25, and 26.

282 Fulkerson, History of Daviess County, 132.
283 Daviess County deed book I, page 775.
284 Fulkerson, History of Daviess County, 508; Goodspeed, History of Knox and Daviess Counties, 893–894.
The Allison brothers continued to add to their land holdings through the nineteenth century. Isaac and Owen Allison, sons of John A. Allison, also were farmers in Veale Township. Around 1915, the brothers operated a farm on 740 acres of land and raised Shorthorn cattle.

The Chapman-Allison Farmstead’s agricultural outbuildings likely were built during Indiana’s golden age of agriculture, between 1881 and 1920. Agricultural buildings in particular reflect the major changes that took place in farming during this era. Farmers constructed larger framed stock barns with shelter and feeding facilities for their animals all placed under one roof and with breeding facilities nearby. With more equipment, the farmer needed buildings for storage and repair of his growing inventory of machinery and tools. County histories show that the Allisons primarily were recognized as livestock farmers, especially of shorthorn cattle. The Chapman-Allison Farmstead contains two large barns for sheltering and feeding cattle and other outbuildings for storage of feed and machinery. The division of the farmstead on either side of the road sharply delineates the agricultural and domestic functions of the farmstead.

Conclusion: The Chapman-Allison House was constructed in phases beginning possibly as early as 1813 and had achieved much of its current form probably by the 1840s. The house is representative of the expansion and stylistic updating of houses by prosperous farmers at the end of the settlement period. The house is part of the Chapman-Allison Farmstead, a representative example of a turn of the twentieth century livestock farm in Daviess County. The farmstead retains a high level of integrity, including a collection of eleven contributing outbuildings. The Chapman-Allison Farmstead is eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A for its association with agriculture and early settlement.

---


Boundary Description and Justification:
The boundary of the property consists of the current boundary of the parcel, with the addition of a loop at the east end of County Road 400 South to include the machine shed east of County Road 50 East. There are no fields that are clearly associated with the farmstead. The boundary includes the house and all of the outbuildings.
Eligible Districts

There are no districts in the APE of Section 2 that are eligible for listing in the NRHP. In no location in the APE is there a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects that are historically or aesthetically linked by plan or by physical development and that retains an overall level of integrity. A Patoka Bottoms Rural Historic District was informally proposed for Pike County in 2003, but was evaluated and rejected by the DHPA. \(^{290}\) Many factors have contributed to the alteration of the historic landscape in the APE during the second half of the twentieth century including strip mining, the US 50/150 bypass around Washington, suburban development near Oakland City, Petersburg, and Washington, the modernization and consolidation of farms, which has resulted in the loss of historic farmsteads and field patterns, the spread of suburban and commercial development along the SR 57 corridor, and the development of the Prides Creek Conservancy District near Petersburg.

Selected Ineligible Properties

Intensive fieldwork and research determined that forty-seven above-ground resources either lack historical or architectural significance or do not retain sufficient integrity to adequately convey their significance. Most lacked integrity due to the loss of building integrity, the loss of farmstead integrity, or the removal from an original location. The integrity of most buildings has been diminished by replacement of original building materials, additions, and/or other alterations. In some cases, the design and setting of farmsteads has been altered by the construction of modern agricultural outbuildings, or in some cases, the loss of historic agricultural outbuildings.

The project historians for Section 2 have selected fourteen representative ineligible above-ground resources to illustrate some of the factors that resulted in the above-ground resources being determined ineligible. These resources include two properties formerly rated Notable (Gibson 30005 and Daviess 30030), two newly inventoried properties rated Notable (Pike 05006 and Pike 05011), one property that was brought to the attention of the Tier 1 project historians by Citizens for Appropriate Rural Roads (Daviess 35007), and nine properties identified by the Tier 1 project historians as potentially eligible (Daviess 30037, Pike 20001, Pike 20006, Pike 20009, Pike 05002, Pike 05004, Pike 05005, Pike 05007, and Pike 05010). The Section 2 project historians selected these fourteen above-ground resources either as representing certain property types seen in the APE or as being the resources that showed the highest level of integrity, but did not meet the NRHP criteria for evaluation. See Appendix A, Map 4 for the locations of the selected ineligible above-ground resources.

Selected Ineligible Properties
Harper Farmstead (Gibson 30005)
SR 64

The Harper Farmstead is not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of integrity. The farmstead is associated with the history of agriculture in the township and retains a collection of domestic and agricultural outbuildings. The house is a good example of the application of Folk Victorian ornamentation to a vernacular house type. However, a fire has gutted and severely damaged the house and reduced its integrity to the point where it is not eligible for the NRHP.

Description. The Harper Farmstead, rated Notable in the Interim Report, includes a circa 1880 cross-plan house with Folk Victorian-style ornament. The one-story house sits on a brick foundation, has an asphalt shingle roof, and is clad in wood clapboards. There are porches in the northeast, northwest, and southwest angles of the building.

The front porches appear to have been added or altered circa 1915 and have square wood posts on brick piers. The rear porch has turned posts. Three brick chimneys rise from the roof ridge. The doors are original and have Folk Victorian ornamentation. The north wing has cutaway corners at its north end with brackets under the eaves. The north gable end is covered with cove shingles and has intricate gable ornamentation at the apex of the gable.

A fire has gutted the interior of the house and has left the exterior walls as little more than a shell. The alteration or replacement of the house’s north porches has diminished the integrity of the house’s design. Although the porches are more than fifty years old, they do not match the style of the remainder of the house.
The fire damage has diminished the integrity of materials and workmanship.

The house sits on a small rise overlooking SR 64. A driveway extends from the road to west of the house and, beyond a gate, continues to the agricultural outbuildings to the south. A well with a hand pump is located west of the house. A circa 1930 wood-frame garage is on the west side of the driveway north of the gate. A circa 1890 brick summer kitchen is located immediately southwest of the house. A fence separates the domestic portion of the farmstead from the agricultural portion. A cluster of small wood-framed outbuildings is located south of the gate and east of the driveway. One of these, immediately south of the summer kitchen, may have been a privy. The other three buildings may have been poultry and/or hog houses (circa 1910). South of the gate and west of the driveway are two corncribs, one wood-frame (circa 1910) and one wire mesh. A circa 1880 transverse frame barn is located south of the corncribs. A metal pole barn and a hog house are east of the transverse frame barn and the driveway. The presence of SR 57 and the lack of associated land in agricultural use have diminished the setting of the farmstead.

Context/Significance. The Harper Farmstead is not a better or more significant example of a period farmstead than others in the township and is not eligible under Criterion A. In 1881, W. A. Harper owned a forty-acre farm at this location. Many other forty-acre farms were present in the vicinity, although much larger farms, ranging in size from 100 to more than 160 acres, were also common. A house is shown at this location in the 1881 county atlas.\textsuperscript{291}

\textsuperscript{291} Griffing, \textit{Atlas of Gibson and Pike Counties}, 48.
Conclusion: Although Gibson 30005 has historic associations with agriculture in the township, other farmsteads in the township also have such associations. Although originally a good example of a vernacular house type with Folk Victorian ornamentation, the house has suffered too much damage to retain sufficient integrity to be eligible under Criterion C. The Harper Farmstead lacks significance and integrity, and is not eligible under any of the selection criteria.
Pike County Bridge No. 32 (Pike 20006)
Pike County Road 500 West over Patoka River

Pike County Bridge No. 32 is not eligible for the NRHP because it does not meet the criteria for evaluation established by the Indiana DHPA’s Guidelines for Assessing the Cultural Significance of Indiana’s Extant Metal Bridges (1872–1942) to be considered significant.

Description: The bridge is a single span, steel Camelback through truss with bolted connections. The bridge is 162 feet long and has a wood deck that is sixteen feet wide. The vertical clearance is sixteen feet. The span is divided into nine panels. The three center panels have crossing diagonals. The side panels have diagonals angled inward from the top chord. Concrete abutments with wing walls support the truss. The bridge spans the new channel of the Patoka River, also called Houchins Ditch. The road is a narrow, gravel rural road on both sides of the bridge. The bridge retains a high level of integrity.

Context/Significance. There is no bridge at this location on the 1881 county atlas, although there is a bridge present at this location on a 1903 topographic map. The nature of the 1903 bridge is unknown, but the Houchins Ditch has replaced the stretch of river that the 1903 bridge once crossed. Therefore, the existing bridge likely was constructed shortly after the completion of the Houchins Ditch in 1924. The design of the bridge is attributed to the Vincennes Bridge Company.


Cooper, Iron Monuments, 174.
The DHPA guidelines have established certain criteria for significance: all structures designed and erected before 1900, all structures containing patented elements, all structures for which there are fewer than eighteen known extant examples of its truss/girder type within its truss/girder form, all structures for which there are fewer than eighteen known examples of fabrication by a builder, and all structures already listed on the NRHP or determined to be eligible by the DHPA, including structures rated “NRC” in the 1987 inventory included in Iron Monuments. Pike County Bridge No. 32 is not a nineteenth century bridge and is not known to contain patented elements. Bridge No. 32 is attributed to the Vincennes Bridge Company, and examples of bridges by that company are not rare. Cooper lists eight bridges built by or attributed to the Vincennes Bridge Company in Pike County and its contiguous counties, and other bridges by the company are found throughout the rest of the state.

In addition, DHPA guidelines establish a point scale under which a bridge that scores seven or more points is considered significant. Bridge No. 32 only scores six points on this scale. The bridge scores four points for having its trusses essentially intact, one point for having been built by an Indiana fabricator (although this is only an attribution), and one point for having fewer extant examples than there are counties in the region (the county in which the structure is located and all contiguous counties).

Conclusion: Bridge No. 32 is not significant in the area of transportation. The river crossing is not on an early route, nor did it lead to development or agricultural expansion in the area. Although the Camelback through truss is an uncommon bridge type in Indiana, this bridge did not receive a rating in the 1987 inventory. Furthermore, another example of a Camelback through truss bridge built about the same time is located a short distance to the east (Pike 20005) and is listed in the NRHP as part of the Patoka Bridges Historic District. Bridge No. 32 lacks significance and is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under any of the evaluation criteria.

294 Cooper, Iron Monuments, 174.
Ropp Farmstead (Pike 20001)
3451 County Road 200 South

The Ropp Farmstead is not eligible for the NRHP due to lack of integrity and significance. Alterations to the house and three-portal barn have diminished integrity of design and materials. Alterations to the garage have diminished its integrity of materials.

Description: The farmstead is located on a rise on the south side of County Road 200 South. This rise is the south end of a branch of the uplands located to the north, and the land continues to gain height north of the road. The land to the east, west, and south of the rise is in the floodplain of the Patoka River, making the farmstead stand out dramatically against the surrounding land. The farmstead consists of a house, garage, three-portal barn, two poultry houses, a shed, and a well house.

The two-story, front-gabled vernacular house displays elements of the Queen Anne style, as well as later features, such as some of the windows. The inclusion of Queen Anne elements on the house suggests a date of construction around the turn of the twentieth century, while the five-over-one and three-over-one windows, which appear to be original, suggest a date in the second decade of the twentieth century. In any case, the farmstead buildings likely date to fairly close to the establishment of the farm circa 1893. The house sits on a brick foundation, has an asphalt shingle roof, and is clad in aluminum siding. The soffits are also aluminum, and aluminum storm windows cover most of the windows.
A hip roof enclosed porch has been added to the front (north) wall of the house. Within the porch, a door is located toward the east end of the wall. The windows are original. West of the door is a five-over-one double hung sash window with a truncated top sash. A triple window with double hung sash is at the second floor above the porch. The center window is slightly taller than the flanking windows and has a diamond pane top sash. The flanking windows are three-over-one sash windows. The west windows are one-over-one double hung sash. The main first floor window of the east wall is a five-over-one double hung sash window with a truncated top sash, similar to the one in the north wall. The other windows are one-over-one double hung sash windows. A one-story ell projects from the south wall of the house. A wraparound enclosed porch has been added to the east side and part of the south side of the ell. The combined ell and porch have a hip roof.

The circa 1893 three-portal barn has a concrete block foundation, concrete floor, and asphalt shingle roof. Structurally, the barn is timber-framed with circular sawn beams. The east and west walls are concrete block. The south wall has metal siding and metal doors, while the north wall has vertical board siding. A modern garage door has been added to the north end of the west bay.

The garage is located at the east edge of the farmstead and has a concrete foundation and metal siding and roofing, except the west (front) wall, which has vertical wood siding. The poultry houses are southwest of the house. The north poultry house is a side-gabled building on a concrete foundation. The building has an asphalt shingle roof and vertical wood siding.
The south poultry house is larger, consists of two shed roof sections set one against the other, and has vertical wood siding and south-facing windows. A front-gabled shed set on piers faces the driveway southeast of the house. The well house, immediately south of the house, has a brick foundation, an asphalt shingle roof, and vertical board siding.

The additions of the enclosed porches and aluminum siding have diminished the house’s integrity of design and material. The insertion of a non-period garage door into one bay of the three-portal barn diminished its integrity of design, as has the use of concrete block in the side walls. The use of metal siding and doors on the rear wall has diminished the integrity of materials. The replacement of most of the garage’s exterior has diminished its integrity of materials.

The farmstead has lost some of its integrity of setting. Strip mining has altered much of the upland fields, changing the contours and drainage. A comparison of a 1937 aerial photograph with a modern aerial photograph shows that several houses or farmsteads once located east and north of the Ropp Farmstead are no longer present, likely as a result of strip mine activities. The 1937 aerial photograph also shows that County Road 200 South once extended west of County Road 375 West, although it no longer does so.

**Context/Significance:** In the summer of 2003, the DHPA considered the significance of the Ropp Farmstead and other above-ground resources as part of a possible rural historic district in the Patoka Bottoms. In reference to the Ropp Farmstead, Frank Hurdis of the DHPA stated: “…small scale agriculture was an activity that…typified the area.
Yet the Ropp farm, the only agricultural resource in the proposed district, was not typical in several respects nor appeared to be representative of a widespread pattern of farmland organization.\textsuperscript{295}

\textit{Conclusion:} The Ropp Farmstead is not particularly illustrative of the agricultural character of Pike County in the first half of the twentieth century. The house does not display the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction and is not significant architecturally. The farm buildings are unremarkable. The house and three-portal barn, the farmstead’s primary resources, lack integrity. Because the Ropp Farm historically has been considerably larger than the average farm of the area, it does not well represent the history of agriculture in the area. The Ropp Farmstead lacks significance and integrity, and is not eligible for the NRHP under any of the selection criteria.

\textsuperscript{295} Frank D. Hurdis, Jr., to Edith Sarra, Typewritten letter, 27 August 2003, copy on file with DHPA, Indianapolis.
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Loveless Farmstead (Pike 20009)
1953 County Road 300 West

The Loveless Farmstead is not eligible for the NRHP due to its lack of significance. Loss of farmland, nearby strip mining and extensive overgrowth around the buildings have diminished the integrity of setting, feeling, and association.

Description: The Loveless Farmstead consists of the house, a transverse frame barn, a summer kitchen, a large outbuilding (possibly a hog house), and two wells. Although still occupied, the house and yard give the appearance of abandonment. The yard is untended, and the driveway is overgrown and barely discernable. There are many trees throughout the yard, but they do not appear to be planted in any discernable pattern. The land to the west and north is fallow and becoming overgrown. Much of the surrounding land has been strip mined.

The circa 1880 house is a one-story, cross-plan house with porches in three of the angles and an addition in the northwest angle. The house is set on piers, has an asphalt shingle roof, and is clad in wood clapboards. There is a brick chimney in the roof ridge of the front ell. Another brick chimney is in the northwest corner addition. Most windows are original one-over-one double hung sash windows, most of which have a molded window cap. There is a shed-roof addition on the southwest side where a former porch was enclosed. Another porch on the northwest elevation has replacement posts and has lost its decorative brackets and spandrels. The house retains its original doors. All doors but the northwest door have a transom.

The circa 1880 transverse frame barn is located southwest of the house. The building has a corrugated metal roof and vertical board siding.
The barn is timber-framed with circular sawn beams. A shed roof extension lines the south side of the barn.

The circa 1880 summer kitchen is northwest of the house. This building is set on piers and has clapboard siding and a metal roof. A door is in the east wall. A stove is still in the building.

The third outbuilding, possibly a hog house, is overgrown and in poor condition. Its age could not be determined. The building has low walls and a shallow-pitched gable roof covered with corrugated metal. Two covered wells are also near the house.

Context/Significance: A late nineteenth century farmstead, the Loveless Farmstead is illustrative of the small-scale farms common to southern Pike County in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, but lacks significant associations with the history of agriculture in the area.

Percy Loveless was a pioneer of what is now Logan Township. This particular property, however, is not associated with pioneer settlement since it was, in fact, built circa 1880, well after the settlement era. By the 1880s, various members of the Loveless family owned a great deal of land in the east half of Logan Township. Isaac Loveless, Jr., purchased the north half of the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of Section 30 (20 acres) from William D. Rumble in 1875. This is the location of the Loveless farmstead. A house appears at this location in the 1881 county atlas. The footprint and ornament of the house suggest a date of construction in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, which would be during the ownership of Isaac Loveless, Jr.
The house may well be the house marked at this location in the 1881 atlas, giving a construction date of 1875 to 1881. The land and buildings are still in the possession of the Loveless family.

**Conclusion:** The generally small scale of farm holdings in the township historically suggests that few period farmsteads would have had a large number of buildings. Nevertheless, the Loveless Farmstead has only two intact outbuildings remaining. The deterioration and overgrowth around the third outbuilding make its function and integrity questionable. Without farmland or a collection of outbuildings of specific and varied function to illustrate the farm’s agricultural processes and productivity, the farmstead lacks sufficient significance to be eligible for the NRHP. The Loveless Farmstead lacks significant historical or architectural associations, and is not eligible for the NRHP under any of the selection criteria.

---

Pike County Bridge No. 175 (Pike 05002)  
County Road 125 West over Flat Creek

*Pike County Bridge No. 175 is not eligible for the NRHP because it does not meet the criteria for evaluation. The bridge does not attain a high enough point total in the Indiana DHPA’s Guidelines for Assessing the Cultural Significance of Indiana’s Extant Metal Bridges (1872–1942) to be considered significant.*

**Description:** The bridge is a single span, steel Warren Pony truss bridge with bolted connections. The bridge is sixty-three feet long and has a deck width of 21.9 ft. The bridge rests on concrete abutments with wing walls and has a concrete deck. The bridge spans a narrow creek, possibly a remnant of the Wabash and Erie Canal, which passed this location, and is located along a narrow, gravel rural road. The surrounding area is mostly agricultural or wooded.

**Context/Significance:** The bridge’s date of construction is uncertain, but is likely in the twentieth century. Cooper and Gantz attributed the bridge to circa 1920; DLZ attributed the bridge to 1930.297

The DHPA guidelines establish certain criteria under which a bridge is automatically considered significant: all structures designed and erected before 1900, all structures containing patented elements, all structures for which there are fewer than eighteen known extant examples of its truss/girder type within its truss/girder form, all structures for which there are fewer than eighteen known examples of fabrication by a builder, and all structures already listed on the NRHP or determined

---

to be eligible by the DHPA, including structures rated “NRC” in the 1987 inventory included in *Iron Monuments*. Pike County Bridge No. 175 is not a nineteenth century bridge and is not known to contain patented elements. Numerous Warren Pony truss bridges are present in the state, including in the contiguous counties. The fabricator of the bridge is unknown. This bridge did not receive a rating in the 1987 inventory.\(^{298}\) In addition, DHPA guidelines establish a point scale under which a bridge that scores seven or more points is considered significant. Bridge No. 175 scores only four points on this scale, for having its trusses essentially intact.

**Conclusion:** Bridge No. 175 is not significant in the area of transportation. The river crossing is not on an early route, nor did it lead to development or agricultural expansion in the area. This bridge lacks significant engineering and historical associations, and is not eligible for the NRHP under any of the selection criteria.

---

\(^{298}\) Cooper, *Iron Monuments*, 175.
The Bahr House is not eligible for the NRHP because it does not meet the criteria for evaluation and lacks integrity. The house is not a good example of a period farmstead associated with the history of agriculture in the township. The house may once have been a good example of a vernacular house form with Italianate elements, but has been altered and lacks integrity of design, setting, and materials.

Description: Pike 05004 consists of the house, a barn, and two outbuildings. The barn and outbuildings are located south and southeast of the house. The surrounding land is agricultural in character, but no farm fields appear to be directly associated with this house. The barn has a metal roof and metal siding in the gable ends. The walls are mostly concrete block, although the southwest corner of the barn is a corncrib. The two outbuildings have metal walls and roofs.

The circa 1885 house is a two-story, front-gabled building with a three bay facade.\(^{299}\) The foundation level is covered with stamped metal, and the house probably sits on piers. The roof is covered with asphalt shingles. The walls are clad in asbestos cement shingles. The windows are mostly original two-over-two, double-hung sash windows. Molded window crowns with ancones top most of the windows and doorways.

\(^{299}\) No house appears at this location in the 1881 county atlas (Griffing, Atlas of Gibson and Pike Counties, 55). The heirs of John Butler owned a forty-acre farm at this location. A house was located southeast of the present house. A house is depicted at this location on the 1903 topographic map (United States Geological Survey, “Petersburg Quadrangle”). Given map research and the stylistic elements of the house, the house likely was constructed circa 1885.
The original doorways have transoms, all of which are now sealed. The house has a center ridge brick chimney.

The fenestration of the house has been altered. A door and window have been added to the east end of the south wall, subsequent to the application of the current siding. An aluminum hood and concrete deck shelter the door. It is likely that this otherwise symmetrical house had first floor bays to match the second floor windows. Window openings have likely been removed from the north wall, as well. A modern wood deck extends from the north wall. A narrow, one-story circa 1915 addition extends from the south end of the east (rear) wall. The addition has clapboard siding and exposed rafter tails.

The addition and the alterations to the fenestration have diminished the integrity of design. The replacement of siding on the house, barn, and outbuildings has diminished the integrity of materials of each.

**Context/Significance:** The barn and outbuildings do not appear to be contemporaneous with the house, nor is this a good example of a period farmstead. Given the low level of integrity, the house is not a good example of a type, period, or method of construction.

**Conclusion:** The Bahr House lacks significance and integrity and is not eligible for the NRHP under any of the selection criteria.
Goodlet Morgan House (Pike 05006)
701 Goodlet Street, Petersburg

The Goodlet Morgan House is not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of significance and integrity. Goodlet Morgan was a wealthy and influential merchant and businessman in Petersburg in the mid-nineteenth century. Due to alterations, the house has lost much of its original Italianate ornament.

Description: The house and a modern shed are the only buildings on the parcel. The house once was the center of several hundred acres of land, but as Petersburg expanded outward this land was developed and only a small amount of open land remains around the house.

The two-story brick house, constructed in the early 1850s in the Italianate style, has a main block that is five bays wide and an original rear ell. A circa 1970s brick garage has been added to the southeast wall of the ell. The house walls are brick laid in four-to-one American bond. The foundation is sandstone. The roof has a very shallow pitch, probably hipped, and could not be seen to determine the covering material.

The center bays of the façade and northeast side project out from the main wall plane. Another projecting bay is in the angle of the rear wall and the southwest side of the ell. The house has wide eaves with a frieze below. The soffits and frieze are covered with vinyl. The front porch is a replacement and contains double doors and a transom in the center bay. A porch along the southwest side of the ell has been removed. A porch still lines the northeast side of the ell. A door at the north end of the ell opens into the kitchen. The windows have stone lintels and sills.
The lintels of the main block have a projecting molding at the top. The façade has four-over-six double hung sash windows. The windows on the northeast side of the main block are narrow paired two-over-two double hung sash windows. The southwest and southeast sides of the main block have four-over-four double hung sash windows. The windows of the ell are six-over-six double hung sash windows.

Integrity issues are highlighted when comparing a copy of an old engraving in the possession of the house’s owner that shows what changes have occurred over time. A cupola once sat above the projecting front bay. Two chimneys were located on either side of the main block. The front porch ran the full width of the façade. Columns supported the porch roof, and a cast iron railing lined the top of the porch roof. Later the side portions of the porch were removed and replaced with patios. The present porch was added a few years ago. The engraving also shows frieze windows and brackets under the eaves. The porch on the southwest side of the ell had already been replaced or severely altered before it was destroyed in a circa 1990 tornado, which also severely damaged the cornice and eaves.300

The house retains integrity of location, feeling, and association. Although the house is recessed from neighboring roads and some open space remains to the south and west, expansion of Petersburg during the twentieth century has encroached on the Morgan House and eliminated much of its integrity of setting. The dominant material of the house is the red brick of the walls, which are intact.

300 Laverne Schaffer, interview by author, 11 August 2004, field notes, in possession of author; also copy of engraving and old photographs of house in possession of Laverne Schaffer. This information assumes that the engraving is basically accurate and not overly exaggerated.
However, alterations have resulted in the removal of some wood elements, which has diminished the integrity of materials. The loss of some of the porches and ornamentation has diminished the integrity of design and workmanship.

*Context/Significance:* Goodlet Morgan was a wealthy and influential citizen of Pike County in the mid-nineteenth century. Goodlet Morgan was born in Dubois County, Indiana, February 26, 1825. Morgan moved to Petersburg while in his teens to live with the Judge Matthew Foster family, with whom he learned the flat boat business, farming, and merchandising. In November 1848, Goodlet Morgan married Emily Proffit, daughter of George H. Proffit, a businessman and politician who served in the U.S. Congress from 1839 to 1843 and was appointed ambassador to Brazil by President Tyler in 1843. At his death, Proffit owned 1,541 acres of land in the vicinity of Petersburg.  

The Morgans built their large brick house on land inherited from George Proffit. Construction of the house began in 1851 and was completed in 1853 or 1854. Goodlet Morgan was a leading merchant in Petersburg through the 1850s and 1860s. He owned a great deal of land, dealt extensively in livestock and produce, and owned one of the largest stores in Petersburg. With the Wabash and Erie Canal facing severe financial difficulties in the late 1850s, the state legislature allowed the trustees of the canal to lease the canal to private groups. Goodlet Morgan was one of a group of men who formed the Southern Indiana Canal Company to lease the portion of the canal from Point Commerce to Evansville. Morgan served as Pike County commissioner and county clerk and served as president of the Pike County Council. During the Civil War, he gave away thousands of dollars worth of goods to the families of soldiers from the county. In 1877, he suffered financial troubles and retired to farming his estate.

*Conclusion:* Although a wealthy and successful individual, Morgan’s activities did not have a significant enough impact on Petersburg or Pike County for properties associated with him to be eligible for the NRHP. Other successful merchants were present in Petersburg during Morgan’s period of prominence, as were other politicians. Morgan’s activities do not appear to have had a lasting influence on the architecture, economy, politics, or social life of Petersburg or Pike County, despite his great wealth and land holdings. With the loss of elements of its design and ornament, the house is not a significant example of a style of architecture or a type, period, or method of construction. The house is not associated with significant events in the history of Pike County. The Goodlet Morgan House lacks integrity and is not eligible for the NRHP under any of the selection criteria.

---

301 Goodspeed, *History of Pike and Dubois Counties*, 402; McClellan, *Pike County History*, 91; McClellan, *People of Pike County*, 111–12.
Helfenbein Farmstead (Pike 05005)
4032 North SR 61

The Helfenbein farmstead is not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of significance. The house and farmstead retain most of their integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship.

Description: The farmstead contains a circa 1915 Craftsman-style bungalow-type house, a transverse frame barn, a well house, two poultry houses, a brooder house, and a cistern and horse trough.

The house is a one-and-one-half-story, side-gabled building. The foundation consists of panel-faced concrete blocks. The roof is covered with standing seam metal. The walls are covered with wood shingles. Triangular braces are located under the wide eaves along the north and south walls.

The windows are original and most are four-over-one double hung sash, although a few four-light single sash windows are also present. There is a full-width inset front porch, now enclosed. Panel-faced concrete blocks are used for the porch foundation, piers, and columns. Within the porch, a Craftsman-style door is located toward the north end of the wall, and four-over-one double hung sash windows flanking a five-over-one double hung sash window are located toward the south end of the wall. The south half of the rear of the house is an original enclosed porch. The porch is lined with a band of four-over-one double hung sash windows. The interior of the house retains much of its original woodwork, doors, and built-in furniture.

The well house has a standing seam metal roof, wood shingle walls, and a concrete block foundation. The wide eaves have exposed rafter tails with fascia boards. There is a door in the west wall and two-over-two double hung sash windows.
The family reportedly built the well house at the same time as the bungalow.\textsuperscript{303}

The outbuildings generally are contemporary with the house.\textsuperscript{304} The barn is a transverse frame bank barn. The barn has a concrete block foundation, board and batten siding, and a standing seam metal roof. The lower level of the walls is concrete block near the bank. The barn faces west and has a hay hood and hayloft doors at the west gable end.

The two poultry houses are roughly similar and consist of a shed roof section with closed walls set against a lower shed roof section with open walls. The south poultry house has a concrete foundation, board and batten siding, and a standing seam metal roof. The north poultry house has a concrete foundation, vertical board siding, and a standing seam metal roof. The brooder house is located between the barn and the south poultry house. The building has a shed roof covered with corrugated metal, sits on a concrete foundation, and is clad in clapboard siding.

The house’s integrity of design has been diminished by the enclosure of the front porch. According to the owner, the porch enclosure was designed to be removable without damage to the original material, and so can be considered a reversible alteration. The integrity of materials on most of the buildings has been diminished slightly through the application of standing seam metal roofing.

\textsuperscript{303} Patty Warner, interview by author, 10 August 2004.
\textsuperscript{304} Ibid.
Context/Significance: The Helfenbein Farmstead is an early-twentieth century farmstead and is illustrative of the agricultural character of Washington Township before the advent of strip mining and modern agricultural techniques in the mid-twentieth century. However, the farmstead lacks significant associations with agricultural history in the area.

John G. Helfenbein bought ten acres of land at this location in 1909.\textsuperscript{305} The family likely built the house and outbuildings sometime shortly after they purchased the land. The Helfenbein family acquired other land through the years as well.

Conclusion: The Helfenbein Farmstead does not have significant associations with agriculture. The barn is small and most of the other outbuildings are associated with poultry. The farmstead appears to lack buildings for processing or storage of crops. The outbuildings do not clearly demonstrate the function and productivity of the farm. The Helfenbein Farmstead does not have significant historical and architectural associations, and is not eligible for the NRHP under any of the selection criteria.

\textsuperscript{305} Pike County deed book 38, page 598.
Alford United Methodist Church (Pike 05007) 1709 SR 356

Alford United Methodist Church is not eligible for the NRHP because it does not meet the criteria for evaluation and lacks integrity. As a religious property, the church must meet Criteria Consideration A: a religious property is eligible if it derives its primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance. The church is a heavily altered vernacular building and is not associated with an event or pattern of events of importance. Furthermore, the church lacks integrity of design, materials, workmanship, and feeling.

Description: The church is the only building associated with Pike 05007. A driveway is west of the church. A Permastone structure containing a sign is near the road south of the church. The church, built in 1927, is a front-gabled building on a foundation of panel-faced concrete blocks. The roof is covered with asphalt shingles, and the walls are clad in aluminum siding. At the time of survey, the church was in the midst of receiving vinyl replacement windows. There is a brick chimney at the rear of the roof ridge. A tower and belfry extend from the front of the church. An enclosed entry porch with glass double doors has been added to the front of the tower. A large addition is also on the rear of the church. This addition extends west of the rear of the original church. The addition has a high concrete block foundation. The additions have diminished the integrity of design and feeling. Non-period siding and windows have diminished the integrity of materials, workmanship, and feeling.
Context/Significance: The organizers of the church received a deed for the land in April 1892. The building was damaged in 1924, and a new church was begun that year. The church received electric lights in 1926. The new church was dedicated in 1927. The church lacks integrity and has little architectural or artistic distinction. Furthermore, the church is not associated with an event or pattern of events of importance.

Conclusion: The integrity of the Alford United Methodist Church has been compromised and it is not eligible under any of the criteria for evaluation or under Criteria Consideration A.
Preston House (Pike 05010)
2191 County Road 475 North

The Preston House is not eligible for the NRHP because it does not meet the criteria for evaluation and lacks integrity. The house has been heavily altered and is not a significant example of a type, period, or method of construction. The house likely was part of a farmstead and therefore associated with the agricultural history of the township. However, there are insufficient agricultural outbuildings remaining with the house to be a good example of a farmstead.

Description: Aside from the house, Pike 05010 contains a garage and a small granary. The house is set back approximately 150 feet from the road. A gravel driveway is west of the house. Shrubs line the street east of the driveway. Mature trees fill the yard between the house and the road. The lawn extends east of the house. The land to the north, west, and south is agricultural.

The house, built circa 1880, is a vernacular, two-story building with a wing to the east and multiple additions. The main block has a shallow-pitched hip roof with a brick chimney toward the center of the roof ridge. The house sits on a brick foundation and has a mix of aluminum and vinyl siding. The windows are vinyl replacement windows. The east wing is side-gabled with flared eaves and a brick chimney at the east gable end. A recently constructed porch runs across the front of the main block and east wing. The doors appear to be original.
The granary, located north of the house, is of indeterminate age and is set on piers. The front-gabled building has exposed rafter tails and vertical board siding. The circa 1925 front-gabled garage is on the west side of the driveway facing the house. The garage has a shed roof addition along its south wall.

The porch and additions have diminished the house’s integrity of design and workmanship. The replacement of the siding and windows has diminished the integrity of materials, workmanship, and feeling. The probable loss of outbuildings has diminished the integrity of setting and association.

_Context/Significance:_ A house is depicted at this location in the 1881 county atlas. The land was part of a 159.8-acre farm owned by the heirs of A. Preston. A house also appears at this location on the 1903 topographic map. Given the house’s box-like massing and shallow-pitched hip roof, the house may once have been an Italianate-style building. In that case, the house may be the house shown at this location in the 1881 atlas. However, alterations have eliminated most of the house’s architectural character. The house likely was originally a farmhouse, but the loss of most of the outbuildings has eliminated the house’s association with agricultural history.

_Conclusion:_ The house is not eligible for the NRHP under any of the criteria for evaluation and lacks integrity.

---

Lemuel R. Hargrave House (Pike 05011)
5152 County Road 200 East

The Lemuel R. Hargrave House is not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of significance. The house retains integrity of location, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

Description: The circa 1863 house and a non-period garage are the only buildings associated with Pike 05011. At the time of survey, the fields north and south of the house were planted in corn. A wood lot is east of the yard. A row of mature trees lines the yard along the road and curve east along the south side of the driveway. The driveway is north of the house and extends east of the house to the side-gabled garage. The house originally was a farmhouse, but the loss of all period outbuildings has diminished the integrity of setting and association.

The house is a two-story, four-bay house and is arranged in an L-plan. The side-gabled section has an original ell projecting east from the south end of the east wall. Both sections of the house are timber frame with brick nogging, and clad in wood clapboard with corner pilasters. A shed roof extension lines the north side of the ell, and replaces the original porch. A modern wood deck lines the north side of the extension and is flush with the north wall of the side-gabled section. The house sits on a replacement concrete block foundation and has a corrugated metal roof. The windows are original six-over-six double hung sash. The main door is original and has sidelights and a transom. A small porch shelters this doorway and provides a balcony for the second floor door. This porch and the second floor doorway are modern additions.
The interior of the house features yellow poplar hardwood floors, wainscoting, and doors. The wainscoting is on the main rooms of the first floor, and the interior doors are four-paneled with transoms. Wood trim surrounds the interior doors and windows.

The organization of the façade into regular bays, the six-over-six sash windows, the wide frieze, the rectangular transom over the front door, and the corner pilasters are all elements of the Greek Revival style, which is consistent with the estimated date of construction. The recessed panels in the pilasters even suggest a hint of the Italianate style, which would also be consistent with the 1860s. The lack of high-style elements on the house most likely reflects its rural location, the design limitations of the master carpenter who built it, and possibly the economic level of its builder, rather than any inherent austerity of style. The near symmetry of the façade and relatively large window openings would not seem to be consistent with an underlying Fachwerk, or half-timbered, construction, a conclusion supported by the lack of early owners with a German or Swiss origin. The house is similar to an I-house in appearance, but has a side-hall entrance. An I-house will almost always have its entrance in the center bay, if there are an odd number of bays, or one of the inner bays, if it has a four-bay façade. I-houses generally are not characteristic of any particular settlement pattern and are found throughout Indiana. Settlers from New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and the Upland South all built I-houses in the state. The side-hall entrance and any other idiosyncratic features most likely reflect either the naiveté of the rural carpenter or the functional demands of the owner for whom the house was built rather than any stylistic or ethnic background.

Context/Significance: Between 1853 and 1863, five different individuals owned this property. All but one of them owned the property for less than three years. The first of these owners, Sylvester France, purchased the property from the Trustees of the Wabash & Erie Canal in 1853, but owned the property for less than a month. As the land was sold to help fund construction of the canal, then it would almost certainly have belonged to the state or federal government prior to 1853 and is unlikely to have had a house on it. The second owner, Thomas Carson, owned the property for less than a year. In the 1850 census, Carson and his wife lived in Petersburg, and Carson is listed as a “wagoner” and with no real estate. It seems unlikely that Carson would have had the resources to construct such a large house. The third owner was Alexander Leslie, who owned the property from 1854 to 1861. Leslie was a wealthy doctor who lived in Petersburg. In both the 1850 and 1860 censuses, he is listed as living in Petersburg.

307 Bastian, “Indiana Folk Architecture,” 123.
308 Deed records in possession of Joseph Tamalavic, current owner. The project historians transcribed the deed information during a site visit on 4 February 2005.
309 Deed records in possession of Joseph Tamalavic, current owner. The project historians transcribed the deed information during a site visit on 4 February 2005.
310 U.S. Decennial Census, 1850.
311 Deed records in possession of Joseph Tamalavic, current owner. The project historians transcribed the deed information during a site visit on 4 February 2005.
and having large real estate holdings. It seems likely that this property was part of his real estate holdings, probably for investment purposes, making it unlikely that he would have lived on the property and built the house. The last owners before the Hargraves purchased the property were James and Elizabeth Bass (1861–63). The 1860 census lists James and Elizabeth Bass as living in Petersburg. Bass’ occupation was listed as master carpenter, so it is possible he built the house himself, although this would still date the house to the early 1860s. Because the Civil War curtailed much, although certainly not all, construction during the early 1860s, it is possible that the house dates to the postwar period, but it seems unlikely to predate the war.

Emily Hargrave purchased the property in 1863. Emily and her husband Lemuel R. Hargrave owned the property until 1888. Lemuel R. Hargrave was born February 6, 1829, in Pike County and was a farmer and merchant. In 1861, he enlisted in the Union army and served until 1863. Upon his return from the war he began to acquire a farm. Between 1860 and 1867, Hargrave acquired 160 acres in the southeast quarter of Section 24 in Washington Township. A house is depicted at the site of the present house in the 1881 county atlas. In 1884, Hargrave was elected as representative to the state legislature for Pike and Dubois counties. He sold his farm in 1888 and operated a flour mill in Petersburg until 1895. Hargrave died in 1901.

This house is believed to once have been a farmhouse for several reasons. First, most rural properties in this area in the mid-nineteenth century were farms. The 1881 county atlas shows that Hargrave owned 195 acres of land at this location at that time. As no mining activity is known to have occurred on this land, its most likely use was for agriculture. Finally, Goodspeed’s 1885 county history states that Hargrave engaged in agricultural pursuits after the war. Rural properties of this period would have had a variety of outbuildings, some of which would have been associated with agriculture and others with domestic activity. This lack of outbuildings reflects a loss of integrity. As the house was not on a major route into Petersburg

312 Goodspeed, History of Pike and Dubois Counties, 402; U.S. Decennial Census, 1850; U.S. Decennial Census, 1860.
313 Deed records in possession of Joseph Tamalavic, current owner. The project historians transcribed the deed information during a site visit on 4 February 2005.
314 U.S. Decennial Census, 1860.
315 Pike County deed book O, page 240.
316 Sandy McBeth, Pike County Historical Society, interview by author, 24 August 2004, e-mail, in possession of author; Goodspeed, History of Pike and Dubois Counties, 395–96.
318 Griffing, Atlas of Gibson and Pike Counties, 55.
319 McBeth, Pike County Historical Society, interview by author; Goodspeed, History of Pike and Dubois Counties, 395–96.
320 Griffing, Atlas of Gibson and Pike Counties, 55.
and is not located in what would have been a railroad stop at Alford, it is unlikely that the house was ever intended to serve as an inn for either road or railroad traffic.

John Crow purchased the southeast quarter of Section 24 and several lots in Alford from Lemuel Hargrave in 1888. The Crow family owned the farm from 1888 until the 1940s and farmed the land. In the 1940s, Opha and Warner Horrell purchased the land from the Crow family. In 1946, 140 acres in the southeast quarter of Section 24 passed from the Horrell family to Ralph and Mary Werner. With the death of Ralph Werner in 1975, Suzanne M. Werner inherited thirty-seven acres of the southeast quarter of Section 24, all east of County Road 200 East. Later that year, Werner sold the 1.2-acre parcel containing the Hargrave House to Austin and Una Rudolph. The current owners, Joseph and Angela Tamalavic, acquired the house in 1994.\footnote{Pike County deed book 15, page 174; deed book 61, page 438; Pike County Quiet Title Record and Court Orders, Book 3, page 327; Pike County deed book 85, page 689; deed book 105, page 266; deed book 136, page 27; deed book 136, page 95.}

**Conclusion:** Lacking a farmstead, the Hargrave House does not have significant associations with agricultural history. The use of brick nogging is not significant under Criterion A or C. Brick nogging was used in many different places throughout the United States and over a long period of time, and is not indicative of a significant pattern of settlement. Brick nogging was used as a wall filling for insulation, soundproofing, fire safety, and other practical reasons, and is not considered a method of construction.\footnote{Harris, *American Architecture*, 227.} The house is not characteristic of the I-house type and, with only a few modest stylistic details, is not characteristic of the Greek Revival style; therefore, the house is not significant for its architecture. Lemuel Hargrave is not significant in the history of the township or county. Although Lemuel Hargrave was a Civil War veteran and served in the state legislature, he is not known to have made significant contributions to local or state history in either area; therefore, the house is not eligible under Criterion B. Lacking significant historical and/or architectural associations, the Hargrave House is not eligible for the NRHP under any of the selection criteria.
Colbert House (Daviess 35007)
County Road 100 West (RR 2 Box 311)

The Colbert House is not eligible for the NRHP because it lacks integrity. The house is part of a farmstead and is associated with the history of agriculture in the township. However, other examples of period farmsteads are present in the township, and Daviess 35007 is not a better or more significant example of a farmstead than others in the township. The house is not a significant example of a type, period, or method of construction.

Description: The Colbert House was rated Contributing in the Davies County Interim Report. The house is associated with a modern garage, a garage/workshop, a transverse frame barn, a modern metal grain bin, and two hog houses. Across the street is a large non-period pole barn set back from the road. A pasture is between the pole barn and the road. A gravel driveway extends in from the road in front of the house and curves around to the garage. The land slopes downhill south of the barn. The house, garage, garage/workshop, and barn are roughly in a row. West of these buildings are several small fenced enclosures for animals. The two hog houses are in this location.

The Folk Victorian farmhouse, built in 1885, has several additions and modifications that mask its original form. The house consists of a two-story hip roof section with a two-story, front-gabled ell on the front. The house has a brick foundation, an asphalt shingle roof, and aluminum siding. Many windows are vinyl replacement windows, although some two-over-two double hung sash windows are also present. There have been fenestration changes. Picture windows have been added to the first floor of the south wall of the hip roof section.
Casement windows, possibly replacing a doorway, have been added to the first floor of the east wall of the front ell.

A porch, added in 1906, wraps around all three sides of the front ell. Concrete steps lead up to the porch in line with these windows suggesting that there may have been an entrance there. The porch has a concrete deck on a concrete block foundation and an aluminum frieze along the roofline. Some of the porch columns are original, but some have been replaced with aluminum columns or iron supports. Two doorways with original doors are present in the south side of the porch. A one-story addition is on the rear (west) wall of the house. An enclosed porch lines the south wall of the addition.

The modern garage is a two-bay, side-gabled building. The circa 1920 garage/workshop is a front-gabled building with tile block walls. A shed roof addition along its north wall has concrete block walls. The roof is covered with corrugated metal and has two ventilators along the roof ridge.

The transverse frame barn, built in 1911, faces north. The barn’s roof is covered with standing seam metal and has lightning rods along the ridge. The barn is clad in vertical board siding. The two circa 1920 hog houses have shed roofs. One has clapboard siding, and the other has corrugated metal siding. A modern metal grain bin is located southwest of the house.

Changes to the fenestration and the rear addition have diminished the house’s integrity of design. Replacement of siding, windows, and porch posts has diminished integrity of materials and workmanship. The presence of non-period buildings and structures in the farmstead has diminished the integrity of its design.
Many non-period residences, and even a few modern subdivisions, are present in the surrounding area. In addition, much of the surrounding land has reverted to forest.

**Context/Significance:** Friend B. Colbert purchased two acres of land at this location in 1884 and built a four-room house the next year. In 1906, the family purchased an additional nineteen acres and added the front ell, second floor, and porch. The barn was constructed in 1911. The Colberts are descended from Jesse Colbert of Pennsylvania, who came to southern Daviess County in 1818. Friend B. Colbert was his grandson. Friend B. Colbert taught in rural schools and served as county recorder from 1899 to 1904.324

**Conclusion:** Although the house is part of a farmstead that is associated with the history of agriculture in Veale Township, other period farmsteads are also present in the township. This farmstead is not a better or more significant example than others in the township. The house is not a significant example of a type, period, or method of construction and lacks much of its integrity. The Colbert House is not eligible for the NRHP under any of the criteria for evaluation and lacks integrity.

---

324 Myers, Daviess County, vol. 1, 267; Colbert, “Gleanings as Told to Arthur L. Colbert.”
Shanks Farmstead (Daviess 30037)
County Road 300 South west of State Road 57
(RR2 Box 241)

The Shanks Farmstead is not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of significance and integrity. Although the farmstead retains a larger collection of pre-1956 outbuildings than most other farmsteads in the vicinity, the property mostly lacks landscape elements, distinctive field patterns, and patterns of circulation and does not display the contextual atmosphere required to be eligible for the NRHP.

Description: The Shanks Farmstead was rated Contributing in the Interim Report. The property contains a total of eleven contributing resources, including a Gabled ell house (1884), a wood frame garage (circa 1915), a storm cellar (age unknown), a summer kitchen (1884), a tile block garage (circa 1925), a privy (circa 1900), a poultry house (circa 1925), a barn (1884), a workshop (age unknown), and two large outbuildings of uncertain use (age unknown). The farmstead is located at the southwest corner of an 80-acre farm. The fields on each side are planted in corn. Most of the farmstead is in a slightly rectangular lawn area, but several elements are located in an ell of the yard that extends a short distance north into the cornfield. The house and barn are close to the road; the other buildings are set back from the road. Large mature trees form a U-shape around the house.

The two-story house consists of three wings: a side-gabled wing to the east, a front-gabled wing to the south, and a front-gabled wing to the north. The house sits on a brick foundation, has an asbestos cement shingle roof, and is clad in aluminum siding. The windows and doors are original. The south end of the south ell and the west end of the side-gabled ell each has cutaway corners.
There are open porches in the angle of the south and east ells and along the west side of the north ell. The porches have Eastlake ornament including spindlework, turned posts, and pierced brackets. An enclosed porch lines the east side of the north ell.

Close to and northeast of the house is a grass-covered mound with a concrete bulkhead with wood doors at its west end. This structure likely is a storm cellar.

East of the storm cellar is a wood frame garage. The garage has a concrete foundation, vinyl siding, and asphalt shingle roofing. The garage door is a modern replacement.

A summer kitchen is immediately north of the house. The side-gabled building has a shed roof section on its east end. The building has a standing seam metal roof, sits on a concrete foundation, and is clad in vinyl siding. A brick chimney is located at the west end of the building.

North of the house at the north edge of the farmstead is a tile block, front-gabled garage with a concrete foundation and a standing seam metal roof. The garage retains its original hinged and folding doors and its original windows.

East of the tile block garage is a wood frame privy. The privy has a side-gabled roof and is clad in vertical board siding.

The barn is located at the west edge of the farmstead. The barn has a standing seam metal roof and vertical board siding and sits on piers. The barn has additions on the north and south ends. Because of the additions, the barn’s original orientation and type are uncertain. A sliding door is located toward the south end of the east wall.
Northeast of the barn is a small side-gabled outbuilding with a shed roof section along its north wall. The building is set on piers, is clad in vertical board siding, and has a corrugated metal roof. Small windows line the south wall. The building appears to have been used as a workshop.

A poultry house is located between the workshop and the tile block garage. The poultry house has a standing seam metal roof and the same material appears to have been applied to the walls. This structure has a concrete block foundation. Most parts of the four large multi-sash windows have been covered over, but their locations are still evident.

In the north ell of the farmstead is an outbuilding with a long roof oriented north-south. This building has an ell at the south end of the east wall. A wood platform lines the east side of the building; a shed roof shelters the north end of the platform. The building has a standing seam metal roof, a concrete foundation, and vertical board siding. Exposed rafter tails are evident along the eaves. The ell has double hinged doors in its east wall. The remains of a concrete driveway or platform are visible south of the building’s south gable end.

Another outbuilding is located at the northeast corner of the latter outbuilding. This northernmost outbuilding has a standing seam metal roof, vertical board siding, and stone piers.

Context/Significance: A late nineteenth/early twentieth century farmstead, the Shanks Farmstead dates from Indiana’s “golden age of farming.” The property belonged to a successful and well-known farmer and the size of the farmstead is reflective of his prosperity and the prosperity of his descendents.
In 1857, William Shanks purchased two hundred acres of land, including the southeast quarter of Section 9, from John F. Wilmore.\textsuperscript{325} He eventually owned 326 acres of land. He was elected county surveyor in 1868 and 1872.\textsuperscript{326} The Shanks’ residence was on what is now State Road 57 north of what is now County Road 300 South.

John G. Shanks, son of William, was raised on his father’s farm and went into farming himself as an adult.\textsuperscript{327} In 1885, John G. Shanks purchased two acres of his father’s farm along County Road 300 South.\textsuperscript{328} The first part of the current farmhouse, the north ell, reportedly was constructed in 1884, as was the barn.\textsuperscript{329} This house and the two-acre parcel are depicted in the 1888 county atlas.\textsuperscript{330} William Shanks died in 1888, and his wife died in 1900.\textsuperscript{331} After the death of their mother, the east half of the southeast quarter of Section 9 was divided among the three Shanks children. John G. Shanks apparently also inherited the west half of the southeast quarter of Section 9.\textsuperscript{332} The south and east wings of the farmhouse reportedly were added around this time.\textsuperscript{333} It is likely that the bulk of the farmstead was constructed at or after this time as the focus of the farm moved from the old house on State Road 57 in the east half of the quarter section to the west half of the quarter section.

\textsuperscript{325} Daviess County deed book K, page 31.
\textsuperscript{326} Fulkerson, \textit{History of Daviess County}, 638–639.
\textsuperscript{327} Fulkerson, \textit{History of Daviess County}, 639–640.
\textsuperscript{328} Daviess County deed book 8, page 463.
\textsuperscript{329} Mrs. R. C. Shanks to C. B. F., 1987 inventory form for 027-571-30037.
\textsuperscript{330} Griffing, Dixon & Co., \textit{Atlas of Daviess County}.
\textsuperscript{331} Fulkerson, \textit{History of Daviess County}, 639.
\textsuperscript{332} Daviess County deed book 13, page 490; deed book 13, page 491; deed book 13, page 492; No deed was located transferring the west half of the southeast quarter of Section 9.
\textsuperscript{333} Mrs. R. C. Shanks to C. B. F., 1987 inventory form for 027-571-30037.
John G. Shanks owned 206 acres of land and engaged in general farming and stock raising. He specialized in Poland China hogs. He was considered a progressive farmer interested in modern farming methods. He also served as Daviess County commissioner for six years.334

John G. Shanks died in 1944. His land was divided among his heirs, with his two youngest sons John Frank and Russell C. acquiring the land in Section 9 from the other heirs.335 Descendants of the Shanks family still own the farmstead.

Little evidence other than the buildings remains of the historical functions of the farmstead. The farmland associated with the farmstead is planted entirely in corn with no visible evidence of small field patterns, pastures, walls, tree lines, or hedgerows. The barnyard is now a lawn with no evidence of circulation patterns among the buildings, such as driveways or footpaths. Other than the trees screening the house, there are no period plantings evident in the farmstead. John G. Shanks was a stock raiser, but little physical evidence of this remains at the farmstead. A concrete watering trough is present at the north end of the farmstead, but no animal pens, hog houses, or pastures remain. Additions are on either end of the barn, and the barn’s original type, function, and orientation are uncertain. Also, there are no buildings or structures for grain storage, corncribs or granaries, present at the farmstead. Because of these changes, the Shanks Farmstead lacks integrity of design, setting, and association.

Conclusion: The Shanks Farmstead does not demonstrate a trend in agriculture or a particular period of agricultural history, nor does it retain sufficient integrity to be significant architecturally. Although John G. Shanks was a prominent farmer, he lacks the historic significance necessary to make the Shanks Farmstead eligible for the NRHP. The Shanks Farmstead lacks integrity and is not eligible for the NRHP under any of the criteria for evaluation.

334 Fulkerson, History of Daviess County, 638–640.
E. J. Shanks House (Daviess 30030)
Division Road north of US 50/150 Bypass

The E. J. Shanks House is not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of integrity. The house is associated with the history of agriculture in the Washington Township and likely is associated with early settlement in the township. The house is also a good example of a modest Greek Revival-style farmhouse, but it has received a number of alterations that have diminished its integrity. Only two outbuildings survive, and neither is of the same period as the house. Modern development is encroaching on the associated farmland and has diminished the house’s integrity of setting.

Description: The E. J. Shanks House was rated Notable in the Daviess County Interim Report. The house is associated with a transverse frame barn and an outbuilding that may have been a summer kitchen. The house is set back about 900 feet from the road. A gravel driveway leads out to the road. Other than the yard around the buildings, the land consists of agricultural fields that were planted in corn at the time of the survey. Modern subdivisions are extending south from the road to the north, bringing non-period residences nearly adjacent to the house to the north and at only a slight remove to the east. Some non-period residences line Division Road to the west. The modern US 50/150 bypass encroaches on the fields from the south.

The circa 1850 house is a five bay, one-story, side-gabled Greek Revival house constructed of brick. The house has an original rear ell extending from the north end of the east wall. The ell has an addition and an enclosed porch along its south side. The walls are laid in five-to-one American bond. A brick water table is above the foundation. Vents pierce the water table and foundation.
These vents once had metal grills, but most of the vents have been sealed.

The roof is covered with asphalt shingles. A wide frieze runs below the eaves. The main section of the house has brick chimneys at each end. The ell also has a brick chimney. The windows are vinyl replacement windows. The window openings have flat arches above and stone sills. The front door is a replacement. The doorway has sidelights and a transom, and the sandstone sill has been coated with concrete. The front porch partially is a replacement. The porch has a concrete deck, and the posts do not match the pilasters set into the wall. However, the cornice may be original. A porch has been added to the north side of the house.

The circa 1920 transverse frame barn is balloon-framed and sits on a concrete block foundation. The barn has a mix of metal siding and vertical board siding. Metal sliding doors are located at the west end.

The summer kitchen has stucco-covered walls and has exposed rafter tails along the eaves.

The house has lost much integrity. The addition to the ell, the addition of the north porch, and the replacement of the front porch have diminished the integrity of design. The replacement of the windows, foundation vents, front door, and front porch have diminished the integrity of materials and workmanship. The presence of only two outbuildings, and those of a later date than the house, and the modern encroachments on the property have diminished the integrity of setting.
Context/Significance: A house is depicted at this location in the 1888 county atlas. E. J. Shanks owned 183 acres of land at this location. Although the house was once a farmhouse, the house no longer has significant associations with the history of agriculture in Washington Township. Daviess 30030 is not a significant example of a farmstead. Better examples of farmsteads are located in the township farther away from the sprawl of Washington. The house likely has associations with early settlement in the township. However, the alterations to the house have removed much of its early character. Likewise, with a high level of integrity, the house would be a good example of a modest Greek Revival-style farmhouse. However, the alterations have diminished the integrity too much for the house to be eligible under Criterion C.

Conclusion: The E. J. Shanks House lacks integrity and is not eligible for the NRHP under any of the criteria for evaluation.

Griffing, Dixon & Co., Atlas of Daviess County. It is not known whether there is a connection between this Shanks farm and the Shanks farm at Daviess 30037.
Summary/Conclusions

The project APE extends from a point west of Oakland City in Gibson County and proceeds generally northeast into Pike County. The APE skirts the southeast edge of Petersburg, then continues generally northeast into Daviess County, finally ending at a point east of Washington. The APE is primarily rural and agricultural in character. Large amounts of the APE in Pike County have been strip mined since the 1940s, eliminating much of the historic landscape. Lesser portions of Gibson County in the APE also have been strip mined. No portion of the APE is intact as a historic rural landscape because of strip mining, the transition to modern farming techniques, consolidation of farms, and through a general attrition of above-ground resources in the APE.

For Section 106 purposes, project historians examined all buildings, structures, sites, objects, or complexes greater than fifty years of age in the APE. Seven above-ground resources in the APE are included in the Gibson County Warrick County Interim Report. Three of these above-ground resources have been demolished since that survey. Sixteen of the above-ground resources in the APE are included in the Daviess County Interim Report. Two of these above-ground resources have been demolished since that survey. The project historians newly inventoried one above-ground resource in Gibson County, twenty-seven in Pike County, and five in Daviess County. One district consisting of two bridges and a connecting segment of road is listed in the NRHP. Two above-ground resources are eligible for listing in the NRHP. These above-ground resources include a farmstead and a round barn. Other than the NRHP-listed property and the two eligible properties, the remaining properties lack significance and/or integrity and are not eligible for the NRHP.
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Appendix A: Supporting Documentation
Tables
Table 1. Previously Inventoried and Newly Inventoried Above-Ground Resources in the APE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Inventory No.</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address/Location of Building</th>
<th>Date(s) of Construction</th>
<th>Style and Type of Building</th>
<th>Interim Report Rating</th>
<th>IHSSI Survey 2004 Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>30001</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>West side of CR 1050 E between CR 000 and CR 50 N</td>
<td>Ca. 1920</td>
<td>Gable-front bungalow and farmhouse</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>30002</td>
<td>Joe Minnis House</td>
<td>North side of CR 50 S between CR 1150 E and CR 1050 E</td>
<td>Ca. 1920</td>
<td>Gable-front bungalow and farmhouse</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>30003</td>
<td>Stumpburg School</td>
<td>West side of CR 1050 E south of CR 125 S</td>
<td>Ca. 1903</td>
<td>Vernacular one-room schoolhouse</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>30004</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>West side of CR 950 E south of CR 125 S and railroad tracks</td>
<td>Ca. 1915</td>
<td>Gable-front bungalow</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>30005</td>
<td>Harper Farmstead</td>
<td>South side of SR 64 west of SR 57</td>
<td>Ca. 1880</td>
<td>Cross plan with Folk Victorian ornament and farmhouse</td>
<td>Notable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>30011</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>West side of CR 950 E between CR 250 S and CR 300 S</td>
<td>Ca. 1900</td>
<td>Folk Victorian T-plan</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>30012</td>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>North side of CR 250 S east of CR 850 E</td>
<td>Ca. 1890</td>
<td>L-plan Folk Victorian</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>30016</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>North side of SR 64 west of SR 57</td>
<td>Ca. 1921</td>
<td>Craftsman Gable-front bungalow</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>00001</td>
<td>Arnold Church</td>
<td>4255 CR 675 N at corner of CR 425 E</td>
<td>Ca. 1875</td>
<td>Vernacular church</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>00002</td>
<td>Ashton Farmstead</td>
<td>4687 CR 750 N</td>
<td>Ca. 1940</td>
<td>Vernacular double pen and farmhouse</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>00003</td>
<td>Newkirk House</td>
<td>4294 CR 750 N</td>
<td>Ca. 1900</td>
<td>Vernacular gabled ell and farmhouse</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>05001</td>
<td>Little Willis Cemetery</td>
<td>Unmarked road on reclaimed mine land south of CR 200 N</td>
<td>Ca. 1850</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>05002</td>
<td>Pike County Bridge No. 175</td>
<td>CR 125 W over Flat Creek</td>
<td>Ca. 1920</td>
<td>Warren Pony truss bridge</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>05003</td>
<td>Johnson Cemetery</td>
<td>East side of Meridian Road south of CR 300 N</td>
<td>Ca. 1835</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Previously Inventoried and Newly Inventoried Above-Ground Resources in the APE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Inventory No.</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address/Location of Building</th>
<th>Date(s) of Construction</th>
<th>Style and Type of Building</th>
<th>Interim Report Rating</th>
<th>IHSSI Survey 2004 Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>05004</td>
<td>Bahr House</td>
<td>3432 N. Meridian Road</td>
<td>Ca. 1885</td>
<td>Vernacular front-gabled with Italianate elements and farmstead</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>05005</td>
<td>Helfenbein Farmstead</td>
<td>4032 North SR 61</td>
<td>Ca. 1915</td>
<td>Craftsman dormer-front bungalow and farmstead</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>05006</td>
<td>Goodlet Morgan House</td>
<td>701 Goodlet Street, Petersburg</td>
<td>1851–1854</td>
<td>Italianate two-story hip roof</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Notable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>05007</td>
<td>Alford United Methodist Church</td>
<td>1709 SR 356, Alford</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Vernacular church</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>05008</td>
<td>Bradfield House</td>
<td>South side of CR 650 N east of SR 57</td>
<td>Ca. 1875</td>
<td>Italianate</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>05009</td>
<td>Middleton House</td>
<td>3108 CR 475 N</td>
<td>Ca. 1905</td>
<td>Queen Anne and farmstead</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>05010</td>
<td>Preston House</td>
<td>2191 CR 475 N</td>
<td>Ca. 1880</td>
<td>Vernacular two-story hip roof</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>05011</td>
<td>Lemuel R. Hargrave House</td>
<td>5152 CR 200 E</td>
<td>Ca. 1863</td>
<td>Two-story house with Greek Revival elements</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Notable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>05013</td>
<td>Lick Creek Cemetery/Twin Oaks Memorial Gardens</td>
<td>West side of CR 200 E between CR 650 N and CR 550 N</td>
<td>Ca. 1843</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>05014</td>
<td>Damewood Farmstead</td>
<td>3423 CR 725 N</td>
<td>Ca. 1900</td>
<td>Queen Anne</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>20001</td>
<td>Ropp Farmstead</td>
<td>3451 CR 200 S</td>
<td>Ca. 1893</td>
<td>Vernacular two-story front-gabled with Queen Anne elements and farmstead</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>20002</td>
<td>Logan Public Cemetery</td>
<td>East side of CR 350 W north of CR 200 S</td>
<td>Ca. 1865</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Previously Inventoried and Newly Inventoried Above-Ground Resources in the APE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Inventory No.</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address/Location of Building</th>
<th>Date(s) of Construction</th>
<th>Style and Type of Building</th>
<th>Interim Report Rating</th>
<th>IHSSI Survey 2004 Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>20003</td>
<td>Knights Chapel and Knights Cemetery</td>
<td>Northeast corner of CR 125 S and CR 375 W</td>
<td>Ca. 1920 (church) and ca. 1870 (cemetery)</td>
<td>Vernacular church and cemetery</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>20004</td>
<td>Loveless Cemetery</td>
<td>North side of Division Road east of CR 325 W</td>
<td>Ca. 1872</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>20005</td>
<td>Patoka Bridges Historic District (Pike County Bridges No. 81 and 246 and portion of CR 300 W)</td>
<td>CR 300 W north of Gibson County line</td>
<td>1884 and 1924 (bridges), circa 1840s (road)</td>
<td>Pratt Through truss bridge, Camelback Through truss bridge, road</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Outstanding (Listed in NRHP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>20006</td>
<td>Pike County Bridge No. 32</td>
<td>CR 500 W over Patoka River new channel</td>
<td>Ca. 1924</td>
<td>Camelback Through truss bridge</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>20007</td>
<td>Loveless House</td>
<td>East side of CR 300 W between CR 200 S and CR 125 S</td>
<td>Ca. 1905</td>
<td>Vernacular T-plan</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>20009</td>
<td>Loveless Farmstead</td>
<td>1953 CR 300 W</td>
<td>Ca. 1880</td>
<td>Vernacular cross-plan house with Folk Victorian ornament and farmstead</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>20010</td>
<td>Loveless Farmstead II</td>
<td>2653 CR 200 S</td>
<td>Ca. 1910</td>
<td>Vernacular double pen and farmstead</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>30021</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>CR 300 E between U.S 50/150 and CSX railroad tracks</td>
<td>Ca. 1880</td>
<td>Vernacular house and farmstead</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>30030</td>
<td>E. J. Shanks House</td>
<td>Division Road north of U.S 50/150</td>
<td>Ca. 1850</td>
<td>Greek Revival one-story side-gabled and farmstead</td>
<td>Notable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>30031</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>East side of CR 75 E south of US 50/150</td>
<td>Ca. 1850s</td>
<td>Log houses</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>30032</td>
<td>School No. 3</td>
<td>Southwest corner of CR 125 E and CR 150 S</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Vernacular one-room schoolhouse</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>30033</td>
<td>Veale Creek Cemetery</td>
<td>Intersection of CR 175 E, CR 150 S, and SR 257</td>
<td>Ca. 1835</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Previously Inventoried and Newly Inventoried Above-Ground Resources in the APE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Inventory No.</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address/Location of Building</th>
<th>Date(s) of Construction</th>
<th>Style and Type of Building</th>
<th>Interim Report Rating</th>
<th>IHSSI Survey 2004 Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>30034</td>
<td>Union Cemetery</td>
<td>Northeast corner of CR 50 W and CR 300 S</td>
<td>Ca. 1870</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>30035</td>
<td>Jones House</td>
<td>East side of SR 57 south of CR 250 S</td>
<td>Ca. 1935</td>
<td>Colonial Revival 1.5-story side-gabled</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>30036</td>
<td>Old Bethel Cemetery</td>
<td>West side of SR 57 north of CR 300 S</td>
<td>Ca. 1850</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>30037</td>
<td>Shanks Farmstead</td>
<td>North side of CR 300 S west of SR 57</td>
<td>Ca. 1884</td>
<td>Gabled ell house with Folk Victorian elements and farmstead</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>30039</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>2418 E. National Hwy 50</td>
<td>Ca. 1900</td>
<td>Vernacular 1.5-story T-plan</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>30040</td>
<td>Graham Homestead Farmstead</td>
<td>South side of US 50/150 between CR 200 E and CR 300 E</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Vernacular Gable front Bungalow and farmstead</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>30042</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>South side of SR 257 east of CR 175 E</td>
<td>Ca. 1915</td>
<td>Vernacular Dormer-front bungalow</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>30043</td>
<td>John Prewett Farmstead</td>
<td>East side of SR 257 north of CR 200 S</td>
<td>Ca. 1920</td>
<td>Vernacular Dormer-front bungalow and farmstead</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Veale</td>
<td>35001</td>
<td>Chapman-Allison Farmstead</td>
<td>Intersection of CR 400 S and CR 50 E</td>
<td>Ca. 1840s (house) and circa 1900 (farmstead)</td>
<td>Vernacular side-gabled house and farmstead</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Notable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Veale</td>
<td>35002</td>
<td>John A. Horrall House</td>
<td>North side of CR 375 S between CR 50 W and Horrall Road</td>
<td>Ca. 1890</td>
<td>Vernacular two-story side-gabled</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Veale</td>
<td>35003</td>
<td>Bethel United Methodist Church and Cemetery</td>
<td>Intersection of CR 50 W and CR 375 S</td>
<td>Ca. 1840 (cemetery), circa 1910 (church)</td>
<td>Vernacular church and cemetery</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Veale</td>
<td>35004</td>
<td>Mt. Olivet Cemetery</td>
<td>West side of SR 57 at intersection of CR 450 S</td>
<td>Ca. 1847</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Previously Inventoried and Newly Inventoried Above-Ground Resources in the APE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Inventory No.</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address/Location of Building</th>
<th>Date(s) of Construction</th>
<th>Style and Type of Building</th>
<th>Interim Report Rating</th>
<th>IHSSI Survey 2004 Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Veale</td>
<td>35005</td>
<td>Thomas C. Singleton Round Barn</td>
<td>Southwest corner of intersection of SR 57 and CR 450 S</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Round barn</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Veale</td>
<td>35006</td>
<td>Lett School</td>
<td>East side of SR 57 at intersection of CR 450 S</td>
<td>Ca. 1890</td>
<td>Vernacular one-room schoolhouse with Classical Revival elements</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>Veale</td>
<td>35007</td>
<td>Colbert House</td>
<td>West side of CR 100 W south of CR 450 S</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Folk Victorian two-story house</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Township</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Property Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Integrity Issues/Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson/ Columbia</td>
<td>30016</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>North side of SR 64 west of SR 57</td>
<td>Ca. 1921</td>
<td>Craftsman gable-front bungalow</td>
<td>Siding replaced, some windows replaced, lacks significance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike/ Jefferson</td>
<td>00001</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Arnold Church</td>
<td>4255 CR 675 N at corner of CR 425 E</td>
<td>Ca. 1875</td>
<td>Vernacular church</td>
<td>Foundation replaced, belfry added, lacks significance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike/ Jefferson</td>
<td>00002</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ashton Farmstead</td>
<td>4687 CR 750 N</td>
<td>Ca. 1940</td>
<td>Vernacular double pen and farmstead</td>
<td>Siding replaced, roofing replaced, front porch altered, additions, outbuildings deteriorated, no historic field patterns evident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike/ Jefferson</td>
<td>00003</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Newkirk House</td>
<td>4294 CR 750 N</td>
<td>Ca. 1900</td>
<td>Vernacular Gabled ell and farmstead</td>
<td>Siding replaced, front porch altered, rear deck added, garage added to rear end of basement, no pre-1955 outbuildings remain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>County Township</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Property Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Integrity Issues/Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Pike/Washington</td>
<td>05001</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Little Willis Cemetery</td>
<td>Unmarked road on reclaimed mine land south of CR 200 N</td>
<td>Ca. 1850</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Setting altered, lacks significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Pike/Washington</td>
<td>05002</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pike County Bridge No. 175</td>
<td>CR 125 W over Flat Creek</td>
<td>Ca. 1920</td>
<td>Warren Pony truss</td>
<td>Lacks significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Pike/Washington</td>
<td>05003</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Johnson Cemetery</td>
<td>East side of Meridian Road south of CR 300 N</td>
<td>Ca. 1835</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Setting altered, damaged markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Pike/Washington</td>
<td>05004</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bahr House</td>
<td>3432 N. Meridian Road</td>
<td>Ca. 1885</td>
<td>Vernacular front-gabled with Italianate elements and farmstead</td>
<td>Fenestration altered, siding replaced, rear addition, modern deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>County Township</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Property Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Integrity Issues/Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pike/ Washington</td>
<td>05005</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Helfenbein Farmstead</td>
<td>4032 North SR 61</td>
<td>Ca. 1915</td>
<td>Craftsman dormer-front bungalow and farmstead</td>
<td>Front porch enclosed, setting altered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pike/ Washington</td>
<td>05006</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Goodlet Morgan House</td>
<td>701 Goodlet Street</td>
<td>1851-1854</td>
<td>Italianate</td>
<td>Front porch replaced, garage added, rear porch removed, eaves trim removed, chimneys removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pike/ Washington</td>
<td>05007</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Alford United Methodist Church</td>
<td>1709 SR 356</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Vernacular church</td>
<td>Siding replaced, windows replaced, large rear addition, addition at front entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pike/ Washington</td>
<td>05008</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bradfield House</td>
<td>South side of CR 650 N east of SR 57</td>
<td>Ca. 1875</td>
<td>Italianate</td>
<td>Fenestration altered, siding replaced, front door replaced, some windows replaced, setting altered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Newly Inventoried Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photos</th>
<th>County Township</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Integrity Issues/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Middleton House" /></td>
<td>Pike/ Washington</td>
<td>05009</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Middleton House</td>
<td>3108 CR 475 N</td>
<td>Ca. 1905</td>
<td>Queen Anne and farmstead</td>
<td>Windows replaced, siding replaced, modern rear deck, non-contributing outbuildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Preston House" /></td>
<td>Pike/ Washington</td>
<td>05010</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Preston House</td>
<td>2191 CR 475 N</td>
<td>Ca. 1880</td>
<td>Vernacular</td>
<td>Windows replaced, siding replaced, additions, front porch altered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Lemuel R. Hargrave House" /></td>
<td>Pike/ Washington</td>
<td>05011</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Lemuel R. Hargrave House</td>
<td>5152 CR 200 E</td>
<td>Ca. 1863</td>
<td>I-house with Greek Revival elements</td>
<td>Outbuildings removed, front porch altered, side porch removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4" alt="House" /></td>
<td>Pike/ Washington</td>
<td>05012</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>East side of CR 200 E south of CR 650 N</td>
<td>Ca. 1940</td>
<td>Vernacular</td>
<td>Deteriorated condition, lack of significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Newly Inventoried Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photos</th>
<th>County Township</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Integrity Issues/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Pike/ Washington</td>
<td>05013</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lick Creek Cemetery/Twin Oaks Memorial Gardens</td>
<td>West side of CR 200 E between CR 650 N and CR 550 N</td>
<td>Ca. 1843</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Setting altered through modern expansion of cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Pike/ Washington</td>
<td>05014</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Damewood Farmstead</td>
<td>3423 CR 725 N</td>
<td>Ca. 1900</td>
<td>Queen Anne</td>
<td>Siding replaced, west porch altered, rear addition, doorway removed from east porch, outbuildings removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Pike/ Washington</td>
<td>05015</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>East side of CR 200 E between CR 650 N and CR 550 N</td>
<td>Ca. 1915</td>
<td>Vernacular double pen and farmstead</td>
<td>Outbuildings severely deteriorated, lacks historic field patterns,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Pike/ Logan</td>
<td>20001</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ropp Farmstead</td>
<td>3451 CR 200 S</td>
<td>Ca. 1893</td>
<td>Vernacular front-gabled with Queen Anne elements and farmstead</td>
<td>Siding replaced, porches enclosed, alterations to barn, setting altered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>County Township</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Property Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Integrity Issues/Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pike/Logan</td>
<td>20002</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Logan Public Cemetery</td>
<td>East side of CR 350 W north of CR 200 S</td>
<td>Ca. 1865</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Setting altered, most markers damaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pike/Logan</td>
<td>20003</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Knights Chapel and Knights Cemetery</td>
<td>Northeast corner of CR 125 S and CR 375 W</td>
<td>Ca. 1920</td>
<td>Vernacular church and cemetery</td>
<td>Front and rear additions, siding replaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pike/Logan</td>
<td>20004</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Loveless Cemetery</td>
<td>North side of Division Road east of CR 325 W</td>
<td>Ca. 1872</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Setting altered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pike/Logan</td>
<td>20005</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Patoka Bridges Historic District (Pike County Bridges Nos. 81 and 246 and portion of CR 300 W)</td>
<td>CR 300 W north of Gibson County Line</td>
<td>1884 and 1924 (bridges), Ca. 1840s (road)</td>
<td>Pratt Through truss, Camelback Through truss, road</td>
<td>Listed in NRHP as a historic district under Criteria A and C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Newly Inventoried Properties
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photos</th>
<th>County Township</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Integrity Issues/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Pike/Logan</td>
<td>20006</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pike County Bridge No. 32</td>
<td>CR 500 W over Patoka River new channel</td>
<td>Ca. 1924</td>
<td>Camelback Through truss</td>
<td>Good integrity, not eligible per state guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Pike/Logan</td>
<td>20007</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Loveless House</td>
<td>East side of CR 300 W between CR 200 S and CR 125 S</td>
<td>Ca. 1905</td>
<td>Vernacular T-plan</td>
<td>Front porch removed, barn removed, some windows replaced, front door removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Pike/Logan</td>
<td>20009</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Loveless Farmstead</td>
<td>1953 CR 300 W</td>
<td>Ca. 1880</td>
<td>Vernacular cross-plan with Folk Victorian ornament and farmstead</td>
<td>Setting altered, small addition in northwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Pike/Logan</td>
<td>20010</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Loveless Farmstead II</td>
<td>2653 CR 200 S</td>
<td>Ca. 1910</td>
<td>Vernacular double pen and farmstead</td>
<td>Siding replaced, doorway removed on ell, setting altered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>County/Township</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Property Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Integrity Issues/Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Photo" /> Daviess/Washington 30039</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>2418 E. National Hwy 50</td>
<td>Ca. 1900</td>
<td>Vernacular T-plan</td>
<td>Siding replaced, setting altered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Photo" /> Daviess/Washington 30040</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Graham Homestead Farmstead</td>
<td>South side of US 50/150 between CR 200 E and CR 300 E</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Vernacular Gable-front Bungalow and farmstead</td>
<td>Siding replaced, modern outbuildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Photo" /> Daviess/Washington 30041</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Joe Schultheis Farmstead</td>
<td>North side of SR 257 between US 50/150 and CR 175 E</td>
<td>Ca. 1925</td>
<td>Gable-front bungalow and farmstead</td>
<td>Siding replaced, lacks significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Photo" /> Daviess/Washington 30042</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>South side of SR 257 east of CR 175 E</td>
<td>Ca. 1915</td>
<td>Dormer-front bungalow</td>
<td>Rear addition, lacks significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

### Section 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photos</th>
<th>County Township</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Integrity Issues/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="House" /></td>
<td>Daviess/Washington</td>
<td>30043</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>John Prewett Farmstead</td>
<td>East side of SR 257 north of CR 200 S</td>
<td>Ca. 1920</td>
<td>Dormer-front bungalow and farmstead</td>
<td>Good integrity, but lacks significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix B: Correspondence From Consulting Parties
May 17, 2005

Robert F. Tally, Jr., P.E.
Division Administrator
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration, Indiana Division
575 North Pennsylvania Street, Room 254
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Federal Agency: Federal Highway Administration

Re: Executive summary and draft historic property report for the I-69 Section 2 Tier 2 project

Dear Mr. Tally:

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. § 470f) and 36 C.F.R. Part 800, the staff of the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer ("Indiana SHPO") has conducted an analysis of the materials dated March 29 and 30, 2005, and received on March 30, 2005, for the above indicated project.

We have reviewed the Draft of Tier 2 Historic Property Report for the I-69 Indianapolis to Evansville project – Section 2 and we agree with the proposed findings of eligibility and non-eligibility for the properties identified in the report. However, please note that the Patoka Bridges Historic District was listed in the National Register of Historic Places on March 25-2005.

A copy of the revised 36 C.F.R. Part 800 regulations that went into effect on August 5, 2004, may be found on the Internet at www.achp.gov for your reference. If you have questions about our comments, please call Karie A. Brudis of our office at (317) 232-1646.

Very truly yours,

Jon C. Smith
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

cc: Linda Weintraut, Ph.D., Weintraut & Associates Historians, Inc.
emc: Janice Osadezuk, Indiana Department of Transportation
       Anthony DeSimone, Federal Highway Administration, Indiana Division
       Ben Lawrence, Indiana Department of Transportation
       Mary Crowe, Indiana Department of Transportation
       Thomas Cervone, Ph.D., Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.
June 18, 2004

Linda Weintraut, Ph.D.
Weintraut & Associates Historians, Inc.
16 Boone Woods
Zionsville, Indiana 46077

Federal agency: Federal Highway Administration

Re: Your letter of June 17, 2004; area of potential effects for Section 3 of the Tier 2, I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Study.

Dear Dr. Weintraut:

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 470f), and implementing regulations at 36 C.F.R. Part 800, the staff of the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer ("Indiana SHPO") has conducted an analysis of your June 17, 2004, letter and enclosures, which we received on June 17.

Based on information that you have provided and that otherwise is currently available to us, the proposed area of potential effects ("APE") for Section 3 appears to be appropriate. However, if specific kinds of effects or geographic factors that come to light later in the Section 106 consultation suggest otherwise, it may be appropriate at that time to consider making adjustments to the APE.

You may direct questions about our comments to John Carr of my staff at 317-232-1646.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

John T. Carr
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

JCS:JLC:jlc

cc: Robert F. Tally, Jr., P.E., Federal Highway Administration, Indiana Division
Janice Osadczuk, Indiana Department of Transportation

emc: Anthony DeSimone, Federal Highway Administration, Indiana Division
Lyle Sadler, Indiana Department of Transportation
Mary Crowe, Indiana Department of Transportation
Linda Weintraut, Ph.D., Weintraut & Associates Historians, Inc.
April 5, 2005

RE: I-69 Section 2 Tier 2 Study; SR 64 to US 50
Section 106: Consulting Party Meeting, April 13, 2005

Thank you for notice of the referenced project. The Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma is currently unaware of any documentation directly linking Indian Religious Sites to the proposed construction. In the event any items falling under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) are discovered during construction, the Peoria Tribe request notification and further consultation.

The Peoria Tribe has no objection to the proposed construction. However, if any human skeletal remains and/or any objects falling under NAGPRA are uncovered during construction, the construction should stop immediately, and the appropriate persons, including state and tribal NAGPRA representatives contacted.

John P. Froman
Chief

xc: Bud Ellis, Repatriation/NAGPRA Committee Chairman
4 May 2005

I-69 Project Office, Section 2
804 S. Industrial Park Drive
Petersburg, IN 47567

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is written for three purposes, the first being to provide written comments on the content and methodology of the draft Historic Property Report for Tier 2 of Section 2 of the I-69 Project. Secondly, as a consulting party, I attended the April 13th meeting at the Section 2 Project Office in Petersburg. The second part of my comments will concern corrections and additions to the minutes of that meeting that were mailed to all attending consulting parties after April 21st. Thirdly, I would like to express my concerns about the Section 2 Project team’s compliance with Section 106 Review processes. My final comments address this issue and provide documentation of my difficulties accessing the draft Historic Property Report.

I. Comments on Section 2 “Draft Historic Property Report”

I have seven issues of concern with the methodology and content of the draft Historic Property Report. The first two are general/methodological, and the remaining five have to do with the descriptions/evaluations of individual structures.

The first two of these issues are interrelated and have to do with the “Agricultural contexts” section in two parts of the “Historic Context” chapter of the draft report (“Indiana’s Golden Age: 1881-1920” and “Depression and War: 1921-1954”). There are essentially two glaring problems here: 1) the lack of a narrative description of agricultural practices and trends in Pike county, and 2) the absence of any reference to the larger history of drainage and flood control practices in the Patoka wetlands, their impact on agricultural trends, and most importantly, their impact on the built environment in Pike and Gibson.

1. Agricultural practices in Pike County.

The section entitled “Indiana’s Golden Age” states (p. 46) that “most of the above-ground resources in the APE date from this period.” Elsewhere, the report makes the point that most of the above-ground resources in the APE are associated with agriculture. Given the report’s own stated finding that agriculture is the dominant theme affecting extant above ground resources in the APE, the omission of a detailed survey of Pike’s agricultural profile is curious. Starting on p. 52, the report begins a county-by-county verbal description of agricultural trends, but excludes Pike from this account. There is no specific information given on Pike County’s patterns of crop production or on any notable agricultural practices comparable to that given for Daviess and Gibson.
The absence of a specific description of agriculture and agricultural practices in Pike results in serious deficiencies that affect the credibility of the Historic Property Report and skew its inventory of above-ground resources for Pike County. Absent this information, the tables that follow the narrative account (providing information on the average size of farms, and average acreage relative to numbers of farms in Pike, Gibson and Daviess) provide no insight on the report’s own findings that “Between 1900-1920...the average size and value [of farms in all three counties] increased—but the greatest decline in the number of farms and amount of acreage farmed was in Gibson and Pike.” Further on, the report also notes, without explanation, that “Pike was well below both state and regional averages for farm size.”

2. The history of dredging, ditching, and erosion control in the Patoka bottoms.

Part of the report’s inability to account for the facts about farm size in Pike County has to do with its failure to acknowledge the existence (let alone impact) of extensive dredging and erosion control efforts initiated by Pike County commissioners (and individual Pike County farmers and entrepreneurs) in Monroe, Logan, and other townships along the Patoka. At least one of these projects (Houchins Ditch) was a huge undertaking, jointly carried out by Pike and Gibson during the late teens and early twenties. It had an enormous impact on farming practices and farm size in the Patoka River valley.\(^1\) Moreover, the farming practices initiated in Pike at this time are representative of trends that can be seen throughout the area known as the Wabash lowlands (which includes Dubois, Knox, and Posey counties as well as Gibson and Pike).\(^2\) Individual above ground resources associated with Pike and Gibson counties’ drainage/dredging efforts include (but are probably not limited to):

- Pike County bridge #81 (part of the Patoka Bridges Historic District)
- Pike County bridge # 32 (see below, item #3)
- The Ropp levees (see below, item #4)
- Houchins Ditch (see below, item #5)

In addition to these individual properties, the failure to factor in the impact of Pike’s history of dredging operations in the Patoka bottoms undermines the Historic Property Report’s evaluations of farmsteads in affected townships. The economic hardships produced by Pike County’s “ditch assessments” on individual farmers in the Bottoms remain one of the important influences underlying the history of farming and farmsteads in Pike County throughout the twenties and into the Depression and beyond. The draft Historic Property Report needs to be seriously revised in light of further research on this important facet of southwestern Indiana’s agricultural past.

\(^1\) See Edith Sarra, “Patoka Bridges Historic District National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, 11-13.

3. Pike County bridge #32 (a.k.a. Miller Bridge).

There are multiple problems with the Historic Property Report’s description of this bridge. The bridge retains a very high level of integrity, as the report admits. But it is deemed ineligible for the NHR largely on the basis of its failure to score 7 points or better on the DHPA’s “Guidelines for Assessing the Cultural Significance of Indiana’s Extant Metal Bridges (1872-1942)” (the report finds its score to be 6). Aside from the fact that the “Point System of Significance” is meant to be treated as rules of thumb only, I question whether the guidelines have been fairly and thoroughly applied in the case of this bridge on the following grounds:

The Historic Property Report lists and assesses the bridge’s significance in terms of the five categories (A-E) listed under “Category I: Automatic Consideration.” These categories are meant to determine significance “without much ado”—that is, every bridge that falls into at least one of the five categories listed will be considered significant as long as the bridge is structurally intact. Bridge #32 likely falls into at least one, and possibly two of these categories (C and D).³

Category C: The Historic Property Report never definitively states whether or not the bridge provides an example of category C, though a summary paragraph on p. 96 asserts that “although the Camelback through truss is an uncommon type in Indiana, there are not so few examples that bridge #32 automatically meets the criteria for significance…” There is no documentation for this assertion. The Report does not state the number of extant Camelback through truss bridges in Indiana. Furthermore, its own findings reveal that the bridge gains a point on the “Point System of Significance” for being a bridge type of which there are fewer extant examples than there are counties in the region. The Report points to the existence of another Camelback through truss in the vicinity (Bridge #81), which is now listed on the National Register, but this should not be construed, as the Report attempts to do, as having a negative impact on the significance of Bridge #32. Indeed, the proximity of another metal bridge of the same era and type, built as part of the same event in local history (the creation of Houchins Ditch), links the bridge to a larger pattern in the social history and agricultural development of the Patoka bottoms (see below, Criterion 11).

Category E: The Historic Property Report states that the bridge’s significance is diminished because it did not receive a rating in James Cooper’s authoritative survey, Iron Monuments to Distant Prosperity. While this is true, the volume itself was published almost twenty years ago (1987); its surveys and ratings need to be updated against currently existing bridges in the state (many metal bridges have been destroyed or have greatly deteriorated since 1987). I have contacted Dr. Cooper personally, and he has communicated to me that he would “from a structural standpoint... start by regarding the

³ “Guidelines for Assessing the Cultural Significance of Indiana’s Extant Metal Bridges (1872-1942).”
bridge as Nat-Reg-eligible and goes on to question whether the historic consultants who conducted the Section 106 review know something about the bridge that he does not.

The "Point System of Significance." The five categories (A-E) for determining automatic consideration are NOT the criteria on which bridges are awarded points per the state guidelines, though some of the categories overlap with those criteria. The Historic Property Report presents the five basic categories as if they were the only criteria used for determining the bridge’s significance and score. The "Point System of Significance" contains thirteen criteria, which the Historic Property Report does not list and in several instances does not address at all, despite their assessment of the bridge’s score of 6 on this scale. I question whether all criteria have been in fact considered in determining that score. In particular, the Historic Property Report is silent on the following:

**Criterion 3:** My site inspection of the bridge on 2 May 2005 confirmed the physical description given in the Historic Property Report. The bridge retains a high level of structural integrity. One detail struck me while on site. The bridge does indeed have a wooden deck (apparently original). This feature, however, is at odds with the description of the bridge given in "Indiana’s Historic Metal Bridges" survey which was forwarded to me by James Cooper in the email cited above. In that inventory, the bridge is described as having a concrete deck. There may be other discrepancies not apparent to me between the "Historic Metal Bridge" inventory and the Section 106 report that bear looking into in any fair assessment of this bridge’s significance. For example, is the bridge in fact sitting on a concrete substructure or on a cut-stone or metal one (criterion 3; one of the criteria that goes unmentioned in the Historic Property Report).

**Criterion 11:** The bridge was erected to span Houchins Ditch. I would contend on that basis (its significance as part of the history of Pike County’s dredging efforts) that bridge #32 meets criterion 11: it forms part of an unusually important (agriculture and social history-related) community setting. Bridge 32 is part of the built environment created in response to a significant event in local history (the creation of Houchins Ditch). This origin of the bridge links it to a larger pattern in the social history and agricultural development of the Patoka bottoms and to the Wabash lowlands in general.

**Criterion 12:** I question whether research has been conducted to discover if criterion 12 applies. Has it been determined whether extant plans/detailed specifications for the bridge exist? Further investigation on this head might also reveal whether the bridge is in fact a product of the Vincennes Bridge Company (Category D).

**Setting, association, and feeling:** In addition to its high level of structural integrity, this bridge retains outstanding integrity of setting, association, and feeling. The gravel and dirt road approaches to the bridge via a county road running N-S through Pike and Gibson, and another county road running E-W along the south bank of Houchins Ditch in Gibson county are intensely rural and agricultural, conveying the feeling of farm roads of
the 1920s, prior to rural electrification and the heyday of the automobile. These roads are
unencumbered by power lines and are sheltered by a dense canopy of overarching trees.
North of the bridge, the county road enters forested wetlands. South of it, the road
traverses open fields under cultivation. The E-W road features alternating vistas of
cultivated fields and dense wetland forest.

Finally, I want to point out that the bridge was not marked with its identifying number on
the maps sent out to the consulting parties prior to the meeting on April 13th, so I had
some difficulty locating it on the ground. Nor were any of the Gibson county structures
marked with identifying numbers on the first page of maps sent to the consulting parties.

4. The Ropp farmstead.

There are various distortions in the assessment of this farmstead’s integrity and
significance. I will address four issues here.

**Integrity of setting:** The Report contends that “because strip mining has altered much of
the upland fields, the farmstead has lost some of its integrity of setting” (p.99). In fact,
the bulk of the Ropp farm acreage lies south of CR 200 S, in the lowlands, and this has
been so since the farm’s beginnings in 1893, according to my research into the Land
Transfer records on Gus Ropp’s creation of the farm from the 1890s and into the
Depression. Furthermore, strip mining is not occurring now in the upland fields north of
CR 200 S. Indeed, the hill just north of the farm is still crowned by a woodlot and the
Logan Public Cemetery (a.k.a the Simpson Cemetery), resting place for the children and
grandchildren of Bazil Simpson, a local “conductor” on the Underground Railroad. I
would contend that the Historic Property Report’s assessment of the farm’s integrity of
setting is highly arguable.

**Physical description:** The physical description of the farmstead omits any mention of
one of the farm’s most distinctive and significant features: the extensive system of
earthen levees surrounding the farm’s eastern, southern, and southwestern bottomland
fields. See my draft report on the proposed Patoka Bottoms Rural Historic District
submitted to the DHPA prior to the site visit I made with them on 25 July 2003, for a
description and dating of the levees to 1946. Because of these levees, field patterns and
drainage practices in the Ropp farm today continue patterns set by 1946.

**The “Context/Significance” assessment** inaccurately represents correspondence between
myself and Frank Hurdis, of the DHPA. The Report states that “after a field visit, the
DHPA concluded that the Ropp Farmstead has no apparent important architectural or
historical association.” This interpretation has little to do with the gist of Frank Hurdis’s
letter to me, which concerned among other things the feasibility of including the Ropp
Farmstead in a Rural Historic District for the Patoka Bottoms that would link it with the

---

5 For the record, this is not the first time this letter has been misrepresented by the I-69
Project team. See my letter to Mike Grovak, Project Manager for Bernardin,
Patoka Bridges (#81 and #246) and the Wabash and Erie Canal crossing at Dongola. The issue for the DHPA was not the architectural/historical significance of the Ropp farmstead, but rather which of the historic resources toured during the site visit and described in my report could work as part of the Patoka Bottoms Rural Historic District as it was proposed at that point. Duncan Campbell, who had consulted with the DHPA also on this proposal and was part of the site visit, later followed up the correspondence by suggesting that further research on the history of ditching and levee building in the Patoka valley and the Wabash lowlands in general could reveal the Ropp farm’s significance in local history and render it potentially eligible as a separate nomination to the National Register.⁶

**Assessment of the Ropp farm’s significance in the history of agriculture:** The Historic Property Report asserts that “The Ropp Farm is not particularly illustrative of the agricultural character of Pike County in the first half of the 20th century....Because the Ropp Farm historically has been considerably larger than the average farm of the area, it does not well represent the history of agriculture in the area” (p. 99). However, it should be acknowledged that the greater size of the Ropp Farm relative to its neighbors in Logan Township foretells the trends in farm size during Indiana’s Golden Age which the Historic Property Report itself confirms in “Indiana’s Golden Age.” Gustaf Ropp (a.k.a. Rapp) and his parents were part of the mid-nineteenth century wave of German immigrants to southern Indiana. He and his heirs were ahead of the curve of farming trends in the largely Scots-Irish ethnic community of southern Pike county, and stayed ahead of it by dint of their ingenuity and innovation. The farm therefore is in fact quite illustrative of the agricultural character of the greater Wabash lowlands; it was simply ahead of its time for Pike County and more typical of farms of German-ethnic ownership.

The distinctive features of this farm (its prosperity, the neatness and continued maintenance of its field patterns and outbuildings, and particularly its innovative system of earthen levees) also link it to trends in Pike and Gibson that become clearer during the course of the Depression and in the wake of World War II, with the advent of mobile pumps for draining agricultural fields and the growth of farms with more substantial acreage than was the norm for the early twentieth century. The farm’s significance should not be arbitrarily assessed in terms of norms that apply to the first two decades of the twentieth century in Pike County, without reference to the larger picture of trends that were just beginning to develop in response to wetland drainage in the Wabash lowlands (Dubois, Gibson, Pike, Knox, and Gibson counties) during the 1930s and 1940s. This problem might have been avoided, had the Historic Property Report addressed the peculiarities of Pike County’s agricultural history in their “Historic Context” chapter (see above, item 2).

---

⁶ Email from Duncan Campbell to Edith Sarra, James Cooper, John Smith, and Lane Ralph, 22 September 2003.
5. Houchins Ditch

This structure, integral to the history of Pike and Gibson Counties' history of dredging and ditching operations in the early 20th century, received no mention in the Historic Property Report. Part of Houchins Ditch is included in the Patoka Bridges Historic District. The story of its construction provides one of the more dramatic episodes in the social and agricultural history of the Patoka bottoms. But its construction was not an anomaly; it was the culmination of a pattern of local efforts to intervene in the agricultural development of the area, and was preceded by at least one other major Pike county effort to dredge the Patoka in the teens. See Sarra, "Patoka Bridges Historic District National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, 11-13 for a brief history of Houchins Ditch and its impact on farming and the built environment. This structure should be included in the Section 106 Review of historic resources in the APE.

6. The Loveless farmstead (Pike 20009).

The Historic Property Report deems this structurally intact farmstead as ineligible due to its lack of significance. The report cites "loss of farmland, nearby strip mining, and extensive overgrowth around the buildings" as having diminished the integrity of setting, feeling, and association." While it may be true that the farmstead lacks significance as a farmstead, this should not disqualify the house for consideration of eligibility.

The physical description of the house and outbuildings in the Historic Property Report highlights the feeling of abandonment and unkemptness. The description never mentions and does not photograph the house's delicate corner pilasters, and the interesting and intact wood trim decorating the three original porches and the gable front of the house (including a unique folk carving of a horse on the gable front).

The Context/Significance section of the report is confusingly equivocal, admitting that the farmstead is "illustrative of small-scale farms common to southern Pike County in the 19th and early 20th centuries, but lacks significant associations with the history of agriculture in the region." No grounds for this latter assertion are given.

Mention is made of the fact that the property is still in the possession of the Loveless family, and that the family "owned a great deal of land in the east half of Logan township," but no mention is made of the fact that the Loveless family (in the person of Percy Loveless) provided the first recorded white settler (1811) in what is now called Logan township, then a part of Madison township.7

The property is deemed ineligible as a farmstead. I would suggest that the house be reconsidered as a significant example of a vernacular cross-plan house with folk Victorian ornament, and with associations to historically significant figures in the history of Logan township (NR criteria A and C).

7. The Lemuel Hargrove house

This property was deemed ineligible due to a lack of significance. This assessment seems to have been arrived at primarily on the basis of categorizing the house as the only surviving remnant of a former farmstead: “The house originally was a farmhouse, but the loss of all period outbuildings has diminished the integrity of setting and association.” (Historic Property Report, “Selected Ineligible Properties”). This was further confirmed at the April 13th consulting party meeting, when project historian Lori Thursby stated to Joe Tamalavic, the current owner of the house, that “the issue with your house was not its integrity, it was its historical significance.” My contention is that the house only lacks significance when viewed as a potential representative of a 19th century farmstead (hence the Report’s emphasis on the house’s lack of outbuildings).

In answer to the criticism that the house lacked outbuildings, Mr. Tamalavic stated that his research revealed Lemuel Hargrove to have been a kind of gentleman farmer who did not farm from the property—the land he actually farmed was land that he owned and/or leased elsewhere. (This pattern of “gentleman farming” is not unheard of in parts of southern Indiana, when the landowner is a person of some means). This explains the lack of traces of outbuildings around the house.

Architectural integrity and significance of the house: I would point out that it is not necessary for the house to be part of an intact farmstead in order to be considered eligible for the National Register. Having made a site visit to the house on 2 May 2005, I would suggest that the case be reopened on the basis of consideration of the house’s significance under NR criterion C. The house illustrates an interesting variation on a particular type of vernacular domestic architecture characteristic of southern Indiana and its Upland South cultural hearth roots. Furthermore, the variations it illustrates are not uncharacteristic of the vernacular house type it embodies (the I-house), and they may in fact point to significant details about the house’s origins.

The Historic Property Report describes the house as an I-house, though later (p. 119) concludes that it is “not characteristic of the I-house type and with only a few modest stylistic details, is not characteristic of the Greek Revival style.” No reasons are given for the conclusion that the house is uncharacteristic of I-houses. Furthermore, I would contend that modesty of stylistic detail is characteristic of the Federal style, of which this house appears to be a late version.

The stylistic details mentioned in the Historic Property Report are details that can be found in both Federal and Greek Revival stylistic vocabularies (transoms and sidelights, low pitched roof, wainscoting). Stylistic details which are present but which the Historic Property Report does NOT mention further support a characterization of this house as Federal in style: lack of lintels defining the windows and an unrecessed front door (thus giving it an austere look); extremely delicate pilasters on the outer corners of the house; a parlor mantel with simple reedlike fluting—a lightness of detail that is characteristic of vernacular Federal houses; an original stairway with frail, turned balusters and a slender
handrail ending in a non-bulbous newel post.\textsuperscript{8} The placement of the front door on the far right side of house’s front façade rather than in its center also suggests a throwback to Federal building idioms (an eschewing of the symmetry associated with both earlier Georgian-influenced vernacular houses of the colonial era and later Greek Revival tendencies).

The modern addition of a one story portico over the front door of the house suggests that the owner who made this addition was in fact interpreting the house as Federal in idiom, not Greek Revival (which would have called for a gable-front or pedimented portico). The addition of the portico has not compromised the presence of the pilasters, flush with the wall of the house, that serve as ornament highlighting the house’s front door and the bay immediately above it. In that respect, the portico may be said to be a superficial and reversible change, not a structural one that compromises the house’s architectural integrity.

Regardless of whether one characterizes the house as Federal or Greek Revival in stylistic detail, its modesty of detail is characteristic of I-houses in general, as are the house’s floor plan, room arrangements, and fenestration.

**Dating of the house/historic context and associations:** The Historic Property Report dates the house to circa 1863 (when the property was bought by Emily Hargrove), but notes that the property itself had five different owners between 1853 and 1863. All but one owned the property for less than three years. Census records indicate that four of the property owners lived in Petersburg and one in Logan township (i.e. not on the property itself). The Report concludes from this that the property was acquired for “investment purposes.” I feel that research on this part of the property’s history is insufficient, and that further digging may well reveal some important information about the origin of the house, its possible links to local history, and some of its peculiar architectural details (for example, the curious and apparently original interior windows in rooms on the second floor of the ell—not mentioned in the Historic Property Report).

The period from 1853 to 1863 was a busy and tumultuous one for the history of Pike County, and perhaps particularly so for this corner of the county. The sections of the Wabash and Erie Canal linking Petersburg to Evansville were finally completed in 1853. Local informants suggest there was a spur of the Wabash and Erie Canal located near the Lemuel Hargrove house.\textsuperscript{9} Goodspeed’s *History of Pike and Dubois Counties* notes that the village of Alfords (which still exists as a crossroads a couple of miles south of the Hargrove house on CR 200 East) was platted in 1856 by contractors for the “Old Straight Railroad”—whose failure as a venture “brought stagnation to the place.”\textsuperscript{10} Since these ventures and great expectations characterized local life around Alfords in the 1850s, I would urge further research on possible links between the Hargrove house and local


\textsuperscript{9} Interview with Angela Tamalavic, by Edith Sarra, 2 May 2005.

\textsuperscript{10} Goodspeed, 355.
history. It is possible that the place may have been built in the 1850s, not 1863, and intended, not primarily as a farmhouse but rather as a public house or hostelry, with investors anticipating Canal and/or rail traffic business from the nearby village of Alfords.

The Historic Property Report also omits any rationale for its evaluation of Lemuel Hargrove, Civil War veteran and State Representative for Pike and Dubois County, as "not significant in the history of the township or county."

Conclusion
The Report has not fully addressed the question of the dating of the house, the identity and motives of any of the first five property owners, nor important stylistic details of the house itself. Its architectural description of the house is neither thorough nor judicious. It fails to account for its negative assessment of Hargrove's significance in local history. In short, the assessment of the Lemuel Hargrove house in the Report raises far more questions than it answers.

I argue strongly that this house be considered eligible for National Register listing under criterion C, regardless of whether links to local historical significance can be established. But I also urge further research be done on the historical context in which the house was built, and on Lemuel Hargrove's various roles in local history for possible consideration of the property under criterion A.

II. Corrections/Queries: Minutes of the Consulting Party Meeting, 13 April 2005

Paragraph 6: "Thursby discussed listed or eligible properties in the APE: Patoka Bridges Historic District (listed under Criterion A)"

Correlation: the District is listed under Criteria A and C.

Paragraph 8: "Michael Striker...Thirty-six known sites were located in the 2000 ft wide corridor. This information will be reported."

Query: reported where?

Paragraph 12: "Sarra asked if Dongola was to be evaluated for potential archeological significance."

Correction: I asked whether the Patoka aqueduct/Patoka Bottoms area was being considered for archeological significance (not Dongola). I further noted that Cheryl Munson had indicated the uniqueness of the area as a mid-19th century work site; she knows of no others in southwestern Indiana.

Paragraph 12: "The corridor crosses the canal in tilled agricultural fields where no outline of the canal is visible."

---

11 How likely is it that such a house would have been built in a county like Pike at the height of the Civil War? Common sense alone suggests an earlier date of construction.
Query: what about the corridor as it crosses CR 1150 E in Columbia township, Gibson County? My impression is that there is a watered section of the canal crossing the corridor and the county road.

Paragraph 16: “Thursby explained...the [Hargrove] house has some integrity issues but it is generally the lack of significance that led the historians to their conclusion.”

Correction: I heard Thursby say (and I was taking notes) “the issue with your house was not its integrity, it was its historical significance.”

Paragraph 18: “Sarra ... asked the status of the Pike County Interim report.”

Correction: I asked who is conducting that project and when it would be underway. My question about who would conduct the Interim Report survey was never answered. Instead Linda Weintraut said that Pike’s Interim Report “will be part of the mitigation.”

It makes no sense that the Interim Report should have to wait until after the Section 106 process has moved on to a discussion of mitigation. It would be of much greater use now, in terms of Section 106’s object of identifying and rating all potentially eligible above ground resources. By the same token, why should the I-69 Project team have the authority to say when the Interim Report will be undertaken?

Paragraph 18: Logan Cemetery

Correction: I did not say I believed that family members buried there were active in the Underground Railroad. I noted that the cemetery has connections to Bazil Simpson, a conductor on the UGRR, and one of Logan township’s earliest settlers. He was twice owner of the property and his children and grandchildren are buried there.

Nor did I suggest it should be considered eligible for the NR. Cemeteries are not normally eligible for NR status. They are protected under other kinds of legislation (no mention of which has been made anywhere in the Historic Property Report, however).

Paragraph 19: “Sarra doubted that tobacco farming and livestock raising were dominant agriculture (sic) activities.”

Correction: I expressed doubt that these kinds of farms characterize agricultural history in Pike County throughout the possible periods of significance applicable to the Lemuel Hargrove house and other Pike County above-ground resources under discussion. In general, I expressed concern about the Report’s (and the presentation’s) inadequate grasp and representation of Pike County agricultural history.

Paragraph 22: “Pauline Spiegel ... asked Tamalavic to explain how he sought inclusion of his property.”

Addition: Ms. Spiegel asked the ASC group and Weintraut/DeSimone whether all owners of properties that were being considered for their historical significance were systematically contacted and consulted with for the purpose of gathering historical information. This question was never really answered, as the conversation turned quickly to a somewhat adversarial dialogue between Thursby and Tamalavic, the latter of whom protested that his “dialogue” with ASC had been largely initiated and sustained as a result of his own efforts, not theirs.
III. Compliance with Section 106 Review processes?

I encountered great difficulties, requiring an extensive investment of time and phoning of various parties repeatedly in order to gain access to the Historic Property Report, hence these comments arrive after the initial deadline of April 29th, and two days after the extended deadline of May 3rd.

Since “interactive consultation is at the heart of Section 106 review”12 I must point out that in this instance, the I-69 Project team is falling short of its professed “good faith effort” to make its findings available to the interested public and to fully engage in consultation with willing consulting parties. Many, if not most of the consulting parties on this project are volunteers like myself who are not professionally involved in this project, and who must take time away from their regular occupations in order to participate at all. The I-69 Project team has acknowledged these circumstances to the degree that it now schedules consulting party meetings during evening hours. However, the meaningfulness of these meetings is greatly undermined when consulting parties have limited access to the documents under discussion.

Delays and restrictions on access to the Historic Property Report
Initially, the report was available at the Section 2 Project Office in Petersburg, and at the public libraries in Petersburg and Washington, locales that are a one and a half to two hour drive from my home. I am a full-time faculty member at Indiana University, Bloomington, and the semester was in full swing during the period when the report was available, so I was unable to make the day-trip that would be required for reading the roughly 140 page report. I had to reschedule an afternoon class in order to attend the meeting in Petersburg on April 13th, and was only able to skim through the report before the meeting.

I therefore asked at the outset of the meeting why the report had not been put on line. Tony DeSimone and Linda Weintraut initially seemed to agree that this was an oversight on their part that could be easily corrected. Mr. DeSimone promised he would get back to me on this.

On Thursday, April 21, one week after the meeting, I still had not heard back from Mr. DeSimone. I phoned his office in Indianapolis. He told me no decision had been reached yet, but that they were now considering placing a copy of the report in the Section 4 Office (Bloomington) so that consulting parties in that part of the corridor could read it. Meanwhile, they had withdrawn copies formerly deposited at the public libraries in Pike and Daviess counties—i.e., they had further limited access to the report, instead of the requested opposite.

Their rationale for this further restriction of access was that the report was in draft form, and therefore not appropriate for public consumption outside of the consulting parties and members of the Project team. This rationale, from the point of view of a consulting party still unable to access the report, made no sense.

I asked him to please inform me when the copy might become available at the Section 4 Office, and I requested an extension of the April 29th deadline for submission of comments. Mr. DeSimone promised he would consider both requests.

On Friday, April 22, I spoke with a Mr. Wilson, from the Section 2 Project Office in Petersburg. He told me that the decision to put a copy in the Section 4 Office was “still in the talking stage.”

On Tuesday, April 26, Mr. DeSimone phoned to say that they would place a copy at the Section 4 Office and I should phone that office to learn its hours of operation. He requested that I submit my comments by a revised deadline of May 3rd.

The copy did not arrive at the Section 4 office until Thursday, April 28th (per my phone conversation with the Section 4 Office intern on April 29th; “We got it in the mail yesterday”). I thus was not able to read the report until Friday, April 29th. I also was not allowed to make use of a copier, so all my notes on the report had to be made by hand.

Conclusion
As the author of the Patoka Bridges Historic District’s successful listing on the National Register of Historic Places, I conducted extensive research on the history of Pike and Gibson counties over a period of three years, and consulted at length with several experts on southern Indiana’s historic resources (Dr. James Cooper, on iron and steel bridges; Dr. Cheryl Ann Munson, on archeological profiles of southwestern Indiana; Mr. Duncan Campbell, professional preservationist, and Ms. Sandy McBeth, Pike County Historical Society). Given my recent research in the history of these counties, I have been particularly concerned about the I-69 Project team’s inadequate representation of Pike County, for which there are no systematic prior historical inventories (like the Interim Reports available for other counties in the APE). I contend that the team still needs to conduct a substantive amount of general and specific research before the Historic Property Report should be accepted for Tier 2 purposes.

Sincerely,

Edith Sarra, Ph.D.
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