



# Above Ground Historic Properties in PA and MD Determination of Effects Report

March 2024

**US 6219, Section 050  
Transportation Improvement Project  
*Meyersdale, PA to Old Salisbury Road, MD***  
**2021PR06554 Somerset County, PA and Garrett County, MD**



## ABSTRACT

This *Determination of Effects Report* evaluates the potential effect of the US 6219, Section 050 Transportation Improvement Project on historic structures located within the project's Above Ground Historic Properties Area of Potential Effects (APE) in Pennsylvania and Maryland. The proposed project includes the construction of a 12.9 km (8.0 mile), four-lane limited access facility from the end of the US 219 Meyersdale Bypass in Somerset County, Pennsylvania, to the north end of the newly constructed I-68/US 219 Interchange in Garrett County, Maryland. This report considers four project alternatives: Alternative DU Modified, Alternative DU Shift Modified, Alternative E Modified, and Alternative E Shift Modified.

This cultural resources work was performed for the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) Engineering District 9-0, in coordination with the Maryland State Highway Administration (MD SHA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). All work was performed to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulation 36 CFR §800. This legislation requires that the effect of any federally assisted undertaking on historically significant resources be considered during project planning. This Determination of Effects Report was prepared in accordance with federal and state laws that treat significant historic and cultural resources. This includes the NHPA of 1966 (as amended), the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (as amended in 1968), the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Executive Order 11593 (36 FR 8921, 3 CFR 1971 Comp. P. 154), the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania State Act No. 1978-273, the Maryland Historical Trust Act of 1985 as amended, and State Finance and Procurement Article §§ 5A-325 and 5A-326 of the Annotated Code of Maryland. The Markosky Engineering Group, Inc (Markosky) and NTM Engineering, Inc. (NTM) conducted the effects analysis for this report in 2023 and 2024.

In Pennsylvania, there are five (5) above ground historic properties that are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in the project's Above Ground Historic Properties APE. One (1) eligible resource is shared by Pennsylvania and Maryland. In Maryland, the APE also contains one (1) listed and one (1) eligible resource.

- S.J. Miller School (PA resource number 2023RE07648); eligible
- Miller Farm / Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436); eligible,
- Lowry Farm (2004RE00605); eligible,
- Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606); eligible,
- Jacob Glotfelty Barn (1995RE41407); eligible,
- Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191 (PA resource number 2006RE00149 and MD resource number G-I-A-189): eligible,
- Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (MD resource number G-I-A-012); listed, and
- National Road (G-I-A-227); eligible.

The proposed project has been designed to avoid and/or minimize potential impacts to these resources to the extent possible. Markosky and NTM recommend that the proposed US 6219, Section 050 Transportation Improvement Project will have the following effects on NRHP-eligible and listed historic resources (**Table 1**).

**Table 1. Summary of Effects to Above Ground Historic Properties**

Historic Resource	Alternative DU Modified	Alternative DU Shift Modified	Alternative E Modified	Alternative E Shift Modified
S.J. Miller School (2023RE07648)	No Effect	No Effect	No Effect	No Effect
Miller Farm / Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436)	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect
Lowry Farm (2004RE00605)	Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect	No Effect	No Effect
Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606)	Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect	No Effect	No Effect
Jacob Glotfelty Barn (1995RE41407)	No Effect	No Effect	No Effect	No Effect
Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191 (2006RE00149 and G-I-A-189)	No Effect	No Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect
Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (G-I-A-012)	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect
National Road (G-I-A-227)	No Effect	No Effect	No Effect	No Effect
	<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>	<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>	<b>Alternative E Modified</b>	<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>
<b>Summary of Effects to Above Ground Historic Properties</b>	Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect

Coordination with the State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs) in Pennsylvania and Maryland and the project’s consulting parties will continue as proposed project activities are further refined; as the project’s effects become better known; and as a Preferred Alternative is selected for the project.

## Table of Contents

<b>1.0 PROJECT INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Project Description .....	1
1.2 Project Purpose and Need.....	1
1.3 Description of the Above Ground Historic Properties Area of Potential Effects (APE).....	2
1.4 Summary of Public Involvement and Consulting Party Coordination .....	2
1.5 Summary of the Status of Archaeology .....	3
<b>2.0 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES.....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 Overview.....	4
2.2 No Build Alternative.....	5
2.3 Alternative DU Modified.....	5
2.4 Alternative DU Shift Modified.....	6
2.5 Alternative E Modified.....	7
2.6 Alternative E Shift Modified.....	7
<b>3.0 DESCRIPTION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES IN THE APE IN PA AND MD .....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1 Pennsylvania Resources.....	9
3.1.1 S.J. Miller School (2023RE07648) .....	9
3.1.2 Miller Farm / Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436) .....	9
3.1.3 Lowry Farm (2004RE00605).....	10
3.1.4 Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606) .....	10
3.1.5 Jacob Glotfelty Barn (1995RE41407).....	10
3.1.6 Other Resources in the APE in Pennsylvania .....	11
3.2 Shared Resources in Pennsylvania and Maryland.....	11
3.2.1 Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191 (2006RE00149 and G-I-A-189)	
11	
3.3 Resources in Maryland.....	12
3.3.1 Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (G-I-A-012).....	12
3.3.2 National Road (G-I-A-227).....	13
<b>4.0 CONSIDERATION OF PROJECT EFFECTS.....</b>	<b>14</b>
4.1 Definition of Effect .....	14
4.2 Criteria of Adverse Effect .....	14

4.3 Application of the Definition of Effect and Criteria of Adverse Effect for Resources in Pennsylvania..... 16

    4.3.1 S.J. Miller School (2023RE07648) ..... 16

    4.3.2 Miller Farm / Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436) ..... 16

    4.3.3 Lowry Farm (2004RE00605)..... 19

    4.3.4 Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606) ..... 21

    4.3.5 Jacob Glotfelty Barn (1995RE41407)..... 24

4.4 Application of the Definition of Effect and Criteria of Adverse Effect for Shared Resources in Pennsylvania and Maryland..... 25

    4.4.1 Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191 (2006RE00149 and G-I-A-189) 25

4.5 Application of the Definition of Effect and Criteria of Adverse Effect for Resources in Maryland..... 29

    4.5.1 Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (G-I-A-012)..... 29

    4.5.2 National Road (G-I-A-227)..... 32

4.6 Summary of Efforts to Avoid and/or Minimize Effects to Historic Properties..... 33

**5.0 SUMMARY OF RESULTS ..... 34**

**6.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY ..... 35**

**Tables**

Table 1. Summary of Effects to Above Ground Historic Properties ii

Table 2. Results of Effect Evaluation for the S.J. Miller School (2023RE07648) 16

Table 3. Results of Effect Evaluation for the Miller Farm / Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436) 17

Table 4. Application of Criteria of Adverse Effect for the Miller Farm / Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436) 17

Table 5. Results of Effect Evaluation for the Lowry Farm (2004RE00605) 19

Table 6. Application of Criteria of Adverse Effect for the Lowry Farm (2004RE00605) 19

Table 7. Results of Effect Evaluation for the Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606) 22

Table 8. Application of Criteria of Adverse Effect for the Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606)	22
Table 9. Results of Effect Evaluation for the Jacob Glotfelty Barn (1995RE41407)	25
Table 10. Results of Effect Evaluation for the Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191 (2006RE00149 and G-I-A-189)	26
Table 11. Application of Criteria of Adverse Effect for the Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191 (2006RE00149 and G-I-A-189)	26
Table 12. Results of Effect Evaluation for the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (G-I-A-012)	29
Table 13. Application of Criteria of Adverse Effect for the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (G-I-A-012)	30
Table 14. Results of Effect Evaluation for the National Road (G-I-A-227)	32
Table 15. Summary of Effects to Above Ground Historic Properties	34

## Appendix A Figures

- Figure 1. Project Location with Above Ground Historic Properties APE
- Figure 2. Project Location with Above Ground Historic Properties APE
- Figure 3. Four Project Alternatives
- Figure 4. Four Project Alternatives
- Figure 5. Historic Resources in the Project Area
- Figure 6. S.J. Miller School (2023RE07648)
- Figure 7. Miller Farm / Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436)
- Figure 8. Lowry Farm (2004RE00605) Overview
- Figure 9. Lowry Farm (2004RE00605) Detail
- Figure 10. Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606) Overview
- Figure 11. Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606) Detail
- Figure 12. Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606) Detail
- Figure 13. Jacob Glotfelty Barn (1995RE41407)



Figure 14. Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191 (2006RE00149 and G-I-A-189) Overview

Figure 15. Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191 (2006RE00149 and G-I-A-189) Detail

Figure 16. Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (G-I-A-012) Overview

Figure 17. Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (G-I-A-012) Detail

Figure 18. National Road (G-I-A-227) Overview

Figure 19. National Road (G-I-A-227) Detail

## Appendix B Photographs

Photograph 1. S.J. Miller School (2023RE07648). View of the northeast (front) elevation of the school, facing south.

Photograph 2. S.J. Miller School (2023RE07648). View of the school and surroundings from Shaw Mines Road at the Mason Dixon Highway, facing southwest.

Photograph 3. Miller Farm / Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436). Overview of the Miller Farm, facing northwest.

Photograph 4. Miller Farm / Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436). South (front) and east elevations of the farmhouse, facing northwest.

Photograph 5. Miller Farm / Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436). Eastern edge of Miller Farm NRHP boundary showing the overgrown former alignment of the Mason Dixon Highway climbing a hill at the left of the improved US 219 highway, facing north (GoogleEarth 2023).

Photograph 6. Miller Farm / Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436). View of the eastern edge of the Miller Farm and the former alignment of the Mason Dixon Highway in 1993 before the construction of the improved US 219 highway (yellow highlight), facing north (Google Earth 2023).

Photograph 7. Lowry Farm (2004RE00605). View of the southwest and southeast (front) elevations of the farmhouse, facing north.

Photograph 8. Lowry Farm (2004RE00605). View of the barn (center) and garage (right), facing southeast.

- Photograph 9. Lowry Farm (2004RE00605). Aerial view of the Lowry Farm in 1939 showing a mix of cleared fields and densely wooded areas to the south and southeast of the property (USDA 1939).
- Photograph 10. Lowry Farm (2004RE00605). Aerial view of the Lowry Farm in 1958 showing a mix of cleared fields and densely wooded areas to the south and southeast of the property (USDA 1958b).
- Photograph 11. Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606). Overview of the Deal Farm, facing northeast.
- Photograph 12. Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606). View of the barn complex, facing north.
- Photograph 13. Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606). View of the Deal Farm in 1958 showing densely wooded areas at the far north and far south of the property (USDA 1958a).
- Photograph 14. Jacob Glotfelty Barn (1995RE41407). North elevation of the Jacob Glotfelty Barn, facing southeast.
- Photograph 15. Jacob Glotfelty Barn (1995RE41407). West and south elevations of the bank barn, facing northeast.
- Photograph 16. Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191 (2006RE00149 and G-I-A-189). View of the west face of the marker showing the 1902 resurvey date, facing east.
- Photograph 17. Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (G-I-A-012). North and west elevations of the Tomlinson Inn, facing southeast.
- Photograph 18. Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (G-I-A-012). View of Little Meadows from the Tomlinson Inn complex, facing north.
- Photograph 19. Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (G-I-A-012). View of the landscape associated with the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows looking toward the project area, facing southwest.
- Photograph 20. National Road (G-I-A-227). View of the National Road with the Tomlinson Inn seen at center, facing southeast (Google Earth 2023).

## **Appendix C Relevant Correspondence**



## 1.0 PROJECT INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Project Description

The Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT), Engineering District 9-0, in coordination with the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), propose the US 6219, Section 050 Transportation Improvement Project, which includes the construction of a 12.9 km (8.0 mi), four-lane limited access facility from the end of the US 219 Meyersdale Bypass in Somerset County, Pennsylvania, to the north end of the newly constructed I-68/US 219 Interchange in Garrett County, Maryland (**Figures 1 and 2**). This stretch of highway will complete Corridor N of the Appalachian Development Highway System (ADHS) and will supplement the interstate system by connecting I-68 and the Pennsylvania Turnpike (I-76). Multiple alternatives have been considered over various planning stages of this project. In this Determination of Effects report, four modified alternatives and a no build alternative will be assessed. Section 2.0 discusses the project alternatives.

This Determination of Effects Report was prepared in accordance with federal and state laws that treat significant historic and cultural resources. This includes Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulation 36 CFR §800, the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (as amended in 1968), the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Executive Order 11593 (36 FR 8921, 3 CFR 1971 Comp. P. 154), the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania State Act No. 1978-273, the Maryland Historical Trust Act of 1985 as amended, and State Finance and Procurement Article §§ 5A-325 and 5A-326 of the Annotated Code of Maryland. The Markosky Engineering Group, Inc (Markosky) and NTM Engineering, Inc. (NTM) conducted the effects analysis for this report in 2023 and 2024.

### 1.2 Project Purpose and Need

The purpose of the US 6219, Section 050 Meyersdale to Old Salisbury Road project is to complete Corridor N of the Appalachian Development Highway System (ADHS) in order to improve the system linkage in the region, provide safe and efficient access for motorists, and provide a transportation infrastructure to support economic development within the Appalachian region.

The project needs identified for this project are that existing US 219 does not provide efficient mobility for trucks and freight; there are numerous roadway and geometric deficiencies present along the existing US 219 alignment; and the existing roadway infrastructure is a limiting factor in economic development opportunities in the Appalachian Region.

### 1.3 Description of the Above Ground Historic Properties Area of Potential Effects (APE)

The Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the “geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist” (36 CFR 800.16(d)). The project does not yet have a Preferred Alternative. Multiple possible alternatives are being considered. The preliminary Above Ground Historic Properties APE for the US 6219, Section 050 Transportation Improvement Project, which was revised in June 2023, accounts for potential direct and indirect effects of the current proposed design alternatives as part of the preliminary engineering for this project (see **Figures 1 and 2**). The alternatives include land with existing roadway infrastructure and new alignments for the improved highway through less developed and heavily forested areas. The revised Above Ground Historic Properties APE encompasses a total area of approximately 933 ha (2,304 ac).

In January 2024, the project’s limits of disturbance (LODs) were further revised as a result of the initial above ground historic properties resource surveys in order to avoid, to the extent possible, direct effects to historic properties. See Sections 2.0 generally and 4.6 specifically for more information about efforts to avoid and/or minimize effects to historic properties.

### 1.4 Summary of Public Involvement and Consulting Party Coordination

Consulting Parties have been solicited to participate in the Section 106 Process for this project since the posting of the Early Notification on PennDOT’s publicly accessible cultural resources management website, PATH, in October 2021. Consulting parties are defined for Section 106 as an organization or an individual who has a demonstrated interest in the project, due to their legal or economic relationship to the undertaking or affected property(ies) or their concerns with the undertaking’s effects on historic properties.

Consulting parties have been notified of relevant postings on PATH for their review and comment, including the draft submittal of eligibility studies for above ground historic properties in both Maryland (March 2023) and Pennsylvania (September 2023).

The consulting parties were invited to participate in the first Consulting Party Meeting that was held as a hybrid in person and virtual meeting on Monday October 30, 2023. The meeting was designed to present information and updates about the project overall and to foster discussion about both above ground historic properties and archaeological (below ground) resources in the greater project area. In particular, the consulting parties were invited to comment on the recently completed draft eligibility studies for above ground historic properties in Pennsylvania.

It is anticipated that the second consulting party meeting will be held in Spring 2024 to discuss potential effects from the project's various alternatives on historic properties before the formal effect finding is made for the project.

## **1.5 Summary of the Status of Archaeology**

Identifying and evaluating archaeological resources within the Preliminary Archaeological APE is underway. A Phase IA archaeological reconnaissance, including background and archival research, geomorphology, and pedestrian field reconnaissance, has been conducted within the Project Area in both Pennsylvania and Maryland. Additionally, pre-contact and historic probability models were created for the project to identify areas of archaeological sensitivity.

The geomorphological investigations determined that subsequent archaeological survey efforts are not expected to require deep testing methods. Background research identified areas that have been previously surveyed. Within Pennsylvania, previously surveyed areas will need to be surveyed specifically for potential rockshelters. Within Maryland, the previously surveyed areas will not need to be resurveyed. All of the previously identified sites within or immediately adjacent to the Project Area have been evaluated and mitigated in earlier stages of the Project. The pedestrian reconnaissance identified two (2) historic era loci within Pennsylvania and one (1) in Maryland that were visible at the ground surface and require Phase IB archaeological surveying efforts. Finally, the pre-contact and historic period probability models have been prepared as heat maps illustrating areas of high, moderate, and low or no archaeological probability. The probability models will be integral to establishing Phase IB field methods, which will be conducted within the Archaeological APE once a Preferred Alternative is identified.

If NRHP eligible archaeological properties are identified, and it is determined the project will have an Adverse Effect on the properties, then PennDOT will identify mitigation measures in consultation with the appropriate SHPO(s), Tribes, and other consulting parties. This commitment is being outlined in a Programmatic Agreement for the Project.

## 2.0 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

### 2.1 Overview

Four modified alternatives have been advanced for further study following extensive planning studies and the consideration of more than a dozen preliminary alignments. The four alternatives—Alternative DU Modified, Alternative DU Shift Modified, Alternative E Modified, and Alternative E Shift Modified—often overlap and follow the same common alignment, including for about three miles at north end of corridor in PA and two discrete portions in MD (**Figures 3** and **4**). In the southern half of the project area in PA, Alternatives DU Modified and DU Shift Modified are paired, and they curve to the west to cross Greenville Road closer to the town of Salisbury. Alternatives E Modified and E Shift Modified bear to the east and swing down to join the other alternatives near the state line. In the southern half of the corridor in MD, Alternatives DU Modified and E Modified are paired to follow a westerly path while paired Alternatives DU Shift Modified and E Shift Modified are pulled back from Old Salisbury Road to the east.

All four alternatives have been evaluated with a consistent roadway layout, also known as a typical section. The typical section for each segment provides a four-lane divided limited access highway with 12-foot-wide travel lanes, 8-foot-wide inside shoulders, and 10-foot-wide outside shoulders. The width of the median between the inside edges of northbound and southbound travel lanes is generally 60 feet. In cut sections, where excavation will be required for construction, a proposed swale is located 15 feet outside the edge of the roadway shoulder. The backslope of the swale extends for 5 feet at a 4:1 slope, then continues at a 2:1 slope, until intersecting the existing ground. In fill sections, where fill must be placed for construction, a 10:1 slope extends from the outside roadway shoulder for 6 feet, then continues at a 2:1 slope until intersecting existing ground.

All of the alternatives share improvements at the northern end of the corridor, including:

- An approximately 1.3-mile long section of the Mason-Dixon Highway (T-355) will be improved between Hunsrick Road and the US 219 Meyersdale Interchange. Its design speed will be reduced from 55 MPH to 35 MPH, and its formerly severed section will be reconnected to serve as a continuous local road.
- Alterations to Hunsrick Road will include the elimination of the Hunsrick Road Bridge (SR 2102) and the construction of the Hunsrick Road Extension to connect with Fike Hollow Road (T-363). This new connector roadway will generally run parallel to the new US 219 alternative along the eastern side and will provide access from Hunsrick Road to US Business Route 219 (SR 2047) near the Meyersdale Interchange. The proposed typical section for Hunsrick Road Extension includes two (2) 10-foot travel lanes and 4-foot outside shoulders. The design speed is anticipated to be 25 miles per hour.
- Mountain Road (T-824) will be connected at its north end to Hunsrick Road Extension, and a cul-de-sac will be added at the southern end to avoid a steep grade (14%).

- Clark Road will be bisected by new US 219 and cul-de-sacs will be added on either side of the highway. The eastern side of Clark Road will maintain access to US Business Route 219 near the Meyersdale Interchange via Mountain Road, Hunsrick Road Extension, and Fike Hollow Road.

PennDOT and MD SHA arrived at the modifications to the alternatives in order to avoid and/or minimize potential impacts to environmental and cultural resources, including wetlands, watercourses, farmlands, historic properties, Section 4(f)/Section 2002 resources, and State Game Lands. On January 24, 2024, refinements to Alternatives DU, DU-Shift, E, and E-Shift were proposed to the Pennsylvania and Maryland resource agencies at an interagency meeting, and these refinements were termed Alternatives DU Modified, DU Shift Modified, E Modified, and E Shift Modified. The Pennsylvania and Maryland resource agencies supported the design refinements, and PennDOT and SHA elected to move forward with the modified alternatives and to dismiss the unaltered alternatives—Alternatives DU, DU-Shift, E, and E-Shift—from further consideration.

## 2.2 No Build Alternative

The No Build Alternative involves taking no action, except routine maintenance along US 219. The existing two-lane alternative of US 219 between Meyersdale, Pennsylvania and Garrett County, Maryland would remain. No new alternatives or additional roadway would be constructed.

## 2.3 Alternative DU Modified

Alternative DU Modified resulted from the further refinement of Alternative DU, which was developed by combining suggestions from the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) with an alternative identified during former 2001 NEPA efforts. USFWS suggested an alternative to avoid the mountain slope/ridge in Pennsylvania and reduce potential impacts to terrestrial wildlife.

Alternative DU Modified follows the common alignment of all four modified alternatives in the northern end of the project area until it pairs with Alternative DU Shift Modified and curves to the west to cross Greenville Road closer to the town of Salisbury. It rejoins the common alignment near the Pennsylvania-Maryland state border and then pairs with Alternative E Modified near the southern end of the project.

Alternative DU Modified, like all of the modified alternatives, includes the improvements to the Mason Dixon Highway, Hunsrick Road, Mountain Road, and Clark Road at the northern end of the project area. Furthermore, a 300-foot long retaining wall, approximately 3.5 feet in height is proposed along the east side of US 219 near the northern end of the project as part of all of the modified alternatives. This retaining wall, along with reductions to the LOD in this area, would allow cut slope impacts to Pennsylvania State Game Lands 231 to be avoided.



Alternative DU Modified paired with Alternative DU Shift Modified also shifts westward, away from the Mason-Dixon Line Marker, near the Pennsylvania-Maryland Border. The Mason Dixon Marker is a historic and Section 4(f) resource.

For all of the modified alternatives, the existing US 219 tie-in location in Maryland was adjusted to the north by approximately 650 feet to avoid impacts to the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows historic and Section 4(f) resource. The horizontal alignment was also shifted 60 feet to the west and the median roadway width and LOD was reduced.

## 2.4 Alternative DU Shift Modified

Alternative DU Shift Modified resulted from the further refinement of Alternative DU Shift, which was combined with Alternative E Shift to move the proposed roadway further away from residences along Old Salisbury Road at the southern end of the project in Maryland. Alternative DU did not directly impact the homes along Old Salisbury Road; however, residents requested an evaluation of a slightly eastward shift to move the alternative further from their homes. The trade-off is that Alternative DU Shift (now Modified) impacts a farm field that is only slightly impacted by Alternative DU Modified. Alternative DU Shift Modified mimics the alignment of Alternative DU Modified from Meyersdale to south of the Mason-Dixon Line, where the alternative is then paired with Alternative E Shift Modified and shifted eastward and away from Old Salisbury Road.

Alternative DU Shift Modified follows the common alignment of all four modified alternatives in the northern end of the project area until it pairs with Alternative DU Modified and curves to the west to cross Greenville Road closer to the town of Salisbury. It rejoins the common alignment near the Pennsylvania-Maryland state border and then pairs with Alternative E Shift Modified near the southern end of the project.

Alternative DU Shift Modified, like all of the modified alternatives, includes the improvements to the Mason Dixon Highway, Hunsrick Road, Mountain Road, and Clark Road at the northern end of the project area. Furthermore, a 300-foot long retaining wall, approximately 3.5 feet in height is proposed along the east side of US 219 near the northern end of the project as part of all of the modified alternatives. This retaining wall, along with reductions to the LOD in this area, would allow cut slope impacts to Pennsylvania State Game Lands 231 to be avoided.

Alternative DU Shift Modified paired with Alternative DU Modified also shifts westward, away from the Mason-Dixon Line Marker, near the Pennsylvania-Maryland Border. The Mason Dixon Marker is a historic and Section 4(f) resource.

For all of the modified alternatives, the existing US 219 tie-in location in Maryland was adjusted to the north by approximately 650 feet to avoid impacts to the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows historic and Section 4(f) resource. The horizontal alignment was also shifted 60 feet to the west and the median roadway width and LOD was reduced.



## 2.5 Alternative E Modified

Alternative E Modified resulted from the further refinement of Alternative E, which was suggested during former 2001 NEPA efforts to avoid farmland in Pennsylvania and avoid residential areas along existing US 219.

Alternative E Modified follows the common alignment of all four modified alternatives in the northern end of the project area until it pairs with Alternative E Shift Modified and curves gently to the southeast near Greenville Road. It rejoins the common alignment near the Pennsylvania-Maryland state border and then pairs with Alternative DU Modified near the southern end of the project.

Alternative E Modified, like all of the modified alternatives, includes the improvements to the Mason Dixon Highway, Hunsrick Road, Mountain Road, and Clark Road at the northern end of the project area. Furthermore, a 300-foot long retaining wall, approximately 3.5 feet in height is proposed along the east side of US 219 near the northern end of the project as part of all of the modified alternatives. This retaining wall, along with reductions to the LOD in this area, would allow cut slope impacts to Pennsylvania State Game Lands 231 to be avoided.

Alternative E Modified, paired with Alternative E Shift Modified, includes reductions to the LOD along the west side of Piney Creek Bridge. This reduction avoids any proposed direct impact to the Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm, a historic and Section 4(f) resource.

Alternative E Modified paired with Alternative E Shift Modified also shifts northwestward, away from the Mason-Dixon Line Marker, near the Pennsylvania-Maryland Border. The Mason Dixon Marker is a historic and Section 4(f) resource.

For all of the modified alternatives, the existing US 219 tie-in location in Maryland was adjusted to the north by approximately 650 feet to avoid impacts to the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows historic and Section 4(f) resource. The horizontal alignment was also shifted 60 feet to the west and the median roadway width and LOD was reduced.

## 2.6 Alternative E Shift Modified

Alternative E Shift Modified resulted from the further refinement of Alternative E Shift, which was combined with Alternative DU Shift to move the proposed roadway further away from residences along Old Salisbury Road at the southern end of the project in Maryland. Alternative E did not directly impact the homes along Old Salisbury Road; however, residents requested an evaluation of a slightly eastward shift to move the alternative further from their homes. The trade-off is that Alternative E Shift (now Modified) impacts a farm field that is only slightly impacted by Alternative E Modified. Alternative E Shift Modified mimics the alignment of Alternative E Modified from Meyersdale to south of the Mason-Dixon Line, where the alternative is then paired with Alternative DU Shift Modified and shifted eastward and away from Old Salisbury Road.

Alternative E Shift Modified follows the common alignment of all four modified alternatives in the northern end of the project area until it pairs with Alternative E Modified and curves gently to the southeast near Greenville Road. It rejoins the common alignment near the Pennsylvania-Maryland state border and then pairs with Alternative DU Shift Modified near the southern end of the project.

Alternative E Shift Modified, like all of the modified alternatives, includes the improvements to the Mason Dixon Highway, Hunsrick Road, Mountain Road, and Clark Road at the northern end of the project area. Furthermore, a 300-foot long retaining wall, approximately 3.5 feet in height is proposed along the east side of US 219 near the northern end of the project as part of all of the modified alternatives. This retaining wall, along with reductions to the LOD in this area, would allow cut slope impacts to Pennsylvania State Game Lands 231 to be avoided.

Alternative E Shift Modified, paired with Alternative E Modified, includes reductions to the LOD along the west side of Piney Creek Bridge. This reduction avoids any proposed direct impact to the Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm, a historic and Section 4(f) resource.

Alternative E Shift Modified paired with Alternative E Modified also shifts northwestward, away from the Mason-Dixon Line Marker, near the Pennsylvania-Maryland Border. The Mason Dixon Marker is a historic and Section 4(f) resource.

For all of the modified alternatives, the existing US 219 tie-in location in Maryland was adjusted to the north by approximately 650 feet to avoid impacts to the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows historic and Section 4(f) resource. The horizontal alignment was also shifted 60 feet to the west and the median roadway width and LOD was reduced.

## 3.0 DESCRIPTION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES IN THE APE IN PA AND MD

### 3.1 Pennsylvania Resources

Studies for the identification, documentation, and evaluation of historic architectural resources in Pennsylvania were conducted in accordance with federal and state regulations. The resulting *Above Ground Historic Properties Pennsylvania Determination of Eligibility Report* (Markosky, August 2023) was informed by background research, files from the PA SHPO PA-SHARE database, and field survey (**Appendix C Relevant Correspondence**).

Background research identified ten (10) previously surveyed resources, including one property that was no longer extant. Nine (9) of the properties were evaluated with addendum Historic Resource Survey Forms (HRSFs) to update their physical descriptions and, where applicable, to provide additional information for evaluating the property's significance and NRHP-eligibility. The eligibility survey also identified twenty-five (25) new historic architectural resources that were at least 45 years old. Seven (7) of the newly-identified resources were evaluated with HRSFs. The eligibility studies, which were informed by consultation with the PA SHPO and consulting parties, identified five (5) NRHP-eligible properties in Pennsylvania.

The names of the Pennsylvania historic resources in the above ground historic properties APE are followed by their PA SHPO Resource Number in parentheses (**Figure 5**).

#### 3.1.1 S.J. Miller School (2023RE07648)

The S.J. Miller School (2023RE07648) is a Colonial Revival style schoolhouse from 1924 with a partially exposed basement level (**Figure 6; Photographs 1 and 2**). The institutional building, which is located at 1464 Shaw Mines Road, features a central pedimented entry, asphalt shingle hipped roof, brick walls, and a rock-faced concrete block basement with few exterior alterations. The building is currently used for storage by the school district.

The S.J. Miller School was determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in 2023 Criterion C for its architectural merit. Its NRHP boundary corresponds to the property tax parcel.

#### 3.1.2 Miller Farm / Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436)

The Miller Farm, which is also known as the Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436), is an approximately 294-acre farm property with a ca. 1912 American Foursquare farmhouse, a ca. 1883 bank barn that was rebuilt ca. 1920, and assorted historic and non-historic outbuildings (**Figure 7; Photographs 3 and 4**). The farm is

located at 671 Ernest Miller Road, and it was determined to be NRHP eligible in 1993 (reconfirmed in 2004) under Criterion A for Agriculture and Criterion C for Architecture.

The Miller Farm's NRHP boundary represents historic landholdings associated with the farm. The eastern boundary of the property terminates at the edge of Old US 219, the Mason Dixon Highway, which was abandoned ca. 1998 with the construction of the US 219 Meyersdale Bypass. As part of this project, the Mason Dixon Highway will be re-established along its original alignment at the eastern edge of the property (**Photographs 5 and 6**).

### 3.1.3 Lowry Farm (2004RE00605)

The approximately 166-acre Lowry Farm (2004RE00605) at 761 Engles Mill Road features a ca. 1852 brick farmhouse, a ca. 1869 bank barn, and outbuildings from ca. 1900 through 1960 (**Figures 8 and 9; Photographs 7 and 8**).

The Lowry Farm was determined to be NRHP eligible in 2005 under Criterion A for Agriculture and Criterion C for Architecture. Its NRHP boundary was revised to include associated farmland in the property's current tax parcel. The boundary includes the farmstead, cultivated fields, pastures, and woodlots (**Photographs 9 and 10**).

### 3.1.4 Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606)

The Deal Farm, which is also known as the Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606), is a 125-acre farm at 630 Greenville Road that has been agriculturally active from the late nineteenth century to the present (**Figures 10-12; Photographs 11 and 12**). The farm centers on an expanded bank barn from the 1880s and an American Foursquare farmhouse with stone facing from ca. 1935.

The Deal Farm was determined to be eligible for NRHP listing in 2023 after a re-evaluation that considered its integrity and new information about its significance under the Allegheny Mountain Part-Time and General Farming historic agricultural region context. Its NRHP boundary, which corresponds to the current tax parcel, includes the farmstead, cultivated fields, pastures, and woodlots (**Photograph 13**).

### 3.1.5 Jacob Glotfelty Barn (1995RE41407)

The Jacob Glotfelty Barn (1995RE41407) at 629 Greenville Road is a log and frame bank barn from 1827 that is prominently sited in an agricultural clearing (**Figure 13; Photographs 14 and 15**). It was determined to be eligible for NRHP listing in 2023 under Criterion C in the area of Architecture as a well-preserved example of double-pen, log Sweitzer barn with three-bay threshing floor arrangement; it is a sizeable example of the form, which is rare in the region. The NRHP boundary of the barn corresponds to the footprint of the building with a modest buffer.

### 3.1.6 Other Resources in the APE in Pennsylvania

The PA SHPO noted in correspondence dated November 13, 2023 that among the resources that had been evaluated for NRHP eligibility for this project,

We also agree the Mast Farm (Resource # 2023RE08322) is not eligible for listing in the National Register due to the loss of the house and outbuildings. The Mast Barn (Resource # 2019RE23966) may be eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion C as it is uniquely large for the regional context. Additional information would be needed to assess eligibility including photographs of all elevations, interior layout, a chronology of building changes, and assessment of integrity including confirmation the historic exterior siding remains beneath the modern sheathing. As the barn will not be directly affected by the proposed undertaking, no further documentation is requested as part of this investigation (PA SHPO 2023).

The potentially eligible Mast Barn (2019RE23966) is located on Greenville Road (west of 630). The ca. 1910 bank barn with prominent cross gable roof and ca. 1940 silo are the only surviving historic-era components of this 216.5-acre farm. The barn is located at least 1,072 feet to the southeast of the paired DU Modified and DU Shift Modified Alternatives and at least 3,841 feet to the northwest of the paired E Modified and E Shift Modified Alternatives. As stated in the PA SHPO letter, it will not be affected by this project. Since it does not have a formal NRHP status determination, it has not been included in the formal effects evaluations.

The Piney Creek Lime Kiln (2004RE09766) was determined to be eligible for NRHP listing in 2023. The former ca. 1876 sandstone Piney Creek Lime Kiln stands in ruins on a hillside between Piney Run Road and Piney Creek. The structure had two kiln chambers and an associated platform at the water's edge. Its NRHP boundary, which amended the originally mismapped location of the resource, demonstrated that the Piney Creek Lime Kiln lies entirely outside of the project APE. Since it will not be affected by the project, it has not been included in the formal effects evaluations.

## 3.2 Shared Resources in Pennsylvania and Maryland

The NRHP-eligible Mason-Dixon Line Marker's name is followed by both its PA and its MD SHPO Resource Number in parentheses (see **Figure 5**) (see **Appendix C Relevant Correspondence**).

### 3.2.1 Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191 (2006RE00149 and G-I-A-189)

Mason-Dixon Line Milestone Marker 191 is a boundary marker that was placed during a 1901-1903 resurvey of the Mason-Dixon Line (**Figures 14 and 15; Photograph 16**). The marker is an approximately two-foot-tall square stone post with a pyramidal top. There is an "M" carved into its south face, and a "P" on its north face, denoting the Maryland and



Pennsylvania sides of the border. The dates 1767 and 1902, for the original survey and resurvey of the Mason-Dixon Line, are carved on its east and west faces.

The marker is one of over 240 Mason-Dixon line markers, which include original stones dating from the 1760s, stones dating from the 1901-1903 resurvey, and several twentieth and twenty-first-century replacements. The markers are significant for their association with Mason and Dixon's groundbreaking surveying techniques and with the line's subsequent use as the boundary between slave-owning and non-slave-owning states before and during the Civil War.

Mason-Dixon Marker No. 191 is located on the Mason-Dixon line approximately 2,500 feet east of Chestnut Ridge Road. The marker itself is owned by the State of Maryland and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, but it sits on property owned by Sidney S. and Carolyn S. Markowitz, trustees.

The marker was determined eligible for the NRHP in Pennsylvania in 2006 within a resource group of five similar markers (PA-SHARE No. 2006RE00149). However, Maryland's MEDUSA database shows no eligibility determination as of December 2023. The resource does not have a formal boundary in either PA-SHARE or MEDUSA, but an undated and unattributed addendum in the MEDUSA file includes a recommendation for a boundary of a fifty-foot diameter circle around the monument, encompassing the 1902 marker, the 1760s cairn mound (which could not be identified in 2023), and the immediate setting. The Pennsylvania and Maryland SHPOs both concurred with the fifty-foot diameter boundary in December 2023.

### 3.3 Resources in Maryland

Identification of above ground historic architectural resources was conducted in accordance with federal and state regulations. The *Above Ground Historic Properties Maryland Determination of Eligibility Report* (NTM, January 2023) provides detailed information pertaining to pertinent regulations, investigation methodology, and existing conditions of above ground historic properties in the Maryland portion of the project's Area of Potential Effects (APE) (see **Appendix C Relevant Correspondence**).

Two (2) historic resources in the Maryland portion of the APE were previously determined eligible or listed in the NRHP. Desktop research and field survey identified fourteen resources in the Maryland portion of the APE that had not been previously surveyed. None of the newly identified resources were recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP.

The names of the Maryland historic resources in the above ground historic properties APE are followed by their MD SHPO Resource Number in parentheses (see **Figure 5**).

#### 3.3.1 Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (G-I-A-012)

The Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (G-I-A-012) property includes a ca. 1818 stone inn, two barns, several smaller outbuildings, and possibly a cemetery (**Figures 16 and**



**17; Photographs 17 through 19).** Prior to the construction of the extant buildings, the unusual natural meadow made a convenient stopping place for soldiers and westward-bound settlers. The construction of the National Road and the Tomlinson Inn reinforced the property's significance as a stopping point on the route known as the "Gateway to the West."

The Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows property was listed on the NRHP in 1973 for significance in the areas of architecture, military history, and transportation. Specifically, the property is significant for its association with the construction of the first federally funded highway (the National Road), westward migration, and as the site of a military camp during the French and Indian War. In addition to the property's historic buildings, several individually significant archaeological sites have been identified within its boundaries, including Braddock's Road (18GA314), Braddock's Little Meadows Encampment (18GA317), and The Tomlinson Inn Site (18GA322). These resources were included in a Little Meadows Archeological district that was identified and determined eligible under Criteria A, B, and D in 2016.

The NRHP boundary of the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows property includes approximately 1,476 acres and was drawn to encompass the above-ground resources, the archaeological resources, and their unique natural setting.

### 3.3.2 National Road (G-I-A-227)

The National Road (G-I-A-227) (present-day Alt-US40) was built between ca. 1811 and ca. 1818 and connected the Potomac River at Cumberland, Maryland with the Ohio River at Wheeling, West Virginia. The road propelled western migration during the early nineteenth century by allowing for more efficient transportation of both people and goods. In addition to its significance in the areas of settlement, transportation, engineering, and commerce, the National Road is also significant as the first federally funded road.

An approximately 2-mile portion of the National Road (present-day Alt-40) near Grantsville, Maryland (between Steeler's Drive and New Germany Road) was determined eligible by the MD SHPO in 2005 (**Figures 18 and 19; Photograph 20**): Although the road has been rebuilt several times, MD SHPO found that its alignment, vertical profile, and surrounding landscape retain sufficient integrity. The resource's NRHP boundary follows the 66-foot chartered width of the roadway.

## 4.0 CONSIDERATION OF PROJECT EFFECTS

It is necessary to assess potential project impacts because one (1) NRHP-listed and seven (7) NRHP-eligible above ground historic properties exist within the APE. Project impacts have been assessed following the procedures outlined in the Section 106 regulations (36 CFR §800), as well as guidance published by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), PennDOT (Publication 689), and the both the MD and PA SHPOs. The proposed project activities described in Section 2.0 and shown in **Figures 6-19** have been designed to avoid and/or minimize potential effects to resources that are eligible for or listed in the NRHP.

### 4.1 Definition of Effect

An Effect is defined as an alteration to the characteristics of a historic property that qualify it for inclusion in or eligibility for the NRHP. The two possible results of identification and evaluation are explained below.

If the agency official finds that either there are **No Historic Properties Present**, or that there are historic properties present but the undertaking will have no effect upon them as defined in 36 CFR §800.16(i), the agency official shall provide documentation of this finding, as set forth in 36 CFR §800.11(d), to the State Historic Preservation Office/Tribal Historic Preservation Office (SHPO/THPO). The agency official shall notify all consulting parties, including Native American tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations, and make the documentation available for public inspection prior to approving the undertaking. If the SHPO/THPO or the ACHP (if it has entered the Section 106 process) does not object within 30 days of receipt of an adequately documented finding, the agency official's responsibilities under Section 106 are fulfilled.

If the agency official finds that there are **Historic Properties Affected** by the undertaking, or the SHPO/THPO or the ACHP objects to the agency official's finding under paragraph (d)(1) of this section, the agency official shall notify all consulting parties, including Native American tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations, and invite their views on the effects and assess adverse effects, if any, in accordance with 36 CFR §800.5.

### 4.2 Criteria of Adverse Effect

An Adverse Effect is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the NRHP in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Consideration shall be given to all qualifying characteristics of a historic property, including those that may have been identified subsequent to the original evaluation of the property's eligibility for inclusion in the NRHP. Adverse effects may include reasonably foreseeable impacts that could be

caused by the undertaking and that may be cumulative, may occur later in time, or may occur farther removed in distance. Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:

- (i) Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property;
- (ii) Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation, and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR Part 68) (SOI Standards) and applicable guidelines;
- (iii) Removal of the property from its historic location;
- (iv) Change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contributes to its historic significance;
- (v) Introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features;
- (vi) Neglect of a property which causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization; and
- (vii) Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property's historic significance. (36 CFR §800.5[a]).

If the evaluation of the Criteria of Adverse Effect results in a recommendation of **No Adverse Effect**, the agency official shall maintain a record of the finding and provide information on the finding to the public on request, which is consistent with the confidentiality provisions of Section §800.11(c). Implementation of the undertaking in accordance with the finding, as documented, fulfills the agency official's responsibilities under Section 106 and 36 CFR §800.11. If the agency official will not conduct the undertaking as proposed in the finding, the agency official shall reopen consultation under Section §800.5(a).

If the evaluation results in a recommendation that the project will have **An Adverse Effect**, the agency official shall consult further to resolve the adverse effect pursuant to 36 CFR §800.6. Section §800.6 of the regulations implementing the NHPA describes the resolution of adverse effect. The procedures for resolution include continuing consultation with the agency and the SHPO, resolving adverse effects, and preparing a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA).

## 4.3 Application of the Definition of Effect and Criteria of Adverse Effect for Resources in Pennsylvania

### 4.3.1 S.J. Miller School (2023RE07648)

The No Build Alternative makes no changes to current conditions, and, therefore, would have **No Effect** on the S.J. Miller School (2023RE07648). The potential effects of the four build alternatives are considered below in **Table 2** and shown in **Figure 6**.

TABLE 2 Results of Effect Evaluation for the S.J. Miller School (2023RE07648)				
Definition of Effect	Evaluation			
	Alternative DU Modified	Alternative DU Shift Modified	Alternative E Modified	Alternative E Shift Modified
An effect may occur when the undertaking results in alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the National Register as defined in §800.16(i).	At this location, <b>Alternatives DU Modified, DU Shift Modified, E Modified, and E Shift Modified</b> overlap and share one common alignment. The alternatives are located approximately 40 feet to the southeast of the resource boundary. The proposed improvements at this location involve repairs and upgrades to the existing Mason Dixon Highway, including drainage improvements at Shaw Mines Road. These improvements to existing infrastructure would not directly impact the historic property and would not alter any of the characteristics of the historic school that make it eligible for listing in the NRHP.			
<b>FINDING BY ALTERNATIVE:</b>				
<b>No Build Alternative</b>	No Effect			
<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>	No Effect			
<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>	No Effect			
<b>Alternative E Modified</b>	No Effect			
<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>	No Effect			
<b>FINDING FOR RESOURCE:</b>	It is recommended that the proposed project would have <b>No Effect</b> on the NRHP-eligible S.J. Miller School (2023RE07648).			

### 4.3.2 Miller Farm / Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436)

The No Build Alternative makes no changes to current conditions, and, therefore, would have **No Effect** on the Miller Farm / Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436). The potential effects of the four build alternatives are considered below in **Table 3** and shown in **Figure 7**.

<b>TABLE 3</b>				
<b>Results of Effect Evaluation for the Miller Farm / Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436)</b>				
Definition of Effect	Evaluation			
	Alternative DU Modified	Alternative DU Shift Modified	Alternative E Modified	Alternative E Shift Modified
An effect may occur when the undertaking results in alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the National Register as defined in §800.16(i).	At this location, the LODs for <b>Alternatives DU Modified, DU Shift Modified, E Modified, and E Shift Modified</b> overlap and share one common alignment. The eastern boundary of the Miller Farm terminates at the edge of Old US 219, the Mason Dixon Highway, which was abandoned ca. 1998 with the construction of the US 219 Meyersdale Bypass. As part of this project, the Mason Dixon Highway would be re-established along its original alignment at the eastern edge of the property ( <b>Photographs 5 and 6</b> ). The reintroduction of the former roadway would require construction activities, including the acquisition of temporary construction easements and permanent right-of-way from within the property's NRHP boundary.			
<b>FINDING BY ALTERNATIVE:</b>				
<b>No Build Alternative</b>	No Effect			
<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>	An Effect			
<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>	An Effect			
<b>Alternative E Modified</b>	An Effect			
<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>	An Effect			
<b>FINDING FOR RESOURCE:</b>	It is recommended that the proposed project would have <b>An Effect</b> on the NRHP-eligible Miller Farm / Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436). Pursuant to 36 CFR §800.5 and §800.11(e), the Criteria of Adverse Effect must be applied ( <b>Table 4</b> ).			

<b>TABLE 4</b>				
<b>Application of Criteria of Adverse Effect for the Miller Farm / Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436)</b>				
Examples of Adverse Effects, § 800.5(a)(2): Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:	Evaluation			
	Alternative DU Modified	Alternative DU Shift Modified	Alternative E Modified	Alternative E Shift Modified
(i) Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property;	At this location, the LODs for <b>Alternatives DU Modified, DU Shift Modified, E Modified, and E Shift Modified</b> overlap and share one common alignment. The re-establishment of the Mason Dixon Highway (Old US 219) along its former alignment at the eastern edge of the Miller Farm would temporarily introduce construction activities and would likely require the acquisition of permanent right-of-way from the property. However, the road that is being re-established has long been a neighboring element of the farm and part of its setting. It existed next to the farm in the historic era from the early 20 <sup>th</sup> century through much of the resource's period of significance. Its reconstruction would not adversely affect any of the Miller Farm's aspects that qualify it for listing in the NRHP			

<b>TABLE 4</b>				
<b>Application of Criteria of Adverse Effect for the Miller Farm / Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436)</b>				
<b>Examples of Adverse Effects, § 800.5(a)(2):</b> Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:	<b>Evaluation</b>			
	<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>	<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>	<b>Alternative E Modified</b>	<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>
(ii) Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the SOI Standards and applicable guidelines;	The re-establishment of the Mason Dixon Highway (Old US 219) along its former alignment at the eastern edge of the Miller Farm would not alter the property in a way that is not consistent with the SOI Standards.			
(iii) Removal of the property from its historic location;	The proposed project would not remove the Miller Farm from its historic location.			
(iv) Change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance;	The proposed project would not change the character of the Miller Farm's use or physical features that contribute to its setting			
(v) Introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features;	The reintroduction of the re-established Mason Dixon Highway would return visual, atmospheric, and audible elements that have long been part of the setting of the Miller Farm during its period of significance.			
(vi) Neglect of a property which causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to a Native American tribe or Native Hawaiian organization; and	The reintroduction of the re-established Mason Dixon Highway would not cause the neglect and/or deterioration of the eligible Miller Farm property.			
(vii) Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of Federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restriction or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property's historic significance.	The eligible Miller Farm is a privately owned property.			
<b>FINDING BY ALTERNATIVE:</b>				
<b>No Build Alternative</b>	<b>No Effect</b>			
<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>	<b>No Adverse Effect</b>			
<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>	<b>No Adverse Effect</b>			
<b>Alternative E Modified</b>	<b>No Adverse Effect</b>			
<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>	<b>No Adverse Effect</b>			



**4.3.3 Lowry Farm (2004RE00605)**

The No Build Alternative makes no changes to current conditions, and, therefore, would have **No Effect** on the Lowry Farm (2004RE00605). The potential effects of the four build alternatives are considered below in **Table 5** and shown in **Figures 8** and **9**.

<b>TABLE 5</b>				
<b>Results of Effect Evaluation for the Lowry Farm (2004RE00605)</b>				
Definition of Effect	Evaluation			
	Alternative DU Modified	Alternative DU Shift Modified	Alternative E Modified	Alternative E Shift Modified
An effect may occur when the undertaking results in alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the National Register as defined in §800.16(i).	The paired <b>Alternatives DU Modified</b> and <b>DU Shift Modified</b> cross the property associated with the Lowry Farm in two separate places (see <b>Figure 9</b> ). To the south, the full corridor crosses through farm property that includes both wooded and cleared areas. To the southeast, the project runs through a wooded area. The paired alternatives would have an effect on the historic farm.		The paired <b>Alternatives E Modified</b> and <b>E Shift Modified</b> are located approximately 1,921 feet to the southeast of the farm’s NRHP boundary at their closest point. The paired alternatives would not alter any of the characteristics of the historic farm that make it eligible for listing in the NRHP.	
<b>FINDING BY ALTERNATIVE:</b>				
<b>No Build Alternative</b>	No Effect			
<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>	An Effect			
<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>	An Effect			
<b>Alternative E Modified</b>	No Effect			
<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>	No Effect			
<b>FINDING FOR RESOURCE:</b>	It is recommended that the proposed project may have <b>An Effect</b> on the NRHP-eligible Lowry Farm (2004RE00605). Pursuant to 36 CFR §800.5 and §800.11(e), the Criteria of Adverse Effect must be applied ( <b>Table 6</b> ).			

<b>TABLE 6</b>				
<b>Application of Criteria of Adverse Effect for the Lowry Farm (2004RE00605)</b>				
Examples of Adverse Effects, § 800.5(a)(2): Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:	Evaluation			
	Alternative DU Modified	Alternative DU Shift Modified	Alternative E Modified	Alternative E Shift Modified
(i) Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property;	The paired <b>Alternatives DU Modified</b> and <b>DU Shift Modified</b> cross the Lowry Farm property in two separate places. To the south, the full corridor crosses through farm property that includes both wooded and		N/A	

<b>TABLE 6</b>				
<b>Application of Criteria of Adverse Effect for the Lowry Farm (2004RE00605)</b>				
<b>Examples of Adverse Effects, § 800.5(a)(2):</b> Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:	<b>Evaluation</b>			
	<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>	<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>	<b>Alternative E Modified</b>	<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>
	cleared areas. To the southeast, the project runs through a wooded area. The proposed project impacts would include the construction of the full width of the new US 219 corridor, as well as associated grading activities. The alternatives' LODs officially anticipate 23.4 acres of direct impacts to the farm, but since constructing either the DU Modified or the DU Shift Modified alternative will also separate the small area of fields and woodland at the far south of the property from the rest of the farm, the impacts should be rounded up to approximately 24.4 acres. The eligible Lowry Farm covers 177 acres, so the impacts would affect about 14% of the farm's property.			
(ii) Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the SOI Standards and applicable guidelines;	These alternatives would alter the property in a manner that is not consistent with SOI standards by removing fields and woodlands associated with the eligible farm and replacing them with a limited access highway.		N/A	
(iii) Removal of the property from its historic location;	These alternatives would not remove the property from its historic location		N/A	
(iv) Change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance;	These alternatives would change the character of fields and woodlands associated with the eligible farm by replacing them with a limited access highway.		N/A	
(v) Introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features;	These alternatives would introduce visual, atmospheric, and/or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the		N/A	

TABLE 6 Application of Criteria of Adverse Effect for the Lowry Farm (2004RE00605)				
Examples of Adverse Effects, § 800.5(a)(2): Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:	Evaluation			
	Alternative DU Modified	Alternative DU Shift Modified	Alternative E Modified	Alternative E Shift Modified
	property's significant features. The construction of the DU Modified or DU Shift Modified alternative would introduce a limited access highway with car and truck traffic where formerly there were fields and woodlands in a rural setting.			
(vi) Neglect of a property which causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to a Native American tribe or Native Hawaiian organization; and	The construction of these alternatives has the potential to cause the neglect and deterioration of about one acre of land at the southern point of the eligible farm which would be separated from the rest of the property by the highway.		N/A	
(vii) Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of Federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restriction or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property's historic significance.	The eligible Lowry Farm is privately owned.		N/A	
<b>FINDING BY ALTERNATIVE:</b>				
<b>No Build Alternative</b>	<b>No Effect</b>			
<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>	<b>Adverse Effect</b>			
<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>	<b>Adverse Effect</b>			
<b>Alternative E Modified</b>	<b>No Effect</b>			
<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>	<b>No Effect</b>			

#### 4.3.4 Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606)

The No Build Alternative makes no changes to current conditions, and, therefore, would have **No Effect** on the Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606). The potential effects of the four build alternatives are considered below in **Table 7** and shown in **Figures 10** through **12**.

TABLE 7 Results of Effect Evaluation for the Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606)				
Definition of Effect	Evaluation			
	Alternative DU Modified	Alternative DU Shift Modified	Alternative E Modified	Alternative E Shift Modified
An effect may occur when the undertaking results in alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the National Register as defined in §800.16(i).	The paired <b>Alternatives DU Modified</b> and <b>DU Shift Modified</b> cross the property associated with the Deal Farm. At the north end of the property, the full corridor crosses through a densely wooded area (see <b>Figure 11</b> ). The paired alternatives would have an effect on the historic farm.		The paired <b>Alternatives E Modified</b> and <b>E Shift Modified</b> do not propose any direct impacts to the Deal Farm. The LODs of the paired alternatives are separated from the farm property by heavily wooded areas that provide a visual, audible, and atmospheric buffer that measures a minimum of 98 feet wide (see <b>Figure 12</b> ). At their closest point, the paired alternatives are located approximately 2,961 feet to the east of the farmstead and the primary views from the historic farm. The paired alternatives would not alter any of the characteristics of the historic farm that make it eligible for listing in the NRHP.	
<b>FINDING BY ALTERNATIVE:</b>				
<b>No Build Alternative</b>	No Effect			
<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>	An Effect			
<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>	An Effect			
<b>Alternative E Modified</b>	No Effect			
<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>	No Effect			
<b>FINDING FOR RESOURCE:</b>	It is recommended that the proposed project may have <b>An Effect</b> on the NRHP-eligible Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606). Pursuant to 36 CFR §800.5 and §800.11(e), the Criteria of Adverse Effect must be applied ( <b>Table 8</b> ).			

TABLE 8 Application of Criteria of Adverse Effect for the Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606)				
Examples of Adverse Effects, § 800.5(a)(2): Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:	Evaluation			
	Alternative DU Modified	Alternative DU Shift Modified	Alternative E Modified	Alternative E Shift Modified
(i) Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property;	The paired <b>Alternatives DU Modified</b> and <b>DU Shift Modified</b> cross the property associated with the Deal Farm. At the north end of the property, the full		N/A	

<p align="center"><b>TABLE 8</b>  <b>Application of Criteria of Adverse Effect for the Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm</b>  <b>(2004RE00606)</b></p>				
<p><b>Examples of Adverse Effects, § 800.5(a)(2):</b> Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:</p>	<p align="center"><b>Evaluation</b></p>			
	<p align="center"><b>Alternative DU Modified</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Alternative E Modified</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b></p>
	<p>corridor crosses through a densely wooded area of the eligible Deal Farm. The impacts would include the construction of the full width of the new US 219 corridor as well as associated grading activities. The alternatives' LODs officially anticipate 16.2 acres of direct impacts to the farm, but since constructing either the DU Modified or the DU Shift Modified alternative would also separate the small area of woodland at the far north of the property from the rest of the farm, the impacts should be rounded up to approximately 18.4 acres. The eligible Deal Farm covers 127 acres, so the impacts would affect 14.5% of the farm's property.</p>			
<p>(ii) Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the SOI Standards and applicable guidelines;</p>	<p>These alternatives would alter the property in a manner that is not consistent with SOI standards by removing woodlands associated with the eligible farm and replacing them with a limited access highway.</p>		<p>N/A</p>	
<p>(iii) Removal of the property from its historic location;</p>	<p>These alternatives would not remove the property from its historic location</p>		<p>N/A</p>	
<p>(iv) Change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance;</p>	<p>These alternatives would change the character of the woodlands associated with the eligible farm by replacing them with a limited access highway.</p>		<p>N/A</p>	
<p>(v) Introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the</p>	<p>These alternatives would introduce visual, atmospheric, and/or audible elements that</p>		<p>N/A</p>	

<b>TABLE 8</b> <b>Application of Criteria of Adverse Effect for the Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606)</b>				
<b>Examples of Adverse Effects, § 800.5(a)(2):</b> Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:	<b>Evaluation</b>			
	<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>	<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>	<b>Alternative E Modified</b>	<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>
property's significant historic features;	diminish the integrity of the property's significant features. The construction of the DU Modified or DU Shift Modified alternative would introduce a limited access highway with car and truck traffic where formerly there were woodlands in a rural setting.			
(vi) Neglect of a property which causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to a Native American tribe or Native Hawaiian organization; and	The construction of these alternatives has the potential to cause the neglect and deterioration of about 2.2 acres of land at the northern tip of the eligible farm which would be separated from the rest of the property by the highway.		N/A	
(vii) Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of Federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restriction or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property's historic significance.	The eligible Deal Farm is privately owned.		N/A	
<b>FINDING BY ALTERNATIVE:</b>				
<b>No Build Alternative</b>		<b>No Effect</b>		
<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>		<b>Adverse Effect</b>		
<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>		<b>Adverse Effect</b>		
<b>Alternative E Modified</b>		<b>No Effect</b>		
<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>		<b>No Effect</b>		

### 4.3.5 Jacob Glotfelty Barn (1995RE41407)

The No Build Alternative makes no changes to current conditions, and, therefore, would have **No Effect** on the Jacob Glotfelty Barn (1995RE41407). The potential effects of the four build alternatives are considered below in **Table 9** and shown in **Figure 13**.



Definition of Effect	Evaluation			
	Alternative DU Modified	Alternative DU Shift Modified	Alternative E Modified	Alternative E Shift Modified
An effect may occur when the undertaking results in alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the National Register as defined in §800.16(i).	The paired <b>Alternatives DU Modified</b> and <b>DU Shift Modified</b> are located approximately 1,772 feet to the north of the barn’s NRHP boundary at their closest point. The paired alternatives would not alter any of the characteristics of the historic barn that make it eligible for listing in the NRHP.		The paired <b>Alternatives E Modified</b> and <b>E Shift Modified</b> are located approximately 2,334 feet to the southeast of the barn’s NRHP boundary at their closest point. The paired alternatives would not alter any of the characteristics of the historic barn that make it eligible for listing in the NRHP.	
<b>FINDING BY ALTERNATIVE:</b>				
<b>No Build Alternative</b>	No Effect			
<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>	No Effect			
<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>	No Effect			
<b>Alternative E Modified</b>	No Effect			
<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>	No Effect			
<b>FINDING FOR RESOURCE:</b>	It is recommended that the proposed project would have <b>No Effect</b> on the NRHP-eligible Jacob Glotfelty Barn.			



**4.4.1 Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191 (2006RE00149 and G-I-A-189)**

The No Build Alternative makes no changes to current conditions, and, therefore, would have **No Effect** on the Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191 (2006RE00149 and G-I-A-189). The potential effects of the four build alternatives are considered below in **Table 10** and shown in **Figures 14** and **15**.

<b>TABLE 10</b> <b>Results of Effect Evaluation for the</b> <b>Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191 (2006RE00149 and G-I-A-189)</b>				
Definition of Effect	Evaluation			
	Alternative DU Modified	Alternative DU Shift Modified	Alternative E Modified	Alternative E Shift Modified
An effect may occur when the undertaking results in alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the National Register as defined in §800.16(i).	<p><b>Alternatives DU Modified and DU Shift Modified</b> are identical in the area of Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191. The proposed roadway would pass to the northwest of the marker, while a proposed stormwater basin would be located approximately 125 feet to the southwest of the marker. The eastern edge of the DU Alternatives would be approximately 125 feet from the marker at its closest point, and the proposed roadway would be at least 230 feet from the marker.</p> <p>These alternatives would introduce audiovisual effects to the marker's broader setting, but they would not affect its significant characteristics.</p>		<p><b>Alternatives E Modified and E Shift Modified</b> are identical in the area of Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191. The proposed roadway would pass to the northwest of the marker, while a proposed stormwater basin would be located approximately 125 feet to the southwest of the marker. The southern edge of both E Alternatives would be approximately 26 feet from the marker (one foot outside its 50-foot diameter NRHP boundary) at its closest point.</p> <p>The proximity of these alternatives to the marker would affect the setting of the marker but would not directly affect the property.</p>	
<b>FINDING BY ALTERNATIVE:</b>				
<b>No Build Alternative</b>	No Effect			
<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>	No Effect			
<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>	No Effect			
<b>Alternative E Modified</b>	An Effect			
<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>	An Effect			
<b>FINDING FOR RESOURCE:</b>	It is recommended that the proposed project may have <b>An Effect</b> on the NRHP-eligible Mason-Dixon Line Marker. Pursuant to 36 CFR §800.5 and §800.11(e), the Criteria of Adverse Effect must be applied ( <b>Table 11</b> ).			

<b>TABLE 11</b> <b>Application of Criteria of Adverse Effect for the Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191</b> <b>(2006RE00149 and G-I-A-189)</b>				
Examples of Adverse Effects, § 800.5(a)(2): Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:	Evaluation			
	Alternative DU Modified	Alternative DU Shift Modified	Alternative E Modified	Alternative E Shift Modified
(i) Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property;	N/A		Neither <b>Alternative E Modified</b> nor <b>E Shift Modified</b> , which are identical in this area of the project,	

<p align="center"><b>TABLE 11</b>  <b>Application of Criteria of Adverse Effect for the Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191</b>  <b>(2006RE00149 and G-I-A-189)</b></p>				
<p><b>Examples of Adverse Effects, § 800.5(a)(2):</b> Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:</p>	<p align="center"><b>Evaluation</b></p>			
	<p align="center"><b>Alternative DU Modified</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Alternative E Modified</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b></p>
			<p>would physically affect the Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191 or the area within its 50-foot diameter NRHP boundary.</p>	
<p>(ii) Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the SOI Standards and applicable guidelines;</p>	N/A		<p>Neither alternative would involve alteration of the marker that is not consistent with the SOI Standards.</p>	
<p>(iii) Removal of the property from its historic location;</p>	N/A		<p>The proposed project would not remove the Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191 from its historic location.</p>	
<p>(iv) Change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance;</p>	N/A		<p>Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191 was placed in 1902 to designate the Mason-Dixon Line, and it still serves that purpose. <b>Alternatives E Modified</b> and <b>E Shift Modified</b> would result in physical changes to the larger setting of the marker. The southern LOD of these alternatives would come within approximately one foot of the marker's NRHP boundary, affecting the setting. The setting does not contribute to the property's significance. The marker itself and its specific location are the significant features of the property. Alteration to the setting would not result in changes to the character of the property's use or physical features, which consist of the stone and its specific location marking the border between the states.</p>	

**TABLE 11**  
**Application of Criteria of Adverse Effect for the Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191**  
**(2006RE00149 and G-I-A-189)**

Examples of Adverse Effects, § 800.5(a)(2): Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:	Evaluation			
	Alternative DU Modified	Alternative DU Shift Modified	Alternative E Modified	Alternative E Shift Modified
(v) Introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features;	N/A		<b>Alternatives E Modified and E Shift Modified</b> would introduce visual, atmospheric, or audible elements to the marker's setting; however, these would not diminish the integrity of the marker's significant features. The larger setting may reflect the rural and remote environment that was present when the original Mason-Dixon line was established in 1767, as well as when the line was re-surveyed in 1902; however, the marker was not placed in this location because of its setting, rather it was placed to mark a specific, surveyed location.	
(vi) Neglect of a property which causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to a Native American tribe or Native Hawaiian organization; and	N/A		The proposed project would not cause the Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191 to be neglected.	
(vii) Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of Federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restriction or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property's historic significance.	N/A		The marker is not Federally owned. The proposed project would not cause the marker to be transferred, leased, or sold.	
<b>FINDING BY ALTERNATIVE:</b>				
<b>No Build Alternative</b>	<b>No Effect</b>			
<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>	<b>No Effect</b>			
<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>	<b>No Effect</b>			
<b>Alternative E Modified</b>	<b>No Adverse Effect</b>			
<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>	<b>No Adverse Effect</b>			

## 4.5 Application of the Definition of Effect and Criteria of Adverse Effect for Resources in Maryland

### 4.5.1 Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (G-I-A-012)

The No Build Alternative makes no changes to current conditions, and, therefore, would have **No Effect** on the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (G-I-A-012). The potential effects of the four build alternatives are considered below in **Table 12** and shown in **Figures 16** and **17**. Please note that a shift in the alternatives at this part of the project has changed the order of the listing of alternatives in the table to reflect that Alternatives DU Modified and E Modified and Alternatives DU Shift Modified and E Shift Modified are paired here.

<b>TABLE 12</b>				
<b>Results of Effect Evaluation for the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (G-I-A-012)</b>				
Definition of Effect	Evaluation			
	Alternative DU Modified	Alternative E Modified	Alternative DU Shift Modified	Alternative E Shift Modified
<p>An effect may occur when the undertaking results in alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the National Register as defined in §800.16(i).</p>	<p>The paired <b>Alternatives DU Modified</b> and <b>E Modified</b> would run parallel with the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows NRHP boundary for approximately half a mile before turning west towards Chestnut Ridge Road at the south end of the project area. These alternatives would include two stormwater management (SWM) basins (approximately 6.9 and 1.8 acres respectively) located between the roadway and the NRHP boundary. The eastern edge of these alternatives would range from approximately 25 feet from the NRHP boundary at its closest point to approximately 530 feet from the NRHP boundary at its farthest point. The alternatives would have audiovisual effects on the larger setting of the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows; however, new construction would start approximately 2,000 feet north of the buildings, and both the buildings and natural meadow would be visually shielded from</p>	<p>The paired <b>Alternatives DU Shift Modified</b> and <b>E Shift Modified</b> would run parallel with the northwestern side of the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows NRHP boundary. An approximately 4.5-acre SWM basin would be located between the southern end of the roadway and the listed resource's boundary, and two smaller SWM basins would be located on the opposite side of the roadway away from the boundary. The eastern edge of these shift alternatives would range from approximately 25 feet from the NRHP boundary at its closest point to approximately 200 feet from the boundary at its farthest point. The alternatives would have audiovisual effects on the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows; however, new construction would start approximately 2,000 feet north of the buildings, and both the buildings and natural meadow would be visually shielded from</p>		

	the road by Chestnut Ridge. The setting of the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows property contributes to its historic character, and the construction of a new roadway along the west side of the NRHP boundary would have an effect on the historic property.	the road by Chestnut Ridge. The setting of the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows property contributes to its historic character, and the construction of a new roadway along the west side of the NRHP boundary would have an effect on the historic property.
<b>FINDING BY ALTERNATIVE:</b>		
<b>No Build Alternative</b>	No Effect	
<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>	An Effect	
<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>	An Effect	
<b>Alternative E Modified</b>	An Effect	
<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>	An Effect	
<b>FINDING FOR RESOURCE:</b>	It is recommended that the proposed project would have <b>An Effect</b> on the NRHP-listed Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows property. Pursuant to 36 CFR §800.5 and §800.11(e), the Criteria of Adverse Effect must be applied ( <b>Table 13</b> ).	

<b>TABLE 13</b>				
<b>Application of Criteria of Adverse Effect for the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (G-I-A-012)</b>				
<b>Examples of Adverse Effects, § 800.5(a)(2):</b> Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:	<b>Evaluation</b>			
	<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>	<b>Alternative E Modified</b>	<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>	<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>
(i) Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property;	<b>Alternatives DU Modified and E Modified</b> are paired in this location. Alternatives DU Modified and E Modified would not physically affect the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows. In the area of the listed resource, the alternatives remain outside the property's NRHP boundary.		<b>Alternatives DU Shift Modified and E Shift Modified</b> are paired in this location. Alternatives DU Shift Modified and E Shift Modified would not physically affect the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows. In the area of the listed resource, the alternatives remain outside the property's NRHP boundary.	
(ii) Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the SOI Standards and applicable guidelines;	The paired alternatives would not result in the alteration of the property or its buildings. All construction would take place outside of the NRHP boundary.		The paired alternatives would not result in the alteration of the property or its buildings. All construction would take place outside of the NRHP boundary.	
(iii) Removal of the property from its historic location;	Buildings or features on the property would not be removed from their historic locations.		Buildings or features on the property would not be removed from their historic locations	



<b>TABLE 13</b> <b>Application of Criteria of Adverse Effect for the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (G-I-A-012)</b>				
<b>Examples of Adverse Effects, § 800.5(a)(2):</b> Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:	<b>Evaluation</b>			
	<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>	<b>Alternative E Modified</b>	<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>	<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>
(iv) Change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance;	Neither <b>Alternative DU Modified</b> nor <b>Alternative E Modified</b> would cause a change in the property's use. The alternatives would affect the property's setting but would not negatively affect the features that contribute to its historic significance.		Neither <b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b> nor <b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b> would cause a change in the property's use. The alternatives would affect the property's setting but would not negatively affect the features that contribute to its historic significance.	
(v) Introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features;	<p>The setting of the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows property was affected by the construction of the existing portion of US 219 in 2016. Transportation improvements from an earlier project included the construction of a highway interchange in the southwest corner of the property's NRHP boundary.</p> <p>The paired <b>DU Modified</b> and <b>E Modified</b> alternatives under consideration would introduce visual, atmospheric, and audible elements to the property's setting similar to those resulting from the previous transportation improvements. These effects would not, however, diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features; the natural meadow would not be affected, and audiovisual effects on the buildings would be minimized by the project's location behind Chestnut Ridge.</p>		<p>The setting of the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows property was affected by the construction of the existing portion of US 219 in 2016. Transportation improvements from an earlier project included the construction of a highway interchange in the southwest corner of the property's NRHP boundary.</p> <p>The paired <b>DU Shift Modified</b> and <b>E Shift Modified</b> alternatives under consideration would introduce visual, atmospheric, and audible elements to the property's setting similar to those resulting from the previous transportation improvements. These effects would not, however, diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features; the natural meadow would not be affected, and audiovisual effects on the buildings would be minimized by the project's location behind Chestnut Ridge.</p>	
(vi) Neglect of a property which causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized	The proposed alternatives would not cause the neglect of the property.		The proposed alternatives would not cause the neglect of the property.	

TABLE 13 Application of Criteria of Adverse Effect for the Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (G-I-A-012)				
Examples of Adverse Effects, § 800.5(a)(2): Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:	Evaluation			
	Alternative DU Modified	Alternative E Modified	Alternative DU Shift Modified	Alternative E Shift Modified
qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to a Native American tribe or Native Hawaiian organization; and				
(vii) Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of Federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restriction or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property's historic significance.	The proposed project would not cause the listed property to be transferred, leased, or sold.		The proposed project would not cause the listed property to be transferred, leased, or sold.	
<b>FINDING BY ALTERNATIVE:</b>				
<b>No Build Alternative</b>	<b>No Effect</b>			
<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>	<b>No Adverse Effect</b>			
<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>	<b>No Adverse Effect</b>			
<b>Alternative E Modified</b>	<b>No Adverse Effect</b>			
<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>	<b>No Adverse Effect</b>			

#### 4.5.2 National Road (G-I-A-227)

The No Build Alternative makes no changes to current conditions, and, therefore, would have **No Effect** on the National Road (G-I-A-227). The potential effects of the four build alternatives are considered below in **Table 14** and shown in **Figures 18** and **19**.

TABLE 14 Results of Effect Evaluation for the National Road (G-I-A-227)				
Definition of Effect	Evaluation			
	Alternative DU Modified	Alternative DU Shift Modified	Alternative E Modified	Alternative E Shift Modified
An effect may occur when the undertaking results in alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the National Register as defined in §800.16(i).				

<b>FINDING BY ALTERNATIVE:</b>	
<b>No Build Alternative</b>	No Effect
<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>	No Effect
<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>	No Effect
<b>Alternative E Modified</b>	No Effect
<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>	No Effect
<b>FINDING FOR RESOURCE:</b>	It is recommended that the proposed project would have <b>No Effect</b> on the NRHP-eligible National Road.

## 4.6 Summary of Efforts to Avoid and/or Minimize Effects to Historic Properties

The four alternatives considered in this evaluation—Alternative DU Modified, Alternative DU Shift Modified, Alternative E Modified, and Alternative E Shift Modified—are the culmination of many years of planning and refinement. They have been informed by wide-ranging studies that included consideration of potential impacts to cultural resources. After having systematically dismissed or significantly altered more than a dozen earlier alignments, these four alternatives were created by refining earlier alternatives in January 2024 in order to avoid or further minimize impacts to historic properties.

All four alternatives were adjusted to reduce potential impacts to the NRHP-eligible Miller Farm. The LODs of the E Modified and E Shift Modified alternatives along the west side of the Piney Creek Bridge were reduced to avoid any direct impacts to the eligible Deal Farm.

For the NRHP-eligible Mason-Dixon Line Marker, which was located near the centerline of the previous E and E Shift alternatives, the design of all four alternatives was modified to shift the alignment westward away from the marker between 10 ft and 60 ft. The width of the median was narrowed to a minimum of 44 ft near the marker, and the LODs were reduced to ensure that the alternatives would avoid any direct impacts to the Mason-Dixon Line Marker.

Modifications were also made to all of the alternatives to avoid direct impacts to the NRHP-listed Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows property. For all four alternatives, this included moving the existing US 219 tie-in location to the north by 650 ft; shifting the horizontal alignment of the alternatives 60 ft to the west; and reducing the LODs. For paired alternatives DU Shift Modified and E Shift Modified, these modifications also included a reduction of the median width of 44 ft and 36 ft in straight sections where practical.

## 5.0 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The No Build Alternative will have **No Effect** on historic properties. Both the DU Modified and DU Shift Modified Alternatives will have an **Adverse Effect** on both the NRHP-eligible Lowry Farm and the NRHP-eligible Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm. Both the E Modified and E Shift Modified Alternatives will have **No Adverse Effect** on historic properties. Alternative E Modified and Alternative E Shift modified are the only alternatives that meet the Project Purpose and Need and do not adversely impact above ground historic properties. The results of this effects evaluation are summarized below in **Table 15**.

**Table 15. Summary of Effects to Above Ground Historic Properties**

Historic Resource	Alternative DU Modified	Alternative DU Shift Modified	Alternative E Modified	Alternative E Shift Modified
S.J. Miller School (2023RE07648)	No Effect	No Effect	No Effect	No Effect
Miller Farm / Earnest and Carrie V. Miller Residence (1994RE00436)	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect
Lowry Farm (2004RE00605)	Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect	No Effect	No Effect
Deal Farm / Ambrose Deal Farm (2004RE00606)	Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect	No Effect	No Effect
Jacob Glotfelty Barn (1995RE41407)	No Effect	No Effect	No Effect	No Effect
Mason-Dixon Line Marker No. 191 (2006RE00149 and G-I-A-189)	No Effect	No Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect
Tomlinson Inn and Little Meadows (G-I-A-012)	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect
National Road (G-I-A-227)	No Effect	No Effect	No Effect	No Effect
	<b>Alternative DU Modified</b>	<b>Alternative DU Shift Modified</b>	<b>Alternative E Modified</b>	<b>Alternative E Shift Modified</b>
<b>Summary of Effects to Above Ground Historic Properties</b>	Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect

At this point in the project, a Preferred Alternative has not yet been chosen. Section 106 consultation will continue in order to support the identification of a Preferred Alternative and to understand what that alternative’s potential to affect above ground historic properties might be.

## 6.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY

### ESRI

2023 World Imagery Aerial Imagery of Somerset County, Pennsylvania and Garrett County, Maryland. Website at [http://goto.arcgisonline.com/maps/World\\_Imagery](http://goto.arcgisonline.com/maps/World_Imagery). Accessed June 1, 2023.

### Google Earth

2023 Aerial and street view imagery of Somerset County. Website at <https://earth.google.com/web/>. Accessed May 18, 2023.

### Parker, Margaret *et al.*

2023 Above Ground Historic Properties Maryland Determination of Eligibility Report, US 6219, Section 050 Transportation Improvement Project Meyersdale, PA to Old Salisbury Road, MD. Prepared for the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation District 9-0 by NTM Engineering, Inc. On file, PATH <https://path.penndot.gov/OpenAttachment.aspx?ECSSGUID=76C01E91-8C5E-40FF-80C6-753EC77A7D31>. Accessed January 3, 2024.

### Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office (PA SHPO)

2023 Letter Re: ER Project # 2021PR06554.016, US 219 Meyersdale to Old Salisbury Rd PEL, Federal Highway Administration, Elk Lick Township, Somerset County. Website at <https://path.penndot.gov/OpenAttachment.aspx?ECSSGUID=6A32E438-EE77-C386-AF64-8BD3D9C00000>. Accessed February 5, 2024.

### Ricketts, Laura *et al.*

2023 Above Ground Historic Properties Pennsylvania Determination of Eligibility Report, US 6219, Section 050 Transportation Improvement Project Meyersdale, PA to Old Salisbury Road, MD. Prepared for the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation District 9-0 by The Markosky Engineering Group, Inc. On file, PATH <https://path.penndot.gov/OpenAttachment.aspx?ECSSGUID=76C01E91-8C5E-40FF-80C6-753EC77A7D31>. Accessed January 3, 2024.

### United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)

1939 Aerial photograph somerset\_052439\_apz\_77\_5. Flight date May 24, 1939. Agricultural Adjustment Administration Northeast Division.

1958a Aerial photograph somerset\_052758\_apz\_7v\_41. Flight date May 27, 1958. Commodity Stabilization Service.

1958b Aerial photograph somerset\_052758\_apz\_7v\_48. Flight date May 27, 1958. Commodity Stabilization Service.

United State Geological Survey (USGS)

2023a Avilton, Maryland-Pennsylvania topographic map, 7.5-minute quadrangle. United States Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.

2023b Meyersdale, Pennsylvania topographic map, 7.5-minute quadrangle. United States Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.