Federal Highway Administration Region III

Interstate Route 70
East of Ijamsville Road
To West of Monocacy River
Frederick County

## ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

State of Maryland
Department of Transportation State Highway Administration
pursuant
to
42
U.S.C. 4332(s)
(C),

23 U.S.C.
128 (a)

Bernard M. Evans
State Highway Administrator


Pate
by:


Robert J. Hajeyk, Director Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering

List of Figures ..... v
List of Tables ..... vii
Summary ..... 1
I.. Description of Proposed Action: Purpose, Existing Roadway, and Proposed Alternatives ..... 8
A. Project Purpose. ..... 8
B. Existing Roadway ..... 10

1. Description ..... 10
2. Traffic ..... 12
C. Proposed Alternatives ..... 14
3. Plan A. ..... 14
4. Plan B ..... 20
5. Plan B-1 ..... 24
6. "Do-Nothing" ..... 25
D. Historical Resume' of Project. ..... 25
II. Social, Economic, and Environmental Context of Project ..... 28
A. Social Characteristics of Project Area ..... 28
B. Economic Characteristics of Project Area ..... 30
7. Emp loyment ..... 30
8. Income ..... 33
C. Land Use Planning ..... 33
D. Natural Environmental Characteristics of Project Area. ..... 37
9. Meteorology ..... 37
10. Geology and Ground Water ..... 37
11. Soils ..... 41
12. Topogiaphy and Stream Drainage. ..... 41
13. Water Quality ..... 4.4
14. Aquatic Ecology ..... 46
15. Terrestrial Ecology ..... 49
16. Wetlands. ..... 50
E. Historical Sites ..... 52
F. Archaeological Sites ..... 52
III. Probable Impact of Proposed Alternatives ..... 54
A. Social and Economic Impact ..... 54
17. Relocation Study ..... 54
18. Summary of the Relocation Assistance Program. ..... 60
B. Natural Environmental Impact ..... 63
19. Geology and Ground Water ..... 63
20. Soils and Topography ..... 63
21. Water Quality ..... 67
22. Aquatic Ecology ..... 68
23. Terrestrial Ecology ..... 70
24. Wetlands ..... 71
25. Noise ..... 71
26. Ȧir Quality Analysis. ..... 76
C. Historical Impact. ..... 86
D. Archaeological Impact. ..... 86
IV. Discussion of Alternatives ..... 89
A. Physical Description ..... 89
B. Traffic and Accidents. ..... 89
C. Traffic Operation ..... 94.
D. Costs ..... 97.
E. Summary of Impacts ..... 98
27. Comparison Chart ..... 98
28. Advantages and Disadvantages ..... 99
F. Summary . ..... 100
V. Probable Adverse Environmental Effects Which Cannot Be Avoided ..... 103
A. Relocation. ..... 103
B. Aesthetics ..... 103
C. Air Quality. ..... 103
D. Noise ..... 103
E. Sedimentation. ..... 104
F. Construction ..... 104
VI. Steps Taken To Minimize Unavoidable Environmental Impacts ..... 105
A. Relocation ..... 105
B. Aesthetics ..... 106
C. Air Quality ..... 106
D. Noise ..... 106
E. Sedimentation. ..... 106
F. Construction ..... 107
VII. Relationship Between Local Short Term Uses of the Environment Versus Long Term Productivity ..... 109
VIII. Irreversible and Irretrievable Committments of Resources ..... 110
IX. Recommendation and Disposition of Problems ..... 111
A. Early coordination ..... 111
B. Comments on Draft Environmental Statement. ..... 111
C. Public Hearing ..... 112
D. State Highway Administration Final Evaluation and Decision ..... 114

## E. State Highway Administration responses <br> 115

Appendix ..... 135
Figure Page

1. Project Area Vicinity Map. ..... 9
2a. Typical Roadway Cross-sections ..... 11
2b. Typical Roadway Cross-sections ..... 15
2. Present and Projected ADT's ..... 13
4a. Plan A Horizontal Alignment ..... 16
4b. Plan A Vertical Alignment. ..... 17
5a. Plans $B$ and B-1 Horizontal Alignments ..... 21
5b. Plan $B$ and. B-1 Vertical Alignments ..... 22
3. Existing Land Use in Project Area ..... 29
4. Frederick County Election Districts (1959) ..... 31
5. Present Zoning in Project Area (1974). ..... 36
6. Geology of Project Area (large scale) ..... 39
7. Geology of Project Area ..... 40
8. Highly Erodable Soils in Project Area. ..... 42
9. Topographic Features in Project Area ..... 43
10. Fish Sampling Stations in Project Area (1974) ..... 48
11. Wetlands in Project Area ..... 51
12. Relationship of Plans $A, B$ and $B-1$ to Present Zoning ..... 55
13. Relationship of Plans $A, B$ and $B-1$ to Existing Land Use ..... 56
14. Relationship of Plans $A, B$ and $B-1$ to Geologic Formations ..... 64
15. Relationship of Plans $A, B$ and $B-1$ to Erodable Soils ..... 65
16. Relationship of Plans A, B and B-1 to Slopes Greater Than $25 \%$ ..... 66
17. Relationship of Plans A, B and B-1 to Wetlands ..... 72
18. Sound Sensitive Locations ..... 75
19. Mesoscale Burden Comparison. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 85
20. Present and Projected Traffic Data for Plan A. . . . . . . . . . . 90
21. Present and Projected Traffic Data for Plans B and B-1 . . . . . . 91
22. Present and Projected Traffic Data for "Do Nothing". . . . . . . . 92

## LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Occupational Characteristics of Frederick County. ..... 32
2. Frederick County Labor Force by Industry: 1960, 1990 ..... 34
3. Frederick County Labor Force and Employment Characteristics: 1970 ..... 35
4. Water Quality in Project Area
Linganore Creek and Monocacy River ..... 45
5. Criteria for Classification of Maryland Streams ..... 47
6. Design Noise Level/Land Use Relationships ..... 74
7. Ambient and Predicted Noise Levels Locations shown in Figure 21 ..... 77
8. Mesoscale Comparison of Alternates for 1974, 1980 and 2000 ..... 84.
9. Comparison of Alternates (air impact) ..... 87
10. Twenty Year Accident and Cost Estimates ..... 93
11. Relative Impacts of Plans A, B, B-1 and "Do-Nothing". ..... 102
(1) Administrative Action

Federal Highway Administration
() Draft
(X) Final
(X) Environmental Statement
() Combination Environmental Section 4 (f) Statement
(2) Additional information may be obtained from:
(a) Mr. Karla Snyder

District Engineer
Federal Highway Administration
The Rotunda - Suite 220
711 West 40th Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21211
Office Hours: 8:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M.
Telephone: (301) 962-4010
(b) Mr. Eugene T. Camponeschi, Chief

Bureau of Project Planning
State Highway Administration
300 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21203
Office Hours: 8:30 A.M. to 4:30 P.M.
Telephone: (301) 383-4327
(3) Description

The proposed improvement involves a 3.8 mile relocation of Interstate 70 (formerly designated $\mathrm{I}-70 \mathrm{~N}$ ) extending from Ijamsvilie Road to west of the Monocacy River in Frederick County, Maryland. The purpose of the project is to complete this section of a major interstate transportation system in Maryland. The proposal is to construct a limited access highway with two 36 foot roadways, two 10 foot shoulders, and a median. This typical section will be contained within a minimum 300 foot right-of-way.
(4) Sugary of Environmental Impacts

The construction of a highway of this magnitude will result in
both beneficial and adverse environmental effects. Negative social, economic, and natural ervironmental impacts may be expected for the reconstruction, relocation or even the "do-nothing" alternative. Environmental impacts have been compounded by related interchanges and service road facilities. A brief tabular environmental impact Summary is presented on the following page.

## (5) Summary of Alternatives

Four alternative design concepts were considered in this study. They are referred to as alternative Plan A, Plan B, Plan B-1 and "Do-Nothing." Based on the environmental analysis including public and governmental comments, Plan $B$ is the recommended alternative of the State Highway Administration. Plan A, Plan B-1 and the "do-Nothing" alternatives are not recommended.
(a) Plan A (not recommended)

This alternative involved upgrading existing U.S. Route 40 to meet interstate standards. The plan featured the construction of an additional 12 foot lane on both the east and west bound roadways of existing U.S. Route 40. Local service would have been provided by an interchange in the vicinty of Bell and Mains Lanes, and a system of service roads to the north of existing $U$. S. Route 40. A number of local roads in the vicinty of $U$. S. Route 40 would have been improved to meet county standards.
(b) Plan B (recommended)

This recommended alternative involves locating proposed I-70 north of existing U. S. Route 40. Two directional type interchanges are provided. One is constructed west of the Monocacy River and provides access for westbound local and return traffic

Relative Impacts of Plans $A, B, B-1$ and 'Do.Nothing •

Social

## Plan $A$

Relocation 2


10
0 -
$0 \quad 0$
$0 \quad 0$
0 • 0
100

Economic

| Businesises | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Property values | + | + | 1 |
| Agriculture | 1 | 1 | 0 |

Natural

| Air quality | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Noise | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| Water Quality | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Aquatic ecology | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Terrestrial ecology | 2 | 3 | 1 |

- Traffic

| Through traffic (overall) | + | + | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| National defense | + | + | 1 |
| Local accessibility | + | + | 0 |
| School bus safety | + | 1 | 2 |
| Energy consumption | + | + | 1 |

Notes: 1) Ranked in incrasing order of negative impact, hence "1" implics the least negative jmpact and " 3 " the most.
2) In case of similar impact the same rank applices to all.
3) A "+" indicates a positive impact.
to the freeway. A second interchange, located near Ijamsville Road, provides access for eastbound and return traffic.
(c) Plan b-1 (not recommended)

This alternative plan was a variation of Plan B, differing only in that it took advantage of a more favorable southern topegraph. doth Plans B and B-1 had a common beginning and end.

They coincided with each other until the crossing at Quinn Orchard Road. At this point, Plan B-1 turned southwest, and would have passed under Shul Lane approximately 1,000 feet south of proposed Plan B: From here, the alignment turned northwest and would have rejoined the proposed Plan B alignment after having crossed Long Branch Stream.
(d) "Do-Nothing" Alternative (not recommended)

This alternative proposed that U. S. Route 40 be maintained in its present form with normal safety improvements.
(6) Distribution of Draft Environmental Statement

Listed below are agencies that received copies of the Draft
Environmental Statement, circulated June 6, 1972:
FEDERAL

Mr. Theodore R. Rob Regional Administrator
Department of Housing and Urban Development
Curtis Building
Sixth and Walnut Streets
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106
Attention: Mr. William Kaplan Assistant Regional Administrator

Dr. T. C. Byerly
Office of the Secretary
Department of Agriculture
Washington, D. C. 20250

Mr. Roland B. Handle (7)*
Regional Director
U.S. Department of the Interior

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
Federal Building
1421 Cherry Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

Mr. John H. Gibson
Acting State Conservationist
Soil Conservation Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture

4321 Hartwick Road
College Park, Maryland 20740

Dr. Sidney R. Caller (3)*
Deputy Assistant
Secretary for Environmental Affairs
U.S. Department of Commerce

14th and Constitution Avenue Room 3876
Washington, D.C. 20230
Mr. Leonard O. Walker (2)*
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife
Patuxent Wildlife Research Center
Laurel, Maryland 20810
Mr. Bruce J. Miller
Assistant Director
Cooperative Program
National Park Service
U.S. Department of Interior

143 South Third Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106

Department of the Interior
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Programs
Washington, D.C. 20240
Mr. Charles Fabricant (5)*
Director of Impact Statements Office
Environmental Protection Agency
1626 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460
Mr. Arthur J. Reid, Jr. Director
Office of Economic Opportunity 1200 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Assistant Secretary for Health and Science Affairs
H.E.W. North Building

Washington, D.C. 20202

## STATE

Mr. Edwin L. Powell, Jr. (8)*
Chief, State Clearinghouse
Maryland Department of State Planning
301 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
Mr. Harry R. Hughes, Secretary
Department of Transportation
Post Office Box 8755
Friendship International Airport
Baltimore, Maryland 21240
Dr. Neil Solomon
Department of Health and Mental Hygiene
Environmental Health Administration
610 North Howard Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
()* number of copies sent

Mr. Charles B. Allen, Chairman.
Maryland State Aviation Commission
301 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Mr. Michael Ports
Surface Water Management
Department of Water Resources
State Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
Dr. James A. Sensenbaugh
Director
State Department of Education
301 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
Attention: Frederick County Board of Education

Mr. Orlando Ridout
Director
State Liaison Office for Marylanc
Maryland Historical Trust
Post Off:ice Box 1704
Annapolis, Maryland 21404
Mr. George R. Lewis
Secretary
Department of General Services
301 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
Mr. William A. Pate
Director
Division of Economic Development
State Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Mr. Frank Walsh
Executive Director
Maryland Office of Economic Opportunity
1100 North Eutaw Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Honorable James B. Coulter
Secretary
Department of Natural Resources
State Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21404
Colonel Robert J. Lally
Secretary
Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services
Suite 800
Executive Plaza 2
Hunt Valley, Maryland 21030

Honorable Charles H. Smelser
State Senator - Frederick County Route \# 2
Union Bridge, Maryland 21791

Honorabie Edward P. Thomas, Jr. State Senator - Frederick County 710 Wyngate Drive
Frederick, Maryland 21701
Honorable Julien P. Delphey Delegate - Frederick County 222 Carroll Parkway
Frederick, Maryland 21701
Honorable Wallace E. Hutton Delegate - Frederick County 7 East Church Street Frederick, Maryland 21701

Honorable C. Clifton Virts Delegate - Frederick County 5 West Church Street Frederick, Maryland 21701

Honorable John A. Derr
President
Board of County Commissioners
Frederick County
Winchester Hall
Frederick, Maryland 21701
Mr. William S. Fout
County Engineer
Winchester Hall
Frederick, Maryland 21701
Mr. Edward F. Holter, Chairman
Planning and Zoning Commission
Winchester Hall
Frederick, Maryland 21701
Mr. Lawrence W. Johnson
Planning Director
Winchester Hall
Frederick, Maryland 21701
Mr. James W. Freeman, Chairman
New Industry Committee
Chamber of Commerce of Frederick

## County

924 East Street
Frederick, Maryland 21701

Mr. George W. Barlett
Vice President for Engineering National Association of Broadcasters
1771 North Street, N. W. Washington, D. C. 20036
Attention: Maryland Representative
Seventy-two (72) copies of the Draft Environmental Statement were distributed. Comments on the Draft Environmental Statement and responses are included in Section IX.
(7)

Copies of the Draft Environmental Statement were mailed to the Council on Environmental Quality through the Federal. Highway Administration on June 6, 1972.

Mr. Richard Hammond Executive Vice President Chamber of Commerce of Frederick County Frederick, Maryland 21701

## I. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION

## A. Project Purpose

The following statement has been prepared in accordance with policies promulgated by the National Environment Policy Act of 1969. The Environmental considerations set forth are based on preliminary engineering studies designed to establish the final disposition of ${ }^{-}$ I-70 from Ijansville Road to west of the Monocacy River in Frederick County, Maryland. The exact study area has been delineated in Figure 1.

I-70 is a major transportation link of the Federal Highway System. The need and authorization for it is affirmed in the Federal Highway Act of 1956. This Act provides for construction of a safe, efficient national system of interstate and defense highways. The I-70 arterv is an important component because it connects the east coast of the United States with the Great Ohio Valley, and other points to the northwest and southwest.

In planning the new highway, the best way to accommodate the geometric standards provided by Federal regulations, policies and criteria outlined by the American Association of State Highway Officials, is to follow, generally, the Old National Pike Corridor.

Today, I-70 in Maryland, is in various stages of completion. The Baltimore City segment is in the location study stage and a draft E.I.S. on this segment was circulated in 1972. From the Baltimore City line west to Mckendee Road in Howard County, I-70 is open to traffic and complete with the exception of signing, fencing, and landscaping. Two lanes are open to traffic with construction underway from Mekendee
LR

Road to Woodville Road in Frederick County. The interstate is open and complete from Woodville Road to Ijamsvi:le Road, which is the eastern terminal of the subject project.

The subject of this statement is the final disposition of that part of I-70 from a point beginning 1,000 fret east of Ijamsville Road to a point terminating west of the Monscacy River near the Patrick Street overpass. The total project length is approximately 3.8 miles and will be Federally funded on a $90-10$ basis.

## B. Existing Roadway

## 1. Description

U.S. Route 40 design geometrics consist of 2-24 foot roadways separated by 50 feet of grass median. The outer portion has a 10 foot stabilized shoulder with 6 feet of additional grading to the ditch, and supporting slopes throughout. The right-of-way is variable with the minimum being 200 feet wide. Figure 2-A illustrates an existing typical road cross-section.

The present partial control of access with grade crossings and intersecting local roads is a major factor in the need for the proposed facility. Two rather steep ascending grades cresting between Bartonsville Road and Linganore Road contribute to an unsafe stopping distance condition where these two county roads intersect with U. S. Route 40.

Ancther steep grade ( $4.5 \%$ ) is encountered on the approach to the existing two lane bridge over the Monocacy River. This grade is acceptable, but can become a hazard during snow storms and freczing rain.


## 2. Traffic

U. S. Route 40, in its present state, provides a dual service to local and through traffic movements. It is the main direct link between residents of the Bartonsville neighborhood and the Central Business district of the City of Frederick. It functions as an alternative link for motorists desirous of avoiding the high density commercial ard residential sectors. A 1974 traffic study indicated an ADT (Average Daily Traffic Volume) of 28,400 vehicles per day on the Bartonsville section of U. S. Route 40. Future increases in local and through traffic volume will generate an estimated ADT of 62,300 by 1998. The distribution of the demand by specific dates is indicated in Figure 3. A certainty about this trend is that the existing U. S. Route 40 , with its current capacity of 42,600 cannot accommodate the anticipated increase in volume without resulting in operating speeds below 30 mph , increased travel delays, and increased potential for serious accidents, particularly at the numerous grade intersections along the present U. S. Route 40.

No projections of the traffic volume on the local service roads are available at this time. In their present state, these service roads appear to be adequate for the existing low density local activities. However, in view of the proposed development and present zoning in the areas, a significant increase in local traffic may be expected. This increase may be gradual and dependent on other future actions, but it will warrant improvement of the geonetric design of the present service roads.

The new interstate facility will provide for full control of access and be contained within a minimum 300 feet of right-of-way.


FIGURE 3

preseitt and projected TRAFFIC DATA FOR<br>"do-hothiss" alterinative OY<br>rraffic matinifg section<br>bureau of ureaid a:id regiotal liason marylarld state hghway administration

## C. Proposed Alternatives

Thorough investigation of the study area has identified for feesidle alignment possibilities. These alternates will hereinafter be referred to as Plan A, Plan B, Plan b-1 and the "Do-Nothing" alternative. Based on this study which includes public an 1 governmental comments, Plan $B$ is recommended.

All options have a common beginning and ending with appropriate interchanges, grade separations, service roads, etc. The design speed is 70 miles per hour. Typical proposed service road and ramp sections are shown in Figure 2-B.
-1. Plan A (not recommended)
The proposed Plan A alignment (herein-after referred to as Plan A), shown in Figures Aa and 4b, involved modifying existing U. S. Route 40 to meet interstate specifications. This plan would have been geometrically compatible with the current conversion of $U$. S. Route 40 to interstate standards now underway.

Maximum horizontal curvature, excluding interchange ramps, would not have exceeded one degree, 30 minutes. A maximum vertical grade of 4.5 percent, would have been encountered at the Monocacy River Bridge location. A proposed 50 foot grass median would have been utilized up to a narrowing transition at the Monocacy River Bridge. East of the river the construction of additional 12 foot lanes were proposed along the outer portion of the existing dual highway. West of the river, the median would have narrowed to 26 feet with two additional lanes built on the inside. Existing drainage structures would have been adjusted as necessary. The widened road section, the interchange criteria, and the approximately 5100




RTE. 144 \& RELIC. 144

service roads

feet of Long Branch Creek relocation would have required new right-ofway acquisitions. Grace Trinity Evangelical Reform Church and Maryland Route 144 would have been protected from encroachment by a retaining wall constructed south of Plan A and east of Bell Lane.

Under Plan A, an interchange adaptable to the proposed Frederick Beltway ( as shown in the Frederick County Master Plan) would have been placed between Mains and Bell Lanes. This facility would have been oriented to local service on the north by a new service road with connections into Frederick and on the south to existing Bartonsville Road.

The immediate concentration of traffic, and the anticipated accelerated development associated with suburban interchanges warrented complementary renovation of the various service roads described above.

With Plan A, local traffic would have crossed the Monocacy River and entered Frederick by crossing the present westbound bridge which would have been reverted to the proposed service road system. The existing U. S. Route 40 east-bound bridge would have been widened to meet interstate bridge criteria, and ultimately reversed to carry westbound I-70 traffic. A new bridge would have been constructed adjacent to and south of this original span for use as the new $1-70$ eastbound crossing.

Starting from the eastern terminus, the first grade crossing elimination for Plan A would have been the Ijamsville - Meadow Maryland Route lit road configuration. This would have been accomplashed by relocating Ijamsville and Meadow Road cast of their present location and connecting them by a bridge across plan A. The gradeline
of Maryland Route 144 would have been altered to meet the relocated Meadow Road at a common intersection. Maryland Route 144 and Ijamsville Road would have bcen barricaded at their present U. S. Route 40 at-grade crossings. Route 144 would have been extended and connected to the proposed extension of the Route 144 service road.

The relocated sections of Meadow Road and Ijamsville Road would have been constructed to standards equal to or exceeding Gounty specifications. In addition to the main section of $I-70, P 1 a n A$ would have included the physical improvenent of Bartonsville Road, Mains Lane, Bell Lane, Quian Orchard Road, and other service roads, to the extent indicated by Figure 4 a .

The Plan A, eastbound Monocacy River Bridge would have required approximately one-half mile of interstate roadway to be reconstructed west of the river. Some of the original roadway in this area could have been salvaged by transition methods.

West of the river, a portion of the former $U$. S. Route 40 westbound lane would have been incorporated into the new service road, and re-routed into Patrick Street. Quinn Orchard Road would have been barricaded.

Tulip Hill residents would have used an improved two-way overhead Patrick Strect Bridge to gain access to and from Frederick. This . widened structure would have allowed Tulip Hill residents access to. the interstate via the Reichs Ford Road intercharige. To supplement this I-70 (Plan A) - Tulip Hill - Frederick novement, a suggestion was made to provide a scrvice road running dircetly from Quinn Orchard Road to Reichs Ford Road.

## 2. Plan B (recommended alternative)

The Plan B alignment (herein-after referred to as Plan B), shown in Figures Sa and bb, proposes the construction of I-70 parallel and approximately one-half mile north of existing $U$. S. Route 40. A typical section is shown in Figure 2-A. The maximum horizontal curvature proposed for Plan B is 1 degree, 30 minutes. The maximum, Plan B vertical gradient is $3 \%$.

Plan B requires three stream crossings. by means of a $54^{\prime \prime}$ pipe about 1500 'feet east of Quinn Orchard Road; a bridge over Long Branch Creek located approximately 1200 feet east of Linganore Road, and a 54" pipe approximately 1000 feet west of the Monocacy River, respectively.

Plan B separates from U. S. Route 40; approximately 1,000 feet east of Ijamsville Road. The proposed 50 foot grass median begins to widen at this point to a maximum width of 74 feet. Ijamsville Road under Plan $B$ is extended at-grade across the existing eastbound lane of U. S. Route 40. Eastbound U. S. Route 40 merges with proposed eastbound Plan B east of this intersection. The existing U. S. Route 40 westbound lane is removed in the interchange area. Ijamsville Road underpasses Plan B and continues to a four-way intersection with the westbound I-70 (plan B) ramp and Meadow Road. This intersection will be ultimately regulated by a traffic control device as future traffic volumes increase. Under Plan B westbound ramp underpasses the interstate and merges with westbound U. S. Route 40 . Relocated Ijamsville Road passes under Plan E.

Under Plan B the existing intersection of Maryland Route 144 and Meadow Road are relocated approximately 500 feet to the north to

$$
\left[z \operatorname{lo}+\frac{1}{2}+\operatorname{Los}+1,=\right.
$$


allow local Frederick bound traffic to use U. S. Route 40 . No access to westbound $1-70$ is provided at this interchange under Plan B. Such access is provided by the interchange west of the Monocacy River.

Continuing northwest, Plan B spans a relocated Quinn Orchard Road. Existing Quinn Orchard Road is barricaded. Several homes in this area are provided access to the new Quinn Orchard Road location. From here Plan B assumes an approximate east-west orientation. Shull Lane. is shifted east from its present location and bridges Pian B. West of Shull Lane Plan B parallels Fouche Branch.

In the vicinity of Linganore Road, Plan B turns southwest and descends toward the Monocacy River. Under Plan B Linganore Road is barricaded at its present location and relocated in one of two ways. Linganore Road can be relocated approximately 200 feet east, or it can be relocated approximately 200 feet west and pass under the proposed Monocacy River bridge. The latter relocation would necessitate lengthening the bridge which would increase the cost. The relocation of Linganore Road will be determined during final design.

Plan B requires two new bridges over the Monocacy River. Bridge piers are proposed with sufficient height and length to span the entire flood plain. The proposed location of these structures is approximately 2,200 feet upstream from the existing U. S. Route 40 bridges.

A grade separation is proposed at a location approximately 1200 feet west of the river to maintain a farm road. Under plan $B$ this road is relocated to make it part of a four-lossed intersection which also includes Maryland Route 144 and U. S. Route 40. Another component of this configuration is the castom extension of Patrick

Street which will run parallel and south of Plan B. A new median opening on U. S. Route 40 is proposed at this junction. Traffic control devices will be installed at this intersection, at Patrick Street, and at Quinn Orchard Road as needed.

A directional, limited access, interchange is proposed at the intersection of Plan B and U. S. Route 40 near the Tulip Hill area. No local exit ramp is provided for westbound travelers on'Plan B. Such an exit is provided at the Ijamsville interchange. Eastbound Plan B traffic uses an exit to eastbound U. S. Route 40 which provides access to the Tulip Hill and Bartonsville areas.

Under Plan B the Patrick Street bridge is extended from the existing westbound lane of U.S. Route 40 over Plan A and is improved to accommodate two-way traffic. The roadway extends through Tulip Hill to the previously described four-legged intersection east of Quinn Orchard Road. The existing Patrick Street merging lane into eastbound U. S. Route 40 is removed. Quinn Orchard Road is barricaded at U. S. Route 40 and connected to the new Patrick Street extension.

Local and through U. S. Route 40 westbound travelers proceed over Plan on a merging ramp. This ramp provides access to Plan B and Frederick via a split directional ramp. Tulip Hill residents can use this ramp or the improved Patrick Street bridge to procecd to Frederick or I-70 (Plan B).
3. Plan 3-1 (not recommended)

This plan, as shown in Figure $5 a$, would have been a variation of Plan B. Both Plan $B$ and Plan B-1 aligments have common termini. . They are identical up to the intersection with Quinn Orchard Road. At this point, Plan B-1 would have turned southwest, and would have
passed under Shul1 Lane approximately 1,000 feet south of Plan B. From here, Plan B-l would have turned northwest and would have rejoined the Plan B alignment after having crossed Long Branch stream.
4. "Do-Nothing" (not reconmended)

In addition to Plans A, B and B-1, the alternative of doing nothing was considered. Substantial expenditures of public funds would have been required for surface maintenance and safety improvements made necessary by anticipated traffic increases. Projected traffic data indicated that a minimum six lanes of traffic would have been needed. Accidents of all degrees of severity would have been greater along the existing highway. In addition, overall economic and community development would have been adversely affected.
D. Historical Resume' of Project

By virtue of the 1955 Federal Highway Act, the U. S. Route 40 corridor was selected as a part of Maryland's Interstate Road System. The proposal was placed in the critical category in 1968 and authorized to begin preliminary engineering shortly thereafter. As the schematic plans evolved, they were supplemented by continuing consultation with public and official representatives of all concerned. The most important meetings are listed below, chronologically:

May 13, 1968 - Conference was held with Frederick County Commissioners, County Planners and Highway Engineers, at which time an interchange was proposed for the vicinity of Linganore-Bartonsville Road.
September 25. 1968 - Prescntation was made of preliminary engincering studies to Frederick County Commissioners. A Public Hearing was scheduled.

November 12, 1968 - Public Hearing was held at Mount Airy, Maryland on Highway plans, including:
(a) Interchange at Ijamsville Road
(b) Overpass structure at Mains Lane
(c) Frontage roads and new bridge over Monocacy River for local use
(d) Overpass structure at Quinn Orchard Road December 16, 1969 - Meeting of County Commissioners was held at which the Planning and Zoning Director requested interchange shift to Mains Lane area.

January 23, 1970 - Conference was heid between County Commissioners, Planning and Zoning Director and highway officials which determined that new studies be undertaken. December 16, 1970 - Meeting of Frederick County Commission. The following State Highway Administration plans were tantatively approved by the County Commission; Planning and Zoning Commission and Federal Highway Administration:
(a) Interchange at Mains Lane
(b) Overpass at Ijamsville Road
(c) Overpass at Bartonsville Road
(d) New bridge over Monocacy

January 25, 1971 - Public inceting in office of County Commission. Local citizens request project be relocated north of existing U. S. Route 40 , with interchanges at Ijamsville Road and on west side of Monocacy River. This resulted in Frederick County Commissioners' request to State Highway Administration that relocation concept be investigated.

Federal Highway Administration officials initially objected to the relocation concept, but in view of the Administration's Policy and Procedure Memoranda 20-8 and 90-1 inferring feasibile alternates be held accountable, the new studies were initiated.

March 24, 1971 - Status of the project was reviewed at the Maryland Office of State Planning. Federal, State and County officials were present.

November 10, 1971 - Meeting with Federal Highway Adminstration officials to discuss relocation studies. Federal approval to conduct Location Public Hearing was obtained. November 18, 1971 - Meeting with Frederick County Commissioners to review and apprise of impending Location Public Hearing. January 18, 1972 - During an unrelated public hearing concorning the Frederick County Master Plan, discussions of I-70 Plan $A$ and Plan $B$ dominated the proceedings.

July 6, 1972 - Official corridor Public Hearing was held. It included the following:
(a) Fifteen citizens spoke, five favoring Plan A and three favoring Plan $B$, the rest uncommitted.
(b) Two petitions were received, one favoring Plan A and one favoring Plan B.

Based on the testimony and responses presented, the proponents of Plan A appear to consist primarily of developers owning land north of $U$. S. Route 40 , while the proponents of Plan B appear to be primarily residents of Tulip Hill, Pine Cliff, and Bartonsville.

II: SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT OF PROJECT A. Social Characteristics of Project Ares

The 1967 land use survey of Frederick County showed that 59,508 acres or 14.3 percent of the County's total 664 square miles have been developed. The remainder of the land is primarily agricultural and forest. The present land use is shown in Figure 6 .

The area of the proposed alignment for $\mathrm{I}-70$ is southeast of the City of Frederick. The area east of the Monocacy River is aredominantly agricultural and forest with low density residential units concentrated in the Clearview, Pine Cliff and Bartonsville areas. The region west of the river is characterized by mixed residential and industrial developments associated with the City of Frederick. The area immediately adjacent to the Monocacy River is a designated perpetual conservation district.

The largest concentration of population in the study area is in the community of Bartonsville, located just south of the Old National Pike (Maryland Route 144) near the Monocacy River crossing. The houses in the town are typically small, modest units and are occupied by a great many senior citizens. The west end of town, the oldest part, is an established black community. The general area has changed greatly during the past ten years. Many of the old houses have been extensively improved and a considerable amount of new construction has occurred adjacent to the older area.

The area immediately adjacent to U.S. Route 40 is occupied by single family residential units concentrated in the communities of Tulip Hill, Pine Cliff, and Bartonsville, and separated by farmland. Sural commercial, service oriented businesses, and churches are

located in the project area adjacent to U. S. Route 40.
B. Economic Characteristics of Project Are:

1. Employment

The estimated 1970 population of Frederick County was 91,600 . Election Districts 2 and 9 (see Figure 7), in which the project is located, constitute 34 persent and 5 percent of the County total, respective l $\because$.

These districts will accommodate an estimated 39 percent of the projected 1990 population $(237,000)$. Frederick and New Market population regions will continue the lead in population growth rate for the entire county. The 1967, commercial and residential densties of the New Market region were 3.2 and 3.0 per acre, respectively. Unlike the Frederick population region, a continuous increase in economic activity is anticipated for the New Market area.

The proximity of the study area to Baltimore, Washington, and Frederick will contribute to increased urbanization and decreased agriculturalization with the resultant changes in employment patterns. In 1970, an estimated 22.6 percent of the Frederick County labor force worked outside the county. The most significant occupational decrease over the past 30 years has been in Agriculture. The percentage of the labor force involved in agriculture dropped from 23 percent in 1940 , to 9.8 percent in 1967 (see Table 1). However, the dairy industry still dominates all agricultural astivities and continues to prosper, primarily because of the increasing demand for its products in the metropolitan areas of Baltimore and Kasington, D.C.


TABLE 1
Occupational Characteristics of
Frederick County (1967) ${ }^{1}$

| Industry•Type | Source of Employment (\%) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Agriculture | 9.8 |
| Mining | 0.6 |
| Construction. | 7.1 |
| Manufacturing | 20.6 |
| Transportation, Communication <br> and other public utilities | 6.4 |
| Commercial | 19.1 |
| Finance, Insurance, Real Estate | 3.1 |
| Business, Personal Service | 6.1 |
| Professional | 10.4 |
| Government | 14.2 |
| Miscellaneous | 2.6 |

$1_{\text {Economic Base, A Background Study, Frederick County, Maryland. }}$
Marcou, O'Leary and Associates. Frederick County Planning and Zoning Cominission, February, 1969.

A projection of the 1960 labor force as presented in Table 2 indicates that the percentage of jobs in the agricultural area will continue to decrease from the 1960 level of 12.2 percent to 3.8 percent in 1990. A breakdown of the 1970 Frederick County labor force, by occupation, is given in Table 3.

## 2. Income

The income levels of the persons affected by the proposed project range from upper middle to the lower income of Frederick County. In 1960 and 1970 the median incomes for Frederick County as reported in the U.S. Census were $\$ 5,026$ and $\$ 9,550$, respectively.

## C. Land Use Planning

Future land use changes are governed by the General Plan of Frederick County. The proposed alignments are compatible with this plan. The present zoning as revised in January, 1975 is shown in Figure 8. The General Plan Map for the year 2000 identifies the Monocacy River and its shore line as a conservation area. This area is to be protected from all but very low density development. The Monocacy River Conservation Area is intended to protect the County water supply from excess siltation, to maintain uniform flows, and reduce flood hazards by controlling runoff from drainage areas.

One small park site, Monocacy Pine Cliff Park, lies within the study area. The park is approximately $1 / 2$ mile south of U.S. Route 40 on the banks of the Monocacy River. Access to the park is provided by Reich s Ford Road south of Frederick. This park is intended to retain its identity as a small facility for local residents with no direct access to the proposed interstate.

The General Plan calls for medium density development from

TABLE 2
Frederick County Labor Force
By Industry: 1960, 1990 (projected) ${ }^{1}$

## Industry Type

Agriculture
Mining, Forestry and Fisheries
Construction
Manufacturing
Transportation Communications \& Public Utilities Wholesale Trade
Retail Trade
Real Estate, Finance \& Insurance
Services (including public schools)
Public Administration
Not Reported
Total

Distribution ( $\%$ )

| 12.2 | 3.8 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 0.6 | 1.3 |
| 9.3 | 10.1 |
| 19.6 | 25.9 |
| 7.8 | 5.1 |
| 2.2 | 2.2 |
| 13.5 | 13.3 |
| 2.1 | 3.9 |
| 19.3 | 20.8 |
| 11.8 | 13.3 |
| 1.6 | .--- |
| 100.0 | $\approx 100.0$ |

Note: Total County labor force: $1960=24,173$
$1990=56,800$ (projected)
${ }^{1}$ Economic Biss, A Backround Study. Frederick County, Maryland. Marcou, O'Leary and Associates, Frederick County Planning and Zoning Comaission, February 1969.

TABLE 3
Frederick County Labor Force and
Employment Characteristics: $1970^{1}$

| Occupation | Male | Female |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 21738 | 12494 |
| \% prof, tech, | 14.5 | 12.8 |
|  <br> adan. (non-farm) | 9.6 | 3.5 |
| \% clerical \& sales | 10.5 | 36.8 |
| \% craftsmen, foreman | 24.0 | 2.3 |
| \% operatives | 14.9 | 18.0 |
| \% laborers (non-farm) | 7.5 | 0.8 |
| \% farm workers | 8.0 | 0.8 |
| \% service workers | 6.0 | 19.8 |
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New Market, west to the area of Bartonsville, and low density development from that point west to Frederick.

Future land use plans within the immediate study area include a proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) encompassing 270 acres, approximately $1 / 2$ mile north of $U$. S. Route 40 in the area of Shull Lane and Quinn Orchard Road. D. Natural Environmental Characteristics of Project Area

1. Meteorology

The mean temperature for Frederick County is $54^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$. The coldest months are January and February when the temperature averages $30^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$. July is the hottest month with a mean temperature of $74^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$. Areailing winds are from the northwest having the greatest frequency in late winter and early spring.

The average annual precipitation in the project area is 40 inches. Flooding may occur in the late winter or early spring due to a combination of heavy rain and meting snow. Flooding may also result from summer storms. Hydraulic design of transverse drainage structures for interstate highways in Maryland is based on a storm whose intensity and duration should occur on the average of once every fifty years. Hurricanes affect Frederick County about once every six years. The average snowfall is 24 inches per year in the project area but may fluctuate considerably from year to year.
2. Geology and Ground Water

The project area is within the Frederick Valley Region of the
western division of the Maryland Piedmont Province. A large scale geologic map of the project area is shown in Figure 9. A map showing the specific geology of the study area has been formulated using data from the Maryland Geological Survey, and is shown in Figure 10.

With only a few exceptions, limestone is the major rock type in the project area west of the Monocacy River. The limeṣtones in this locality are of two distinct types: Frederick, and Grove (the more valuable commercial limestone due to its purity). Grove limestone (the more pure type) is presently being surface mined in the western portion of the study area and is used locally for a variety of purposes.

In general, east of the Monocacy River a number of metamorphic and igneous rock types are found including: quartzitic slate, gneiss, granite gneiss, soft micaceous muscovitic schist, harder micaceous and chloritic schist, granitized schist, and diabase. The Loudoun Formation of quartz and granitic conglomerate dominates the eastern portion of the project area.

Depth to bedrock varies from zero to twenty feet over most of the project area. Depths to seasonally high water table range from zero to six feet in the flood plains of the Monocacy River and Long Branch Creek and in depressions and foot slopes, to more than twenty feet on hilltops, plateaus, and upper slopes. A number of homes in the study area are presently using shallow wells as their source of drinking water. Springs are located in the vicinity of Quinn Orchard Road and Shill Lane.


## Ll uend

Figure 9



## 3. Soils

The majority of soils contained in the project area have developed from a weathering process of the underlying rocks. Soils and soil characteristics vary considerably due to the differences in parent material and slope. The Soil Survey of Frederick County ${ }^{1}$ characterizes certain soils in the project area as having an extremely high erosion potential. These soils have been indicated in Figure 11. The Soil Conservation Service concludes that these soils are not suitable for cultivation or pasture, and recommend reforestation.

## 4. Topography and Stream Drainage

The topography in Frederick County is extremely variable, ranging from an elevation as low as 200 feet above sea level in the wide and flat river valleys to an altitude of nearly 2,000 feet in the mountains. In the area of the proposed alignment, the elevation at Ijamsville Road is near 400 feet falling to 300 feet near the Monocacy River. West of the river, in the Monocacy River valley, the elevation ranges from 200-300 feet.

Ground slopes steeper than $15 \%$ are uncommon in the project area. Surface elevations vary from 230-490 feet above sea level. The land surface is characterized by gently rolling terrain and moderate flowing streams with rock outcrops present in some areas. Figure 12 delineates slopes greater than 25 percent. Without special techniques for soil conservation, such slopes can erode rapidly if disturbed by construction.
$\overline{1}$ Soil Survey, Frederick County, Maryland, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1960, 144 pp .
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Headwaters of Frederick Valley streams are located in the gently rolling upper Triassic region of Frederick County and average a 3.86 foot drop per mile through this area. The streams then flow into the low level area of the valley proper. Water flows through the valley in a shallow, slow, and widely meandering fashion, dropping an average of 2.32 feet in elevation per mile.

The Monocacy River is the major drainage outlet of Frederick County. It is normally slow flowing in a wide shallow river bed with an average drop of 2.8 feet per mile. Plan A, Plan B and Plan B-1 alignments cross the Monocacy River just east of the City of Frederick. At this point, the Monocacy River has a wide floodplain.

Long Branch and Linganore Creek are two small streams that also will be impacted by all but the "Do Nothing" alternative. Long Branch Creek flows parallel to the present westbound roadway of U.S. Route 40. A mile long portion of this stream was relocated during the original construction of U.S. Route 40. Linganore Creek is a tributary of the Monocacy River and Long Branch is a tributary of Linganore Creek.

## 5. Water Quality

Water quality is severely degraded in the five mile reach of the Monocacy River below the City of Frederick f which includes the project area). The high bacterial count and periodically low dissolved oxygen concentration indicate that the Monocacy River in this area is not suitable for water contact recreation, and will not support desirable aquatic life ${ }^{l}$. Table 4 summarizes

[^1]TABLE 4
Water Quality in Project Area Linganore Creek and Monocacy River＊


| Da：0：969 | pH | Teso．${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  | 501：2s－27＝ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Turb. } \\ & \text { J.C. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 . \\ & \text { pon. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.0 .0 \\ & \text { pfa. } \end{aligned}$ | Color pa． | Colitc：a MPYi：NOAl． | $\frac{E}{y P} \cdot \frac{c o 1 i}{1100 e 1} .$ | Cond．a mnos | CL－ | NO， | $\mathrm{PO}_{6}$ <br>  <br> 8. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | A： r | Ascer | 5.5. | 3.5. | 3．3． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sarch 21 | 3.3 | 18.0 | 11.0 | 8 | 80 | 88 | 5 | 12.9 | 2.4 | 8 | 4，300 | 9.1 | 123 | 5.9 | 1.2 |  |
| AF＝il 18 | 9.1 | 19.0 | 13.0 | 13 | 124 | 142 | 2.4 | 11.6 | 2.2 | 7 | 430 | 93 | 144 | 4.3 | 1.0 |  |
| Maj 23 | 9．4 | 25.3 | 22.5 | 24 | 12 | 36 | 5.3 | 9.5 | 3.7 | 12 | 9．300 | 2，300 | 155 | 3.1 | 1.2 |  |
| Jure 20 | 7.5 | 30.0 | 25.0 | 68 | 102 | 170 | 27 | 8.5 | 1.9 | 25 | 21．000 | 15，000 | 150 | 5.3 | 1.6 |  |
| July 18 | 9.0 | 33.0 | 28.0 | 12 | 60 | 72 | 7.4 | 9.7 | 2.8 | 12 | 1．500 | 23 | 170 | 7.5 | 0.6 |  |
| AuF． 22 | 9.0 | 31.0 | 26.5 | 8 | 120 | 128 | 16 | 8.8 | 0.9 | 15 | 15，000 | 2，300 | 195 | 3.2 | 1.0 |  |
| 3¢こt． 19 | 7.5 | 19.0 | 18.0 | 4 | 48 | 52 | 12 | 9.9 | 2.3 | 15 | 43，000 | 4，300 | 165 | 3.5 | 1.2 |  |
| Dct． 17 | 7.7 | 12.5 | 13.0 | 4 | 80 | 84 | 3.5 | 10.4 | 2.0 | 15 | 23，000 | 150 | 155 | 6.2 | 0.5 |  |
| $\because こ \because .21$ | 9.1 | 8.0 | 3.5 | 4 | 90 | 94 | 0.5 | 14.0 | 2.7 | 7 | 95，000 | 4.160 | 145 | 3.6 | 1.2 |  |
| دec． 2 C | ？．7 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 12 | 124 | 136 | 3.0 | 12.7 | 3.1 | 25 | 23，000 | 4，300 | 162 | 5.0 | 1.6 |  |

Station ro：8 Scation Location Morocacy River，just above＝outh of Linganore Creek

| Dace： 965 | pri | Te＝0． | ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | Sol：3s－po |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Turb. } \\ & \text { J.C: } \end{aligned}$ | J．0． | 5．0．3． | Color pa． | Ce！1r．0． xpu／1cc＝1． |  | $\mu$ ond． | Cl－ | nc． | PO <br>  <br> $P$ ¢ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $3 \times$ | $2{ }_{2}{ }^{3}$ | IS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Onrci 22 | ？ 3 | 2ij． 0 | 1］． 5 | 4 | 129 | 132 | 7 | 10.4 | 5.6 | 15 | 40\％，000 | 23，000 | 220 | 9.2 | 1.2 |  |
| $\therefore \therefore=1919$ | 7.8 | 15.0 | 11.5 | 16 | 144 | 100 | 5 | 10.2 | 3.2 | 20 | 93，000 | 4，300 | 185 | 7.5 | 0.6 |  |
| $\because \% 24$ | 7.6 | 25.0 | 2C． 2 | 4 | 124 | 128 | 5 | 5.7 | 3.9 | 15 | 240，000 | ＜3，030 | 218 | 5.6 | 0.5 |  |
| ：$: \rightarrow 21$ | 7.5 | $3 \div .0$ | 26.4 | 16 | 150 | 176 | 13 | 3.8 | 9.0 | 35 | 460，000 | 4；，000 | 280 | 8.8 | 1.0 | 0．22 |
| 只1： 16 | 2.9 | 30.0 | 20.0 | 8 | 164 | 172 | 9.5 | 15.5 | 6.3 | 9 | 43，000 | 4,500 | 3：0 | 18.0 | 0.3 | 0.7 |
| A＇：． 22 | 2． 2 | $3: .0$ | 77.0 | 4 | 24 | 248 | 14. | 8.4 | 7.4 | 20 | 2，400，000 | 29，000 | 325 | 15.9 | 0.3 | 1．9 |
| jej： 19 | 7.1. | 22.5 | 19．0 | 4 | 140 | 144 | 14 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 15 | 29，000 | 9，：00 | 275 | 8.0 | 2．3 | 0.11 |
| 水： 17 | 7．is | 13.6 | 13.0 | 8 | $14 E$ | 150 | 4.0 | 8.6 | 3.9 | 15 | 460，000 | 4；，000 | 285 | 8.2 | 0.5 | 1．19 |
| 亿o：．21 | 9.0 | 8.8 | 5.5 | 9 | 166 | 175 | 2.0 | 10.8 | 5.1 | 15 | 24，000 | 93，000 | 270 | 8.3 | 1.2 | 0.73 |
| 3sec．20 | 7.5 | 3.0 | 2．3） | 16 | 180 | 196 | 3.0 | 12.1 | 4.5 | 35 | 43，000 | 4．300 | 225 | 10.0 | 2．4 | 0.25 |

water quality measurements of Monocacy River water made by the Maryland Water Resources Administration ${ }^{1}$. The water does not meet the Class C standards promulgated by this agency in regards to coliform bacteria. The classification criteria of the Maryland Departmet of Natural Resources are listed in Table 5. The primary causes of this stream degradation include the City of Frederick sewage treatment plant, City of Frederick storm sewer drainage, and industrial waste.

Linganore Creek water quality (see Table 4 ) indicates that this stream is relatively undegraded. This water is presently used as part of the City of Frederick's water supply.

No water quality data is available for Long Branch Creek. However, the variety of aquatic life found in the stream indicates relatively undegraded water quality.

## 6. Aquatic Ecology

Long Branch Creek fish populations were surveyed on December 1, and December 6, 1974, at two locations near Bartonsville in Frederick County, as indicated in Figure 13.

The following species were collected and identified during the study:


[^2] Resources, Division of hater Quality Investigations, 1966, 109 pp .

TABLE 5



Silverjaw Minnow Ericymba buccata $\quad 6$
White Sucker Catostomus commersoni 5
Yellow Bullhead Catfish Ictalirus natlis: $\quad 4$
Rock Bass Ambloplites rupestris 1
Fantail Darter Etheostoma flabellate 1

Collections were made using a 375 volt D. C. electroshocker and ten foot seine net for a distance of approximately 300 feet. A special attempt was made to sample a wide variety of habitats, including riffles, deep pools, and undercut streambanks. The stream width varied from two feet to six feet and the depth varied from several inches to four feet. Aquatic plants were scarce.

No species of fish presently considered rare or depleted in Maryland was collected, or has been recorded in this stream. In addition, it is not presently stocked with game fish. The Monocacy River, however, does contain fish species considered endangered in Maryland, such as the comely shiner, pearl dace, and the moseyside dace.

## 7. Terrestrial Ecology

Most of the project area is composed of farmland and pasture. These areas contain few native plants species. The woodlands in the project area consist of cutover forests from which mast of the saleable timber has been removed. The tree communities are typical of eastern hardwood, deciduous forests. Small woodlots and unused farmland are common in the project area.

The following tree species were observed in the project
area:

| river birch | sycamore |
| :--- | :--- |
| elm | hickory |
| chestnut oak | beech |
| red oak | sourgun |
| ash | maple |

In a cool moist, wooded ravine in the approximate location of Plan B's crossing of Long Branch stream, several species of fern were observed, including Ebony Spleenworth, Asplemium platyneuron, and Christmas fern.

Deer, raccoon and squirrel tracks were observed in the project area. No game trails were observed. Kingfishers and cardinals were common birds seen during the site investigation. The cutover forests in the project area support a diverse population of native plants and animals, however no rare or unique, native species were observed.

## 8. Wetlands

The proposed alternate will not cross large areas of marshlands; howevar, the flood plain of the Monocacy River and several of the farm ponds should be considered wetlard areas. These areas are indicated in Figure 14.

The floodplain bottonland of the Monocacy River can be considered a Type 1 Wetland ${ }^{1}$. The area contains a high water table and supports aguatic vegetation. In addition, several farm ponds (see Figure 14) consist of inland open freshwater, Type 5, Wetland ${ }^{1}$. These ponds

[^3]
provide refuge for migrating waterfowl and support populations of emergent fringe wetland vegetation.

## E. Historical Sites

Two primary sites of historical interest in the project area include:
(1) private residence on the northside of the Old National Pike, - just west of what was the "Jug Bridge" over the Monoeacy River. This may be an old toll house;
(2) a stone monument on an island between the Old National Pike (Patrick Street) and U. S. Route 40 just east of the Frederick, Maryland City line. This may be a monument locating the defunct "Jug Bridge".

## F. Archaeological Sites

On October 14, 1975, personnel of the Division of Archeology, Maryland Geological Survey, conducted a preliminary archeological survey of the area to be affected by proposed reconstruction of Interstate 70 from east of Ijamsville Road to East Patrick Street, in Frederick County. The survey area was traversed by car, and the open 1 and within it was examined from different viewpoints. Possible site locations discovered in this manner were then inspected on foot. Areas that could not be seen from existing roads were visited on foot if topographical maps indicated that the terrain was suitable for archeological sites. Also, small test holes were dug in promising locations.

Six sites had been previously recorded between 1905 and 1961 in the general survey area. Two additional sites were discovered and recorded during the 1975 survey. All site locations are on file at
the Division of Archeology, Maryland Geological Survey. Of the six early sites the largest is 18FR19, which dates to the Archaic and Early Woodland periods (ca. 800-300 BC).

The other ${ }^{\text {f five }}$ smaller sites are designated as 18 FR $41,18 F R 51$, 18FR55, and 18 R 64 . One of these sites, 18FR42, has been largely destroyed by the construction of the Pinecliff housing development.

Two previously unreported sites were discovered during the 1975 survey:

18FR135 (Long Branch): This site occupies a stand of trees in a pasture on a knoll overlooking a small stream. The location was used as a garbage dump during the late nineteenth and/or early twentieth centuries: broken bottles, crockery, etc., are scattered on the surface.

The southern end of the site bears a very light scatter of stone chipping debris. Evidently the knoll was occasionally used in prehistoric times as a workshop for the manufacture of stone tools. The raw material was white quartz, undoubtedly derived from cobbles in the stream bed. All pieces were found on the surface. Several small test pits were unproductive. 18 FRI 36 (Linganore East): This is a cornfield of several acres and bearing a very light scatter of broken modern crockery and china. One prehistoric object, a small, crude biface of rhyolite, was found near the southwest corner of the field.

Although survey conditions were good (recent rains had freshly exposed the surface between the rows of corn), no other prehistoric items were visible on the surface. Likewise, several small test pits yielded nothing.

## III. PROBABLE IMPACT OR PROPOSED ALTERNATE

## A. Social and Economic Impact

## 1. Relocation Study

Plan A.
The Bartonsville community that would have been affected by this alternate is rural residential, and agricultural. The income levels range from upper middle income to the lower income levels of Frederick County. The majority of the families are in a lowermiddle income group. The land usage is residential and agricultural (see Figures 15 and 16).

The improvement of Bartonsville Road would have caused considerable disruption to the existing residential community of Bartonsville. A maximum of 120 persons in 30 families, 25 of which are owner-occupants and five of which are tenant-occupants, would have been affected by the 80 foot alternative improvement to Bartonsville Road. A minimum of 100 persons in 25 families, including 20 owner-occupants and five tenant-occupants, would have been affected by the 60 foot alternative improvement to Bartonsville Road. A total of six minority families, consisting of 24 people, would have been affected by either of these improvements to Bartonsville Road.

The racial character is caucasian; however, the Eartonsillc co--mity is integrated. Six of the families, who would have been displaced, were members of a minority group, ad these, tace here tenant-occupants. The families were in the low and lower middle income brackets. No minority businesses or farms would hear been affected.



The people employed in the area were not members of a minority group. Rehousing the families in this area would have been difficult, due to the lack of available replacenent housing that is within the financial means of these families.

No communities in the area would have been separated by Plan A. Plan A would not have had an impact on minority group usage of community facilities or services with the exception of the church relocation. The anticipated adverse effects upon residential, commercial, and industrial development in the minority community would have been minimal.

Three businesses would have been displaced, including a small antique shop, a kennel, and a general merchandise store. Of these three businesses, one probably would have discontinued operation. A nonsectarian church on Bartonsvilie Road would have been acquired. There was no need for functional replacement on this alternative The resulting effect on the local economy, including employment would have been negligible.

Plan A would have changed the access of the small communities along existing $U$. S. Route 40 to comnunity facilities and services such as fire equipment. The alternate would not have had any alurse effects on existing residential, eaworicol, and industris? development. Plan A would not have caused any significant changes in population density or distribution. Property valnes would have increased due to improved access to the undeveloped area.

At the time of the study, there were approximately thirteen single fanily dwellings for sale in the area of the project.

The majority of these dwellings were priced over $\$ 40,000$. Most of the housing would have been beyond the financial means of those who would have been displaced. There were no rental units available in the area. The Frederick County Nultiple Listing Service was utilized to provide this information. Also, the amount of housing that is normally available would have been insufficient for those displaced by the project if either one of the improvements to Bartonsville Road had been considered.

At the time of the study, one business property was for sale in the immediate area. The relocation of the business world have not been a problem since two of the businesses were considered to be family oriented and operating from the home. Federal, State, and County programs that may affect the supply and demand for housing were not anticipated. A minimum of two years would have been required to complete relocation, due to the lack of available housirg and the expectation of "housing as a last resort." The relocation assistance would only have been resolved satisfactorily in accordance with the "Uniform Relocation Assistance and Land Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, "Public Law 91-646, if "housing as a last resort" had been required.

## Plans $B$ and $B-1$.

The area of the project is rural residential, agricultrual, and middle income. The alternates do not dividi or dismit established comnunities, and no adverse offects are anticipated on adjacent commaties. No businesses are disituced but tio
farms are affected. Employment is not affected. There is no known effect on existing development or on population density and distribution. Property values will increase due to the improved access to undeveloped areas. The alignments, with respect to zoning and land use, are shown in Figures 15 and 16. Nine families, 36 persons, are required to relocate. Eight families are owner-occupants and the remaining family is a tenant-occupant. There is no known effect on members of a minority group. All of the families are in the middle income bracket. One of the displaced farms will possibly discontinue operations. There are no non-profit organizations affected, and no need for functional replacement is known.

At the time of the study, there were thirteen single family dwellings for sale, the majority being in the $\$ 40,000$ category. This is considered normal for the area. There were no rental units avilable in the area. No serious difficulty in rehousing those persons who will be displaced is anticipated. The Frederick County Multiple Listing Service was utilized to provide this information. Because the displaced persons are in the middle income brackets, no problems are foreseen in relocating them into available housing. Two farms may be affected. One of these is expected to discontinue and the other is expected to relocate. There are no known Federal, State, or County prograns that will affect the supply of housing needed for this project. Approximately eighteen months will be required to complete the relocation. Relocation will be accomplished in accordance with the requirements of the "Uniform Relocation

Assistance and Land Acquisition Policies Act of 1970," Public Law 91-646. Benefits and payments will be a iministered by the Office of Real Estate District 7 Office, in Frederick, Maryland. All those to be relocated will be treated in a timely, orderly, and humane manner.
"Do Nothing"
All properties along U. S. Route 40 would have been adversely affected by increased congestion and the difficulty of access. Travel time would increase, both for local and commuter traffic. Noise and air pollution would increase and in general, the area would not be conducive to further development. The relationships of Plan A, Plan B, and Plan B-1 alignments to present zoning and existing land use are shown in Figures 15 and 16 , respectively.

## 2. Summary of the Relocation Assistance Program

All State Highway Administration projects must comply with the provisions of the "Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970" (P.L. 91-646) and/or the Annotated Code of Maryland, Article 21, Section 12-206. The State Highway Administration, Bureau of Relocation Assistance, administers the Relocation Assistance Program in the State of Maryland.

The provisions of the Fedcral and State Lav require the State Highway Administration to provide payments and services to persons displaced by a public project. The payments that are provided for include replacement housing payments and/or moving costs. The maximum limits of the replacement housing payments are $\$ 15,000$ for orner-occupants and $\$ 4,000$ for tenant-occupants. In addition, but within the above limits, certain payments may be made for increased
mortgage interest costs and/or incidental expenses. In order to receive these payments, the displaced person must occupy decent, safe, and sanitary replacement housing. In addition to the replacement housing payments described above, there are also moving cost payments to persons, businesses, farms, and non-profit organizations.

The moving cost payments are broken down into several categories which include actual moving costs and "in lieu of" actual moving cost. Actual moving costs for displaced residences could include actual moving costs up to 50 miles or a schedule moving cost payment up to $\$ 500$. For displaced businesses, farms, and non-profit organizations, actual moving costs will be paid up to 50 miles. Payments for searching costs for a replacement site are also included. The "in lieu of" actual moving cost payments provide that a displaced business or farm may be paid a minimum of $\$ 2,500$ to a maximum of $\$ 10,000$, based upon the net income of the business or farm, provided that the business or farm cannot be established in the area or cannot be re-established without a substantial loss of existing patronage. A non-profit organization is eligible to receive "in lieu of" actual moving cost payments, but the maximum payment is $\$ 2,500$. In all cases where "in lieu of" payments are made, the State must determine that the displaced business, farm, or non-profit organization is entitled to tnis payment.

A more detailed explanation of the benefits and payments available to displaced persons, businesses, farms, and non-profit organizations is available in brochures distributed at the public hearings for this project and given to displaced persons.

In the event adequate replacement housing is not available to rehouse the persons displaced by public projects or the available replacement housing is beyond their financial means, replacement "housing as a last resort" will be utilized to accomplish the rehousing. Detailed studies will be completed by the State Highway Administration and approved by the Federal Highway Administration before replacement "housing as a last resort" could be utilized. "Housing as a last resort" could be provided to the displaced persons in several different ways not limited to the following:

1. An improved property can be purchased or leased.
2. Dwelling units can be rehabilitated and purchased or leased.
3. New dwelling units can be constructed.
4. State acquired dwellings can be relocated, rehabilitated, and purchased or leased.

Any of these methods could be utilized by the State Highway Administration and such housing would be made available to the displaced persons. In addition to the above procedure, individual replacement housing payments can be increased beyond the statutory limits in order to allow a displaced person to purchase or rent a dwelling that is within his financial means.

The "Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of $1970^{\prime \prime}$ requires that the State Highway Administration shall not proceed with any phase of any project which will cause the relocation of any person, or proceed with any construction project until it has furnished satisfactory assurances that the above payments will be provided and that all displaced persons will be satisfactorily relocated to comparable decent, safe, and sanitary
housing within their financial means or that such housing is in place and has been made available to the displaced person.

## B. Natural Environmental Impact

1. Geology and Ground Water

The relationship of Plan A, Plan B, and Plan B-1 alignments to geologic formations are shown in Figure 17. The major mineral resource affected by all but the "Do Nothing" plan is the Grove Limestone, located near the western end of the project area. At present this material is being mined in the area, however large quantities still remain north and south of the project area. The limited covering of this resource by highway construction will have little impact on future mining. An abandoned slate quarry located along Linganore Creek is not impacted by any plan. Shallow bedrock and rock out-crops will be a factor in construction. Ground water levels in local wells may fluctuate during construction, and following road cuts. Any springs encountered during construction will be maintained.

## 2. Soils and Topography

The relationships of Plan $A, P 1 a n B$, and Plan $B-1$ to areas with highly erodable soils and areas containing relatively steep slopes are shown in Figures $1 \delta$ and 19, respectively. Plan $A$ would have encountered considerably more erodable soils on step slopes than Plan B, or Plan B-1. Without special techniques for soil stabilezation such areas will erode rapidly if disturbed by construction. In the "Do Nothing" alternative, these soils would have continued to erode unless reforested, as the soils are too erodable even for



grassland and pasture ${ }^{1}$. Most of this area is presently in grassland.

## 3. Water Quality

The Frederick County Water Resource Inventory indicates no conflict between Plans A, B and B-1 and existing or proposed watershed conservation and/or impounding operations. Construction of new bridge structures can be accomplished with minimal sedimentation damage. The flood plain cross-section is rot restricted by the structures.

Plan A (not recommended)
Plan A would have adversely affected the water quality of Long Branch Creek and the Monocacy River. A short term negative impact on water quality would have occurred from increased sediment loads during highway construction, and the rechannelization of Long Branch Creek. A Department of Natural Resources permit would have been required for this rechannelization. As vegetation reestablished itself, the erosion would have decreased. The rechannelized portion of Long Branch Creek would have paralleled U. S: Route 40 for approxmately one mile. During the original construction of U. S. Route 40 , a one mile section of Long Branch Creek was relocated north of its former streambed. The aquatic communities have since recovered. Plan A required that the Creek in this same general area be relocated a second time, which would have required a second recovery period (two year minimum). The streambed composition would have made sediment control extremely difficult during the construction period.

[^4]Pollutants in storm drainage and accidental spills of hazardous materials on highways can have an adverse impact on the organisms in receiving streams. With Plan A, storm drainage and associated street surface contaminents from the highway would have discharged into Long Branch Creek and ultimately into the Monocacy River. At present, there are no effluent guidelines regarding highway runoff.

Most of the aquatic organisms including plants and animals would have required a minimum of two years to reestablish themselves. Algae and the seeds of larger plants would have been carried into the rechanneled region from the undisturbed upstream sections. Insect larvae, which constitute most of the invertebrate animal life would have been replaced as the mature insects deposited eggs in the new section. In addition insect larvae and other animal life, including fish, would have been carried by the stream flow, or would have migrated into the new section.

## Plans $B$ and $B-1$ (Plan $B$ recommended)

Plan B will have the same adverse impact on water quality from short term erosion and long term storm-water drainage as described for Plan A. However, Long Branch Creek will not be rechanneled. In addition, under Plan:: B storm drainage will continue from existing U. S. Route 40. Plan B-1 would have had similar impacts.
"Do Nothing" (not recommended)
The "Do Nothing" alternative would have had little additional impact on water quality.
4. Aquatic Ecology

Plan A (not recommended)
Plan A would have had a major short term impact on the aquatic
ecology of Long Branch Creek and a minor short term impact on the Monocacy River. The proposed rechannelization of approximately one mile of Long Branch Creek would have eliminated the existing bottom dwelling organisms and aquatic plant communities in this section. However, similar communities would have re-tstablished themselves, as indicated by the Creek's recovery from a previous rechannelization provided a physically similar environment was reconstructed. A minimum of two years would have been required to re-introduce (naturally) most of the present aquatic plant and animal species.

Sediment load increases during Plan A rechannelization would have had a short term negative impact on fish communities in the Creek. The re-suspended organic and inert sediments would have increased the oxygen demand, interfered with feeding, and reproduction.

The bridge construction over the Monocacy River would have had a minor negative aquatic impact due to the temporary increases in sediment loads during construction.

Water quality analysis data on the Monocacy River (see Table 4) indicates severely degraded water quality at the proposed Plan A bridge crossing. The long term impact of these bridges on aquatic organisms would have been minimal.

Plans $B$ and $B-1$ (Plan $B$ recommended)
Plan $B$ will have a minor short term negative impact due to construction, caused primarily by increased sediment loads in a number of small tributaries of Long Branch Creek, Lingonore Creek and ultimately in the Monocacy River. Bridges will be constructed over Long Branch Creek, but no rechamelization of this strean is required.

Plan B-I would have had similar impacts.
"Do Nothing" (not recommended)
The "Do Nothing" alternative would have had little or no additional impact on the aquatic ecology of the area.
5. Terrestrial Ecology

The long term impact on the plant and animal communities in the proposed highway area will vary, depending upon the ultimate land use, e.g., parks, open space, residential, commercial or industrial development. This change in land use will occur as the City of Frederick continues to expand and the project area continues to become urbanized.

Plan A (not recommended)
P1an A would have had a minor impact on the terrestrial ecology in the immediate vicinity of the proposed roadway. Plant life in the area is typical of that found in unused farmland. Since Plan A would have followed the existing highway, terrestrial modifications would have been minimal resulting in little additional pressure on surrounding plant and animal communities. Because of the increased number of lanes a small increase in the number of vehicle killed animals would have occurred.

Plans B and B-1 (Plan B recommended)
Plan $B$ will have a negative impact on the terrestrial ecology. Existing woods and plant communities in the right-of-way will be cleared, but only within construction limits where grade changes are accomplished. Woodland will remain to accomodate displaced animal life. The Plan B bridging of the Monocacy River will allow use of farmland adjacent to the structures. The npen area beneath
the structures will provide for wildife movements throughout the Monocacy River Conservation District. The existing natural vegetation in this area serves as a nesting place and food source for a variety of small birds; and mammals. Plan B-1 impacts would have been similar.

Animals wirch cannot adjust to the increased noise pollution, severing of te:.ritories, and destruction of existing natural vegetation are expected to vacate the project area.
"Do Notring" (not recommended)
The "Do Nothing" alternative would have little additional impact on the present terrestrial ecology.

## 6. Wetlands

The project area in the vicinity of the proposed crossing of the Monocacy River contains a wide, frequently flooded lowland.

The structures in Plan $B$ do not restrict the floodplain of the Monocacy River. Plan $A$ and Plan $B-1$ would not have restricted the Monocacy River floodplain. All structures, therefore will have little or no effect on the seasonally flouded bottomland below.

In Plans $B$, and $B-1$, at least one farm pond is removed. Plan A would have necessitated removing one pond to accommodate a future interchange. The approximate route of the plans with respect to the wetland areas is shown in Figure 20.
7. Noise

Traffic noise can be described as undesirable sound generated by vehicles in operation on roadways. The effect of this noise varies with distance from the source, topography, traffic volume, vehicle classification, metcorological conditions and the characteristics of the transmitting medium. The general categories of effects of

noise on people are psychological and physiological. Psychological effects are dependent upon the individual, and the quality and intensity of the sound. People who are regularly exposed to loud noises are less sensitive to community noise intrusion of lesser intensity. The physiological effects include sleep prevention and interruption, constriction of arteries, and loss of hearing. The severity of these effects is proportional to the amount of exposure to noise. This noise analysis was undertaken to determine probable adverse noise related impacts on the environment.

The results of the noise study are given in terms of statistical measures denoted by one hour $L_{10}$ for various distances from the source. Table 6 indicates the noise standards for a selection of 1 and uses. The detailed study is available at SHA in Baltimore.

The flow of traffic on highways has been classified (see Highway Capacity Manual) into various service levels, labeled A through $F$. Traffic flowing at level of service $A$ is light and free flowing, with the driver having great flexibility of changing speeds and lanes. Level of service $F$ represents congested conditions combined with undesirably sluggish traffic. The noise investigation is based upon level of service $C$ which denotes a condition where traffic is travelling near the speed limit, with some restriction on the freedom to change speed and/or lane.

Plan A (not recommended)
Three residences and a church were identified as noise receivers on this plan (Figure 21: 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A). Receivers 2A, $3 A$, and $4 A$ would have experienced slight increases (2-3 dA) above the ambient level. Site 1 A would have had a significant noise reduction, 16 dEA,

Table 6.

Design Noise Level/Land Use Relationships*

| Land Use Category | Design Noise <br> Level - $\mathrm{L}_{10}$ | Description of Land Use Category |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 60dBA } \\ & \text { (Extcrior) } \end{aligned}$ | Tracts of lands in which serenity and quiet are of extraordinary significance and serve an important public need, and where the preservation of those qualities is essential if the area is to continue to serve its intended purpose. Such areas could include amphitheaters, particular parks or portions of parks, or open spaces which are dedicated or recognized by appropriate local officials for activities requiring special qualities of serenity and quiet. |
| B | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \text { dBA } \\ & \text { (Exterior) } \end{aligned}$ | Residences, motels, hotels, public meeting rooms, schools, churches, libraries, hospitals, picnic areas, recreation areas, playgrounds, active sports areas, and parks. |
| C | $\begin{aligned} & 75 \mathrm{dBA} \\ & \text { (Exterior) } \end{aligned}$ | Developed lands, properties or activities not included in categories $A$ and $B$ above, |
| D) | -- | For requirements on undeveloped lands see paragraphs 5.a.(5) and (0) of PPM 90-2. |
| E | 55 dBA | Residences, motels, hotels, public meetings rooms, schools, churches, libraries, hospitals and auditoriums. |

[^5]
due to its location above a road cut section. A summary of the noise impact on the above receivers is presented in Table 7. The ambient noise level at all four points is already above the 70 dBA , upper limit for residential areas.

Plans $B$ and $B-1$ (Plan B recommended)
Residential receivers $1 B$ and $2 B$, Figure 21, will experience a considerable increase ( 9 dBA ) above the ambient noise level. Even though this increase is substantial, the new level will be well below the design noise limit of 70 dBA for residences (see Table 6). Plan B-1 would have caused similar impacts.

Plan B will require the use of heavy-duty construction machinery. The remote location of Plan $B$ will result in a low noise impact during construction.
"Do Nothing" (not recommended)
As previously stated, an increase in traffic volume is accompanied by higher noise levels. Thus, the ambient noise level, which already exceeds the 70 dBA upper limit for residential areas (1A, 2A, 3A, 4A) would have increased.

To facilitate comprehensive planning, copies of this document will be sent to Federal and State agencies, including local planning and zoning offices.

## 8. Air Quality Analysis

Three configurations of this section of I-70 were modeled:
(1) the existing 4-lane roadway between Ijamsville Road and East

Patrick Street known as the "Do-Nothing" plan, (2) a 6-lane buildon configuration (Plan A), that adds two lanes to the existing roadway and includes a proposed Frederick Beltway intersection, and
(3) and 4-1ane relocated roadway which passes to the north of the existing highway, identified as Plan $B$.

The following comments and assumptions pertain to procedures undertaken in this study:
(1) The EPA's HIWAY model, version 74250, has been used for all predictive modeling on this project.
(2) Plans and profiles for the proposed construction were provided by the Bureau of Project ${ }^{\text {Planning of the State Highway Admins- }}$ traction. These plans provided the basis for information regarding specific alignments.
(3) Typical cross sections were constructed from the horizontal alignment plans for the existing and build alternates.
(4) Traffic data for the existing facility and traffic projections for both the no-build and build alternates in future years were provide by the Traffic Planning Section of the State Highway Administration. Note that under the no-build condition, the existing fourlane roadway is projected to reach a level of service $E$ capacity in 1985, with an ADT of 42,600 vehicles, and remain at that volume in all later years. Construction of alternate Plan B will result in an increase in traffic volume permitting a higher level of service for the 20 year period examined. The traffic for the year 2000 was derived by plotting the traffic vs. year for the years provided (1974, 1978, 1980 and 1998), and extrapolating the straight line to obtain the ADT for the year 2000.
(5) Traffic speeds were provided by the Maryland State Highway Administration. A speed of 40 mph was used for peak hour volumes in both directions (peak hour traffic indicates 60 . westbound and $40 \%$

## Table 7

Ambient and Predicted Noise Levels Locations Shown in Figure 21

eastbound) for all alternates and years studied. The off-peak hour traffic was presumed to travel at a speed of 50 mph for all alternates and years considered, and was split equally between westbound and eastbound lanes. Ramp speeds; in the case of the interchange, were forecast to be identical to the appropriate mainline speed.
(6) The comparison of the build and no-build alternates does not include any speed differential that might occur. The use of no-build speeds for the build alternate analysis is conservative and tends to produce very conservative estimates of worst case conditions.
(7) Peak hour truck volumes for use in all predictions were calculated on the basis of $7 \%$ of the peak hour volume for the alternate and time period involved. Off peak hour truck percentages for all micro and mesoscale predictions were assumed to be $15 \%$ of the hourly volume. In all cases, the percent diesel vs. gasoline heavy duty vehicles was derived from the percent of ADT of each type of heavy duty vehicle. Based upon the total average daily heavy duty vehicle traffic, $83 \%$ are diesel powered while $17 \%$ are gasoline powered. These values - were derived by computing the ratio of the percent ADT - diesels to the percent ADT of all heavy duty vehicles, and the percent ADT - gasoline HDV to the total percent HDV, respectively. The $85 \%$ diesel - $17 \%$ gasoline factors were assumed for every hour of the day.
(8) All predictions were made for receptors on one side of the highiay. Due to an assumed symmetry (which occurs over the 8 -hour period when traffic is equally divided over the roadway), exactly the same results would be produced by using a wind from the northeast with a cross section on the southern side of the highway. Therefore, for the eight-hour averages, the values obtained for the cross sections are
valid on both sides of the highway with an appropriate wind direction. The one-hour levels will be slightly lower on the southern side due to the directional distribution of peak hour traffic.
(9) The peak hour predictions were made using $60 \%$ of the hourly traffic volume concentrated in the westbound lane, and the remaining $40 \%$ traveling eastbound. In the case of a 4 or 6-1ane configuration, the westbound and eastbound traffic was divided equally between the two or three westbound and eastbound lanes, respectively.
(10) Light duty vehicle emission factors were computed for Frederick County using BAQC $^{1}$ procedures. Heavy duty vehicle emission factors for both gasoline and diesel vehicles were obtained from AP -42 ${ }^{2}$.
(11) The eight-hour predictions used an eight-hour averaged emission rate derived from the emission factors and traffic during the 8-hour period.
(12) The 8 -hour period from 1 PM to 8 PM was modeled using a wind speed of 1 meter per second and two stability classes. E stability was used from 1 PM until 4 PM , and F stability was used from 5 PM to 8 PM. The eight-hour period extending from 1 PM to 8 PM contains $54.8 \%$ of the $A D T$, and represents the 8 -hour period with the largest percentage of ADT each day. In the case where $E$ and $F$ stabilities were used, two predictions for the respective 4 -hour periods were made and the results averaged together to obtain the full 8 -hour average.
(13) Three wind angles $\left(5^{\circ}, 10^{\circ}, 15^{\circ}\right)$ relative to the roadway $\overline{1}$ Maryland Bureau of Air Quality Control 2

Compilation of dir Pollutant Emission Factors, Second Edition, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of dir and later Programs, Office of dir Quality Phmadne ind Standards, Re: area Triangle Park, North Carolina, September 1973.
were used. These wind angles produced the largest concentration at specific distances from the road edge. For example, a $5^{\circ}$ wind angle may produce the maximum concentration from 0 to 200 feet from road edge. At distances of 200 to 700 feet, a $10^{\circ}$ angle may produce the maximum concentration. Finally, at distances of 700 to 1000 feet from road edge a $15^{\circ}$ wind angle produces the largest concentration. The distances given above are only examples and may vary with road width, road length, and stability.
(14) No roadway or receptor elevations were included, nor were any terrain features such as hills, woods, lakes, or large buildings. The roadway and receptors were considered to be at the same level with the terrain features. Cut features of the build alternates were accounted for in the predictive process using the cut capability of HIWAY, with the top of the cut located at ground level.
(15) The "Do-Nothing" or no-build alignment of the future (1980 and and 2000 ) was modeled using the existing roadway alignment and traffic appropriate to the year being studied.
(16) Plan B (ETC 1980) has been modeled as a 4-lane highway with a median and a total width of 100 feet. The profile indicates that Plan $B$ is mostly at-grade with some fills and essentially four cuts. The fill or elevated sections were modeled -as at-grade roadways since HINAY cannot be applied to elevated roadways while maintaining its predictive accuracy. The four cut sections were modeled as cuts using the cut section option of HIEAY.
(17) Plan $A$, was modeled as a six-lane at-grade roadway - a widened version of the existing configuration.
(18) An interchange between I-70 and the proposed Frederick

Beltway was modeled with the Plan A alternate. Only the four other ramps of the cloverleaf were modeled as per instructions from the SHA. The interchange is assumed to have an ETC of 1980. In addition, the interchange and changes in traffic due to the interchange, were not included with the Plan B or the "Do-Nothing" alternate.
(19) In lieu of on-site monitoring, background levels were provide by the State Highway Administration through consultation with the Maryland Bureau of Air Quality Control. Their estimates suggest that background concentrations will not exceed 5 ppm for a one-hour averaging period and 2 ppm for an eight-hour averaging period due to land usage in the area and traffic on existing streets and raodways.

The following conclusions are evident based upon this study:
(1) Existing air quality in the region adjacent to Interstate 70 between Ijamsville Road and East Patrick Street does not exceed the 35 ppm one-hour standard under worst case conditions. A violation of the eight-hour standard ( 9 ppm ) is indicated near the road edge, well within the right-of-way. There are no violations outside of the right-of-way; thus, there is no severe impact upon sensitive receptors present in the area.
(2) The future air quality surrounding each of the alternates will not exceed either the one or eight-hour standards at any distance from the road edge. A microscale comparison between alternates may be made for each year:
(a) 1980 - The "Do-Nothing" alternate would have resulted in the largest overall.microscale carbon monoxide levels for both one and eighthour periods. The Plan a alternate would have ranked second to the "Do-Nothing", except in the location surrounding the interchange
where the conservative interchange contribution of 1 ppm at all distances yields concentrations that equal those of the "Do-Nothing" alternate. However, the interchange could be constructed with any alternate, and a valid comparison of the alternates alone must neglect this intersection. In this case, the Plan A alternate would have ranked lower than the "Do-Nothing". The Plar: B alternate will result in the lowest inicroscale levels due to the traffic split. .
(b) 2000 -Plan A would have produced the largest microscale carbon monoxide concentrations for both one and eight-hour periods. This alternate would have had the greatest volume of traffic flowing over a single alignment, which would have produced the largest concentrations. The "Do-Nothing" alternate would have ranked second, due to the limited volume of traffic in years after 1985 when level of service E capacity would have been reached. The Plan B alternate, due to the traffic split, follows closely behind the "Do-Nothing" alternate (due to comparable traffic volumes) and ranks third.

The year 2000 levels are generally reduced from those in year 1980 due to the decrease in emission factors; however; the reduction is small because the decrease in emission factors is offset by a large increase in traffic, except under no-build conditions where traffic remains constant after 1985.
(3) Table 8 presents a mesoscale comparison of alternates in 1980 and 2000 for carbon monoxide, total hydrocarbons, and nitrogen oxides. In addition, Figure 22 presents a burden vs. alternate graph for all alternates. The largest loadings would have resulted from the plan A alternate due to the inclusion of the beltway interchange. The Plan $B$ altemate ranks second due to the longer length offered and the

TABLE 8

Mesoscale Comparison of Alternates for 1974, 1980 and 2000 (Units Are Tons Per Day)

| Existing | (1974) |
| :--- | ---: |
| CO | 2.679 |
| THC | .353 |
| $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{X}}$ | 1.182 |


| Year | 1980 |  |  | 2000 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pollutant | CO | THC | $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{X}}$ | CO | THC | $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{X}}$ |
| Alternate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plan B* | 1.484 | .198 | 1.123 | 1.475 | .233 | 1.388 |
| Build-On** | 1.489 | .198 | 1.127 | 1.491 | .235 | 1.403 |
| Do-Nothing | 1.444 | .192 | 1.092 | .962 | .152 | .905 |

* Includes the existing roadway under build conditions.
** Includes Frederick Beltway contribution.

MESOSCALE BURDEN COMPARISON


* lnclude; coatribizion from traffic on existing roadway with Plan b built.
** includes rontribution from Frederick Beltway Intersection.
contribution of the existing roadway traffic and length. The "DoNothing" alternate would have had the lowest pollutant loadings in both years, and especially in 2000 when traffic would have been limited.
(4) The use of no-build speeds for build traffic has produced conservative estimates of micro and mesoscale pollution levels.

Faster speeds will result in lower carbon monoxide concentrations (both micro and mesoscale) and total hydrocarbon levels. However, high nitrogen oxide levels would result from faster speeds.
(5) Table 9 presents an overall comparison of alternates for both micro and mesoscale pollution levels, and summarizes the information contained in paragraphs 2 and 3 of this section.
(6) Note that significant reductions in the mesoscale loadings are anticipated in future years due to lower emission factors. All loadings in future years are less than existing loadings with the exception of nitrogen oxide loadings for Plan B and Plan A alternates in the year 2000. This increase would have resulted from the large increase in traffic volume in 2000 which would have offset the emission factor decrease.
C. Historical Impact

The Maryland Historical Trust, has stated that the proposed project will have no adverse impact on known historic sites in the project area. A copy of this letter is included in the Appendix (Item 85).
D. Archaeological Impact

Only one of the sites of archaeological significance as reported in section II. 9 is directly threatened by the proposed I-70. Plan B (and Plan B-1) will destroy linganore East, (site \#1SfR136). However

TABLE 9
Comparison of Alternates

this site is of minor cultural significance. It does not contain any concentrated deposits of prehistoric objects. Despite good survey conditions, only one artifact was found. If any others are present, they are few in number and widely scattered, and the site is unlikely to attract furtier archaeological attention.

Any or all of the sites could be indirectly affected by the proposed work. Site 18 FR 42 has already been largely destroyed by a housing develcpment. Further housing or industrial construction near I-70 could threaten other sites in the survey area. However, this potential impact cannot be assessed at present.

The U. S. Department of Transportation Policy and Procedure Memorandum 20-7 discusses procedures to be followed for archaeological and paleontological salvage. Their policies and procedures will be adhered to by the Maryland State Highway Administration.

## IV. DISCUSSION OF ALTERNATIVES

A. Physical Description

The proposed alternative alignments are described in detail
in Section I. Plan B is the recommended alternative. Plan A, Plan B-1 and the "Do-Nothing" plan are not recommended.

## B. Traffic and Accidents

The projected traffic volumes for Plan A, Plan B, Plan B-1 and "Do-Nothing" are indicated on Figures 23, 24, and 25. With the "Do-Nothing" alternative, U. S. Route 40 would have retained its present geometric design, which would have been functionally obsolete by 1985. The interstate standards incorporated into the geometric design of alternate Plan B will accommodate, safely and efficiently, the projected increase in traffic volume.

The design data for Plans $A, B$ and $B-1$ are as follows:
Design Hourly Flow Volume (DHV) $12 \%$ of Average Daily Traffic (ADT)

Directional Distribution $\quad 60 \%$ MDT
Truck Percent of ADT 15\%
Truck Percent of AHV $7 \%$
Accident Statistics shown in Table 10 relate the number of accidents to associated costs expected over a twenty year period. The accident figures for the "Do-Nothing" alternative are based upon records for 1970 and extrapolated to provide, 1990 traffic estimates. The accident figures for Plans A, B and B-1 were determined from actual data on similar type highways in Maryland for the year 1970, and extrapolated to provide 1990 traffic estimates. The report is available at the State Highway Administration in Baltimore.
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TABLE 10

Twenty Year Accident and Cost Estimates (1970-1990) For Plan A, Plan B, Plan B-1, and "Do-Nothing" Alternatives ${ }^{1}$

Plan A


In all cases, the accident cost by severity was based upon a study conducted by the Highway Research Board using data collected in Washington, D. C., Illinois and California. These costs include the present worth and future income of persons killed or permanently disabled, as well as average costs of property damage adjusted upward to include unreported accidents.

The number of accidents and associated costs for P1an A would have been 22 accidents and $\$ 364,000$ more than for Plan B and Plan B-1 during the 20 year period. Figures for Plan A compared to figures for the "Do-Nothing" alternative, show 82 fewer accidents at a saving of $\$ 954,000$ to the motorist over the same twenty year period. The projections used in this analysis are based upon actual accident and cost figures determined by recent studies, and any changes that may occur in either of these categories over the next twenty years could affect these comparisons.

## C. Traffic Operation

1. Plon A (not recomnended)

Plan A would have included the addiñ of two lanes to the Bartonsville section of U. S. Route 40 , the upgrading of this route to interstate standards, and the improving of some local service roads (sce Figure 4).

The projected through-traffic volunes (Figure 23) for I-70 would have been adequately accomodated, up to 1990. However, this accomnodation would have been achieved at the expense of local accessibility within the Bartonsville area. The existing at-grade
all at-grade intersections and would have substituted two interchanges: one at Bartonsville Road and the other located just east of Reich Ford Road.

The limited access feature of Plan A would have made adequate provisions for military traffic. In addition the maintenance and upgrading of local service roads would not have significantly reduced the road service between Bartonsville and the central business district.

The continued growth of the study area, will result in an increase in traffic volume on local service roads. Planned urban development in that region will, out of necessity, include schools. The geometric standards of Plan A would have eliminated all at-grade crossings, thereby decreasing the accident potential in school bus operations between areas north and south of the proposed I-70.

Plan A would have required a revamping of present bus routing to adapt to the new service road system. The new routes would not have resulted in adverse traffic conditions or safety hazards. The riding quality would have improved on those county roads upgraded under Plan A.

In terms of long term energy consumption, Plan A would have elimirated congestion created by local and through traffic. "Stop and go" conditions would have been reduced, and motorists would have experienced shorter delays, reduced fuel consumption, and safer operation.
2. Plans $B$ and $\cdot B-1$ : (Plan $B$ recommended $)$

Plans $B$ increases local and regional accessibility. In addition to providing local residents access to the interstate highway system, Plan B maintains the present local traffic pattern to which the residents are accustomed.

Plan $B$ has no significant advantage over Plan $A$ in the areas of national defense and fuel savings. Plan $B$ does not alter the present pattern of school bus operation, nor does it present any new problems in the planning of safe routing of emergency vehicles.

By the avoidance of areas of relatively high development, Plan B provides an opportunity for local authorities to plan the growth of Bartonsville proper, where a residential pattern is already in existence.

The various categories of national or local emergencies cannot be anticipated. However, facilities should allow unimpcded access to vulnerable population centers. Depending on the severity of any major emergency, the need for assigning priority to military traffic and rescue operations may be critical. Plan B-1 impacts would have been similar to those of Plan B.
3. "Do-Nothing" (not recommended)

Currently U. S. Route 40 is operating under capacity, and can adequately accommodate present local and through traffic volumes. These volumes are expected to increase as the level of economic activity increases in Frederick County and adjacent areas. In addition, increases in tourism and interstate conmerce are expected to occur.

Traffic volumes in 1974 were 28,400 ADT (Average Daily Traffic Volune). In 1978, traffic volumes on the improved new highway are predicted to be 34,050 vehicles per day. The predicted 1988 ADT is 48,200 vehicles. Using an average gas consumption of 14 miles/gallon, 1974 gas use would be 7708 gallons/day for the 3.8 mile improvenent. In 1978, after construction of the new highway and increase in predicted traffic volumes, gas consumption would be 9242 gallons/day
for the 3.8 mile improvement ${ }^{1}$. In 1990, predicted gas consumption would be up to 13,082 gallons/day. As traffic density increases beyond the stage of maximum volume, headway and speed decrease. Greater volumes of fuel consumption, high concentrations of exhaust particulates and gases, and longer travel time delays accompany the increased traffic density. This type of functional decay would have occurred over the Frederick section of U. S. Route 40 by 1985, at which time the carrying capacity of this section would have been reached. As a consequence, local traffic would have experienced increased delays; school buses would have encountered more hazardous conditions; emergency service vehicles would have responded less efficiently; and local productivity would have decreased as a result of the number of man-hours wasted in traffic congestion.

If existing U. S. Route 40 were the only route, and were designated for through emergency or military traffic, the congestion created by military or emergency traffic and local traffic could have disastrous consequences. The Bartonsville section of U. S. Route 40 appears unable to accommodate additional service demands which may accompany national emergency operations.

## D. Costs

The cost breakdown for Plan A, Plan B and Plan B-1 in 1975 dollars is:

[^6]| Cost Item | Plan A | Plan B | Plan B-1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Engineering and <br> Over Head | $\$ 2,735,270$ | $\$ 3,588,414$ | $\$ 3,620,791$ |
| Construction | $\$ 12,739,610$ | $\$ 16,573,436$ | $\$ 16,863,959$ |
| Right-of-Way | $\frac{4,719,735}{}$ | $\$ 1,699,650$ | $\$ 1,699,650$ |
| Total | $\$ 20,194,615$ | $\$ 21,861,500$ | $\$ 22,184,400$ |

## E. Summary of Impact

## 1: Comparison Chart

The social, economic, natural and traffic impacts associated with each alternative (Plan A, Plan B, Plan B-1 and "Do-Nothing") are summarized in Table 11 located at the end of this Section.
2. Advantages and Disadvantages
a. Plan A (Advantages)

1. would have minimized additional ecological impact compared to Plans B and B-1
2. would have provided an effective segregation of local and through traffic.
3. would have had a shorter length and lower cost than Plans B and B-1.
b. Plan A (Disadvantages)
4. would have required acquisition of substantial marginal right-of-way.
5. would have affected 25-30 families and 3 businesses.
6. would have necessitated lowering the present U. S. Route 40 grade line near Rartonsville Road as much as 18 feet to eliminate the present accident hazard.
7. would have required adjusting 2500 feet of vertical grade east of the Monocacy River to lower the U. S. Route 40 grade line as described above (\#3).
8. would have maintained the 4.5 percent vertical grade on the proposed Monocacy River bridge which would have bcen a safety hazard during freezing weather.
9. would have required constructing one-half mile of new roadway west of the Monocacy River to accommodate the proposed bridge.
10. would have necessitated constructing a 3 to 10 foot high retaining wall extending 2100 feet east from Bell Lane to protect a church and a private property from encroachment.
11. would have required rechannelizing approximately 5100 feet of Long Branch Creek.
12. would have required improving local service roads.
13. would have caused congestion during construction. c. Plan B (Advantages)
14. affects 9 families compared to 25-30 affected by Plan A.
15. provides greater design flexibility:
a. achieves a 1.5 percent vertical grade on the proposed Monocacy River bridge.
b. provides for a 74 foot median.
c. requires no rechannelizing or construction of retaining walls.
d. allows use of a hillside to act as a sound barrier.
16. provides ten-twelve foot roadways for improved traffic mobility (including U. S. Route 40).
17. improves local and through traffic flow.
18. minimizes congestion during construction:
d. Plan B (Disadvantages)
19. disrupts environmental stability in an area presently devoid of such highway associated impacts.
20. has a higher cost than Plan A.
e. Plan B-1 (Advantages) :
21. would have had advantages similar to those of Plan $B$.
f. Plan B-1 (Disadvantages)
22. would have amplified noise and air pollution problems by its proximity to U. S. Route 40 and Bartonsville.
23. would have divided a property with development potental to a greater extent than does Plan B.
24. would have been the most expensive.
g. "Do-Nothing" (Advantages)
25. would have minimized relocation and ecological impacts.
h. "Do-Nothing" (Disadvantages).
26. would have contradicted Federal, State and County planning objectives.
27. would have necessitated initial and continuing costly spot repairs.
28. would have increased congestion and traffic hazards.

## F. Summary

Other combinations of interlocking alignments and interchange schematics have been studied within the project area. Most have been
discarded for various economic, social or environmental reasons.
The declared policy of the State Highway Administration is to research and incorporate pollution control measures into the design of all highway projects. These measures will be used in the construction of Plan $B$ to minimize impact.

Table 11
Relative Impacts of Plans A, B, B-1 and "Do-Nothing"

Parameters
Social

| Relocation | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minorities | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Recreation | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Education | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Historical Sites | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Archaeological Sites | 0 |  | 1 |

Economic

| Businesses | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property values | + | + | 1 |
| Agriculture | 1 | 1 | 0 |

## Natural

| Air quality | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Noise | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| Water Quality | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Aquatic ecology | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Terrestrial ecology | 2 | 3 | 1 |

Traffic

| Through traffic (overall) | + | + | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| National defense | + | + | 1 |
| Local accessibility | 1 | + | 0 |
| School bus safety | + | 1 | 2 |
| Energy consumption | + | + | 1 |

Notes: 1) Ranked in increasing order of negative impact, hence " 1 " implies the least negative impact and " 3 " the most.
2) In case of similar impact the same rank applies to all.
3) A " +1 indicates a positive impact.

## V. PROBABLE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH CANNOT BE AVOIDED

Unlike adverse environmental effects which can be minimized or eliminated, this section concerns the effects of impacts which cannot be reduced or avoided.

## A. Relocation

Right-of-way acquisition is an unavoidable adverse impact. Plan A would have affected 25-30 families totalling 100-120 persons, and Plans B and B-1 affect nine families totalling 36 persons. In addition, three businesses would have been affected under Plan A. Relocation assistance will be provided for those families affected as required under guidelines established by the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Policies Act of 1970.

## B. Aesthetics

Freeways for the most part do not favorably lend themselves to the overall appearance of the abutting environs. Plan A would have maximized the disturbance on human life, while Plans B or B-l will disturb the serenity of an area presently devoid of urban influence. C. Air Quality

At present there are no air quality violations. The projected air quality surrounding each of the alternates will not exceed the one or eight hour standards at any distance from the road edge. D. Noise

Traffic noise is more objectionable to rural residents due to the inherent low background noise levels. Construction of highways on hilltop areas can increase the distance noise is carried throughout the Frederick valley overlook. Truck noise could be objectionable to many present residents far from the existing highway.

## E. Sedimentation

During the past several years, the safety provisions of highway design specifications, such as widened recovery zones and flatter slopes, have required ever increasing land areas to be stripped of vegetation during construction. These stipulations, increase the probability thas certain amounts of erosion and sedimentation will. occur.
F. Construction

Other adverse impacts which can be minimized are those associated with construction. These consist of air and noise pollution, and borrow pit reclamation.

## VI. STEPS TAKEN TO MINIMIZE UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

## A. Relocation

A major unavoidable adverse effect will be the need to acquire additional right-of-way thereby necessitating the relocation of some local residents. Steps taken to minimize this adverse impact are:

1. Establishment of a Right-of-way

The establishment of a right-of-way which minimizes the impact on homes, businesses, historic sites and major propercy improvements.
2. Payment of fair market compensation

Payment of fair market compensation will be made to affected property owners, for entire parcels or for residual land. Those affected are also reimbursed for costs incurred in moving. In lieu of payment of the actual moving expenses; an owner of a discontinued or relocated business or farm operation may be eligible to receive a payment equal to the average annual net earnings of the business, except that such payment shall not be less than $\$ 2,500$ nor more than $\$ 10,000$. Displaced individuals and family home owners may be eligible for replacement housing payments for like-value houses. Those persons relocated are assured safe and sanitary housing, and reimbursement for interest rate differentials and costs incurred incident to the purchase of a replacement dwelling. These payments will not exceed $\$ 15,000$. Tenants are also eligible for relocation benefits up to $\$ 4,000$. The relocation assistance program is described in section III.
3. Displaced Fersons

Displaced persons will receive assistance from a specially assigned representative of the State Highway Right-of-Way Division.

## B. Aesthetics

A highway can be made more compatible with its surroundings. One method of accomplishing this is to landscape the area between the roadway and the right-of-way limits. Also, an aesthetic architectural treatment of structures and interchanges will improve compatibility. C. Air Quality

The initial clearing and grubbing within the right-of-way will be controlled by contract provisions prohibiting contractors from burning materials: The State Highway Administration construction specifications have been approved by the Maryland Bureau of Air Quality and Noise Control.

## D. Noise

Noise pollution will be minimized by use, wherever feasible, of protective landscape buffers such as trees or walls.

## E. Sedimentation

Erosion Control - A temporary control schedule and method of operation will be worked out and approved by the State Highway Engineer prior to construction operations. The contractor will be required to control run-off by means of earth berms, slope drains, and portable flumes. Where necessary, energy dissipators, rip rap, sediment traps and basins will be incorporated at earliest time possible to minimize pollution. Items in the contract specifications restrict pollution by requiring final clean-up on completion of project, careful handling and storage of material, controlled or no burning of debris, seeding embankments and cuts to insure stability, trimming of borrow pits after use, protection of adjacent properties during dredging or hydraulic fill activities, replacement of salvage
topsoil, etc. These temporary and permanent control measures will do much to reduce highway oriented pollution such as siltation and sedimentation. The control measures will be effective in protecting streams. Detailed standards and specifications are stated in the State Highway Administration's "Book of Standards - Highway and Incidental Structures," Hydraulic Criteria for Design of Highways" and "Specifications for Materials, Highway, Bridges and Incidental Structures." In addition, the Administration's "Erosion and Sediment Control Program" issued August, 1970, has been adopted and approved by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources. A copy of this document is available at the State Highway Administration in Baltimore.

Continuing liaison will be maintained with the Maryland Department of Natural Resources concerning the location and design of structures which affect water courses.

## F. Construction

A temporary adverse effect will be caused by activities connected with the construction phase of the project. To reduce these undesirable impacts, certain standard specifications are written into all State Highway Administration construction contracts. These specifications define standard operating procedures to minimize environmental impacts. The contractor has the responsibility to adhere to these specifications in all instances involving any of his operations.

Chapter 245 of the Acts of the 1970 Maryland General Assembly requires construction contractors to obtain permits and approval from the appropriate public agencies for work such as borrow pits and waste area operations performed outside of construction limits.

The permits are predicated on treatment during, and after completion of the grading.

In most instances, fencing will be included in a separate contract to be installed after completion of the highway. The contractor is required to conduct the work in a manner so as to cause the least practicable obstruction to traffic. This would include providing access to abutting businesses and residents. Barricades, warning signals, flagmen and detours are to be used as added safety precautions. Construction activities and storage of material will be restricted to within the actual right-of-way limits. If dust conditions occur, they will be watered down or treated with discrete amounts of calcium chloride. Liability insurance is required against possible personal injuries and property damages. In addition, contractors are directly responsible for compliance with local, State and Federal Laws applying to any aspect of project construction.

## VII. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCAL SHORT TERM USES OF THE ENVIRONMENT

 VERSUS LONG TERM PRODUCTIVITYHighway improvements have inherent adverse short term impacts during the construction period. Traffic detours, congestion, landscape damage, noise and construction activity will undoubtedly inconvenience area residents. The State Highway Administration will make every effort to minimize these inconveniences.

One of the immediate short term impacts will be the removal from the tax roles of taxable property. Long range effects, however, of interstate highway construction on tax revenues have proved to be generally favorable. Expanded revenues will be generated as suburban developments grow along I-70.

Local community traffic movements would have been notably altered under Plan A. All at-grade intersections and turning movements at median openings presently allowed on U. S. Route 40 would have been eliminated. Local traffic would have been relegated to the proposed frontage road system. Some portions of the existing county road system would have been incorporated into the service road network.

Plan B leaves existing $U$ : S.. Route 40 virtually intact. The present at-grade crossing at U. S. Route 40 and Quinn Orchard Road, however, will be barricaded. Traffic in the Tulip Hill section will be redirected to the proposed two-way Patrick Street Bridge over I-70. The short term adjustments required by Plan B will be more than compensated for by improved safety and access to other urban areas.

## VIII. IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

Plan B passes through approximately eight acres of hardwood trees (oak, hichory; beech). Some of the timber removed may be processed into building material. Plan B-l would have had a similar impact.

The Maryland State Highway Administration, to meet its responsibility relative to a decision making policy, has actively sought the participation of all agencies and individuals known to be interested in, or affected by, the proposed highway improvement.

## A. Early Coordination

Early coordination consisted of advising concerned Federal, State, and County agencies, public officials and public advisory groups of its proposed highway improvement plan.

Tentative plans for the future alignment and interchange $10-$ cations of I-70 were discussed with public agencies as early as May, 1968. These early communications are outlined in Section I.D. Two concepts evolved as the most reasonable alternatives for loeating the proposed highway. A comprehensive description of these basic plans, known as Plans A and B, was distributed December 22, 1971, to over 27 public agencies, associations and elected officials for review and comment. Responses to this correspondence are contained in Subsection $F$ at the end of this section.

Of the 27 concerned offices that were contacted, responses were received from 20. An analysis of these responses indicated that 3 agencies favored Plan A, 3 favored Plan B, and the remainder deferred an opinion pending further developments. B. Comments on Draft Environmental Statement

The Draft Environmental Statement for the project was issued for review by public agencies and citizens on May 23, 1972. The agency distribution roster is included in the Summary Section of the Final Environmental Statement. Citizens were afforded opportunity
to review the statement at the State Highway Administration office, 4 Locust Street, Frederick, Maryland.

Of the twelve separate item responses, two favored Plan A, two favored Plan B and the remainder offered commentary and suggestions on both Plans. The responses were given every consideration during the evaluation process. Copies of this correspondence are included in the Appendix.
C. Public Hearing

Opportunity for citizen participation in the disposition of the proposed project was afforded through an informational hearing on June 29, 1972, and an official Corridor Public Hearing on July 6, 1972. Both hearings were held in the East Frederick Elementary School, Frederick, Maryland. A transcript describing the proceedings of the official hearing is on file at the headquarters office of the State Highway Administration.

Maps, drawings, the Draft Environmental Statement and other pertinent items were made available for public inspection and copying on June 6, 1972, at the State Highway Administration. Office, 4 Locust Street, Frederick, Maryland. This material will continue to be available for public scrutiny at either the local or Baltimore office by appointment. The conduct of the above actions was carried out in accordance with Federal Aid Highway Program Manuals, Volume 7, Chapter 7, Sections 2, 5 and 6, and was certified and approved by that agency on August 21, 1972.

Of the fifteen citizens who submitted testimony at the official public hearing, five spoke in favor of Plan $A$, three for Plan $B$ and six raised questions concerning various design features. A
statement by one non-resident condemns all new roads and the highway administration. Three of the speakers have supplemented their remarks with written statements. These briefs, resulting from the hearing, are included in the Appendix. Public opinion was also assessed through question/recommendation forms made available at the meeting. Thirty of the forms received favored P1 an B and four favored Plan A.

Also included are three separate petitions. Two petitions, favoring Plan B , contained 113 signatures from homeowners in the Tulip Hill area (Item 82), and 13 signatures from members of the Bartonsville Jackson United Methodist Church (Item 83). A third petition (Item 84), consisting of 240 names, favored Plan A. At least 38 names appearing on this petition do not reside within the project's immediate proximity. Correspondence and petitions are available for public scrutiny by appointment at the Maryland State Highway Administration office and are in the Appendix.

One of the many speakers at the official public hearing was Mr. Edwin E. Wells, a local citizen residing in the Jug Bridge Hill area. His supplemental statement (Item 29), included herein, adheres closely to his public hearing address. Much of this narrative is echoed elsewhere in the Environmental Statement, however, it does contain some interesting background information on the neighborhood affected by the project. His comments concerning the relocation characteristics of major portions of the Federal Interstate Highway System pointedly demonstrate that Plan B is not a radical aberation from the norm, but is indeed dictated by the very nature of the proposed project.

Mr. Robert T. Murphy of Montgomery County spoke in opposition to Plan B. His primary concerns involved an affected proposed Planned Unit Development to be known as Long Branch Estates of which he is owner/developer. A brief, covering the major points of this oral testimony, has been submitted and included in the Appendix (Item 30). Phase application for the Planned Unit Development (PUD), Long Branch Estates, has been under arbitration since as early as 1965. One reason for this situation is that existing $U$. S. Route 40 from Ijamsville Road to the Monocacy River was planned and constructed as a controlled arterial highway, and right-of-way was acquired accordingly under the policies in existence at that time. This was done to improve highway safety in this highly diversified area. Today the right-of-way into the Murphy property does not meet the necessary subdivision access criteria as promulgated by the Frederick County Planning and Zoning office. The proposed subdivision is composed of approximately 270 acres of 1 and located adjacent to and west of a proposed interchange shown on Plan A. The planned traffic movements in the proposed PUD were predicated on the State Highway Administration constructing a non-controlled service road on the north side of, and parallel to U. S. Route 40 , or proposed I-70 (Plan A).

Consideration has been given to Mr. Murphy's statement and pertiment SHA comments are presented later in this Section. D. State Highway Administration Final Evaluation and Decision

As a result of the Draft Environmental Statement and Public Hearings, several new construction provisions have been advocated. These additions have necessitated updating the costs quoted at the Hearing and in the Draft Environmental Statement. These revised
figures are presented in Section IV-D.
Based on the environmental impact evaluation presented in this report, including comments by various governmental agencies, private companies, and individuals, the State Highway Administration in its responsibility relative to the alignment disposition of the proposed project, has recommended the adoption of Plan $B$.

## E. State Highway Administration Responses

1. Early Coordination and Comment on Draft E.I.S.

The SHA responses directed to all correspondence from any one agency or group are placed together. The items referred to are included in the Appendix.
a. FEDERAL AGENCIES
U. S. Department of Agriculture

Item 2: No comments required.
Item 3: No comments required.
Item 18: Steps taken to minimize the adverse effects of erosion and sedimentation are discussed in Section VI-E, F.
U. S. Department of Commerce

Item 1: This agency declined to comment, citing their interpretation of Federal Environmental Guidelines requiring that Environmental Statements be prepared by the lead agency. In the case of a highway project, this would be the Federal Highway Administration. A paramount objective, however, of the National Environmental Policy Act is that early environmental consideration be made by the operating agency responsible for initiating, planning, designing and constructing a highway project. For highway sections financed with Federal funds, the State llighay Administration would normally be the appropriate
agency to initiate the environmental evaluation of a project in close consultation with the Federal Highway Administration. This position has been recognized by the August 9, 1975 amendment to Section 102 (2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Item 6: No Comments Required.
Item 20: No Comments Required.
U. S. Department of Interior

Item 4: No Comments Required.
Item 4a: Impact on national and cultural features is discussed in Section III. The State Highway Administration supposes that the highway should be constructed in such a manner as to decrease or minimize impact on the community. The future of Monocacy Pine Cliff Park as a local facility is discussed in Section II-C.

Mr. Handley's July 21, 1972, letter contains one sentence suggesting that County or State officials consider multiple use or joint development along Fouche Branch if Plan B is chosen. This is exactly what is proposed, and full cooperation is planned. The State Highway Administration has made initial contact with the Maryland Department of Natural Resources concerning this matter and with Plan B approved, further coordination will be extended with appropriate County-State officials prior to and during highway location and design. In order for the State Highway Administration to participate to the fullest extent, maximum right-of-way will be obtained to offset added park acquisition that may have to be funded by the County or State. Condemnation beyond the maximum allowable taking for highway purposes is not permitted by the State Highway Administration. However, if
excess 1 and occurs that could be utilized for park purposes, retention will be recommended and Federal participation will be requested. Participation in the design and construction of joint development facilities within the right-of-way will also be done to the fullest extent permitted by the Federal Highway Administration.

Item 5: Historic sites are discussed in Section II-E.
Item 8: Refer to comment on U. S. Department of Interior, Item ta.

Item 19: No comments required.
Item 19a: The exact right-of-way needs for the Plan B alternate cannot be accurately determined until completion of design engineering. Computations, however, based on the geometrics of Plans A and B indicate that the required acreages will be approximately equal. The illusion that Plan A requires less acreage because of the utilization of existing right-of-way along U. S. Route 40 is misleading for the following reasons.
a. Plan A requires an elaborate system of new frontage roads, necessitating new right-of-way acquisition.

- b. Plan A includes a cloverleaf type interchange between Mains and Bell Lanes requiring considerably more right-of-way than the two directional interchanges featured in Plan B.
c. Plan A requires land for outside third lanes along portions of the existing U. S. Route 40 right-of-way.

One point that is disputed is that while noise and air impact exists along U. S. Route 40 , the people living here, as can be attested from letters and public hearing comments, are not acclimated to it.

Sedimentation impact is discussed in Sections. III-B.2, and VIE, F.

Park land development is discussed under comments to the U. S. Department of Interior, Item 4 a .
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III

Item 7: No comments required
Item 21: Air quality impact is discussed in Sections III-B. 8 and V.C.

Water quality and water quality impact are discussed in Sections II-D. 5 and III-B. 3.

The State Highway Administration has considered three structure options in crossing Long Branch Creek on Plan B. A decision has been made in favor of the bridge concept.

The ambiguity of open space definition has precluded firm Federal-State-County commitments at this time. The question arises as to what type is needed; i.e., preservation, public enjoyment, suburban growth oriented or highway oriented. This should be properly resolved after the location and design of the proposed highway is clarified. No further land use commitments other than those in answer to U. S. Department of Interior, Item Aa, will be made at this time.
U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO)

Item 9: The revised assessment of relocation requirements for Plans $A$ and $B$ are discussed in Suction III-A. The numbers cited by OEO are in error. The unavoidable adverse impacts are discussed in Section V-A, B.
b. STATE AGENCIES

Maryland Department of Economic and Community Development
Item 10: No comments required.
Item 24: Traffic accessibility is discussed in
Section IV -C. 2.
Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene
Item 14: The agency's submission was informative and responsible. Their suggested input, Items 1 through 6, and others have been incorporated into the Final Environmental Statement. The No-Trade-Off Noise paragraph is well taken, however, this impact, as summarized in Section III-B. 7 tends to absolve Plan B of excessive noise impact.

Item 27: Refer to Section III-B. 8 for air quality impact assessment. Both Plans A and B will by-pass Frederick compared to the old method of routing through traffic via the central business district; as is the case with existing U. S. Route 40.

Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services
Item 26: No comments required.
Maryland Department of State Planning
Item 13: No comments required.
Item 11a: The early opinion of the State Planning and Clearinghouse Review favoring Plan A was modified after issuance of the Draft Environmental Statement. A Clearinghouse Review of this document tended to reverse or qualify the original position. This is verified by the Department of State Planning's Draft Environmental Statement Review Summary of Au rust 29, 1972 (Item 22A).

Baseline data and impact assessments on water quality and aquatic and terrestrial ecology are discussed in Section II-D.5, II-D.6, II-D. 7 and III-B.3, III-B.4, III-B.5, respectively. Land use planning is discussed in Section II-C.

Item 13b: No comments required.
Them 22: No comments required.
Item 22a: In response to the State Clearinghouse
Staff Review, appropriate statements are offered as follows for each pertinent comment. Responses from other agencies responding to Clearinghouse liaison will be answered in agency turn.

The Association of American Highway Officials considers the design of drainage structures using storm frequencies greater than 50 years to be economically unrealistic.

The description of alternatives including vertical and horizontal alignments is provided in Section I-C.

Existing and projected traffic and accident data are presented in Sections I-B. 2 and IV-B, IV-C.

Environmental impact is discussed in Sections. III and IV.
Projected economic impact is discussed in Section III-A.
Maryland Department of Water Resources
Item 11: No comments required.
Item 11a: Supplemental information was provided to the Maryland Department of Water Resources by a State Highway Administration letter of January 10,1972 , and an onsite project tour with highway officials on February 23,1972 . As a result, the Department of Water Resources endorsed Plan B with conditional qualifications as noted in follow-up letter of March 1, 1972.

In any case, there will be no restriction to the Monocacy $\%=$ River flood plain by either plan. The State Highway Administration is recommending, that the bridge option across Long Branch Creek be adopted. A feasibility study will be made regarding scenic overlooks and/or rest area potentials in the area extending from Long Branch Creek to Linganore Road. This can only begin after final disposition of the project is settled.

Maryland Historical Trust
Item 82: Bases for historical and archaeological impact assessment are reported in Section III.C and D.

## Maryland State Roads Commission

Item 5a: Impact on historical sites is discussed in Section III-C.
c. COUNTY AGENCIES

## Frederick County Board of Education

Item 17: A discussion of the impact on traffic flow, including school bus routing is included in Section IV -C.

Item 23: See comments to Item 17 above.
Frederick County Chamber of Commerce
Item 16: No comment required.
Item 25: The State Highway Administration's decision to utilize the bridge concept across Long Branch Creek, and the recommendation to construct an initial six lanes of interstate highway on Plan B will make this plan the most expensive.

A cost comparison is essential to the decision-making process. However, dollar cost is only one of the decision variables requiring consideration in this Environmental Impact Statement.

Plan A cannot be constructed within the present right-of-way without severely compromising interstate standards. Obviously then, the implementation of Plan A with its marginal right-of-way take has the greatest impact on the existing community. For a more detailed analysis of impact refer to Sections III and IV.

## Frederick County Planning and Zoning Commission

Item 15: Revised estimates of costs, relocation requirements, and impact on local traffic are discussed in Sections IV-D, III-A, and IV-C, respectively.

Frederick County Roads Board
Item 12: Plan $A$ and $B$ alignments and access road design are discussed in Section I-C.
d. PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS AND CORPORATIONS

Environmental Statement by L. J. Brosius
Item 28. Correspondent Brosius, in addition to residing in the Pine Cliff area, is also the principal of a corporation presently engaged in the development of large land holdings to the east and north of the proposed interstate highway. In this capacity, he has been vitally interested in the proposed highway and in marticular the disposition of the interchanges. His knowledgeable background and local insight are appreciated; however, some of his criticisms of the Draft Environmental Statement are unfounded.

Along with other opponents of Plan $B$, he has attempted to discredit the comparative cost of the alternates. A case in point in his grossly overestimated bridge construction cost of eighty dollars (80.00) per square foot as opposed to the twenty-six dollare ( $\$ 26.00$ ) per square foot used by the State Highway Admini-
station. The Administration's estimates were made in a fair and unbiased manner based on unit prices of similar projects in the area.

The inherent difficulties involved with the upgrading of U. S. Route 40 to interstate standards negate illusory cost savings of Plan A over Plan B. The impression that reconstruction can be somehow accomplished within present right-cf-way is simply not realistic. The reason for the supplementary right-of-way allowance for Plan A and not for Plan B is a combination of the need to provide immediate local traffic service roads and the conditional likelihood that a north-south highway facility will be needed in the near future. Local service on Plan B will be accommodated via the respective interchanges at both ends of the relocation, and utilization of U. S. Route 40.

Flexibility is also provided for an interchange contingency when the need arises. Other land saving design options mentioned on pages 6 and 7 of the Brosius correspondence all have been previously explored, and determined to be unsuitable. This includes the double deck bridge concept mentioned in Mr. Brosius' public hearing discourse. A structure of this type was investigated early in the location studies but proved to be over three times as expensive as any of the other bridge designs.

As there has been overwhelming support for six lanes of initial construction on Plan B, the State Highway Administration agrees with his page 2 suggestion that this be done. Also, a bridge option across Long Bunch Creek is now recommended. These added costs are included in revised Plan $B$ estimates (Section $I N^{\prime}-D$ ). The cost of Plan d has also been revised to reflect the Comity's request to
improve certain contiguous local roads.
Estimated right-of-way cost for both plans are predicated on facts presented from the same schematics appearing in the Environmental Statement. The Land Use Map (Figure 6) shows that most of the land involved is presently zoned agricultural. Long Branch Estates, mentioned on page 3 of the Brosius testimony, has restricted access right-of-way, which does not meet Frederick County Planning and Zoning requirements. The State Highway Administration cannot be responsible for sums of money private individuals extend for activities such as the sewer and water studies needed to get the land rezoned. If right-of-way acquisitions start within a. reasonable length of time, the State Highway Administration is of the opinion that the estimates, based on present day conditions, will be close to the herein quoted right-of-way estimates.

The Ridgeville rest area, mentioned on page 4 of the Brosius correspondence, will be a partial facility serving I-70 travelers from the eastbound lane only. Another rest area located fifteen miles farther east in Howard County will be the rest area for westbound I-70 traffic. A desirable criteria used in spacing rest area facilities is based on driver fatigue involving thirty minutes driving time. This is not a firm guideline, however, and more often than not the selected locations depend on site availability. That means that if during the course of right-of-way acquisition, a parcel is acquired because of severance or damage, the unused land will be then considered for open space utilization. This could mean any use, from a stationary vista consisting of only off highway parking for observation, to a complete park facility. In view of
growing citizen popularity for development of open space, and in consideration of the available natural amenities associated with Plan B, every effort will be made in this direction.

Part of Mr. Brosius' Public Hearing testimony concerned indecision in the selection of the interchange locations. Such facilities have been shifted to numerous positions during preliminary engineering during the exploratory phase of the study.

Environmental Statement by R. T. Murphy
Item 30: Section I, Page 1: - No proposed alternatives had as yet, been approved by Federal authorities.

Item 30: Footnote 1, Page 3: - Mr. H. D. Korrell of the Federal Highway Administration was in attendance at the unofficial and official public hearings of June 29, 1972, and July 6, 1972. He was formally introduced from the floor on both occasions.

Item 30: Footnote 2, Page 3: - Petitions objecting to Plan A signed by 126 residents, have been submitted. Letters have been received, the majority in opposition to Plan A.

The Maryland Department of Transportation has the responsibility to provide the citizens of Maryland with efficient and safe transportation facilities to support the social and economic aspirations of the State and its communities: A safe, efficient State primary and secondary road network is the responsibility of the State Highway Administration. Within the Administration, socio-economic and environmental analyses are initiated at the earliest stage of systems planning, and carried through to the project completion. The analyses are conducted under the guidelines established by the U. S. Department of Transportation's Federal Aid Highway Program Manuals which set down
specific procedures to be used.
The purpose of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is to assure that careful attention is given to the evaluation of environmental issues to ensure that adverse effects are avoided or minimized wherever possible, and that environmental quality is restored or enhanced to the fullest extent practicable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement is circulated for review and comment to Federal, State, and local agencies with jurisdiction by law and special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved. In addition, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement allows the concerned agencies and public to give meaningful consideration and make comments on all environmental issues.

Based on the evaluation in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the review comments received as a result of the circulation, and the responses from the public hearing, the Department of Transportation makes its recommendation of the alternative which minimizes the harm to the human environment. The Final Environmental Impact Statement, incorporating the review comments and any changes in the statement as a result of those comments, is forwarded to the Federal Highway Administration for final approval and adoption.

The process indicated above delineates the detailed environmental impact analysis required for the project and assures that the analysis is reviewed by many agencies with diverse concerns. Thus, there is a process which goes beyond the scope of the Highkay Administration, that minimizes the chance of choosing a more
dangerous, less adequate, longer, more costly and more environmentally damaging road. This process includes an evaluation of the alternative of upgrading an existing highway.

Item 30: Footnote 4, Page 6: - Direct access for the Murphy tract was denied because the rights of all abutting owners to access into U.S. Route 40 are subject to controlled arterial highway provisions imposed by public authority. This means that preference is given to through traffic by limiting access connections to selected public roads, and by prohibiting indiccriminate crossings at-grade or direct private driveway entrances.

As a result of several inquiries during 1965 by the Murphy interest, information was forwarded by the State Highway Administation outlining a very preliminary engineering study relative to the upgrading of U.S. Route 40 to interstate standards. A topographical map delineating a proposed service road was attached to this transmittal. The plans were stamped "tentative and subject to revision." In no way did it constitute a commitment on the part of what was then the State Roads Commission.

Item 30: Section III, Page 9: - The small group of vocal citizens consisted of thirty local residents. In actuality, they were an appointed delegation representing a much larger citizen group who had met previously on January 23, 1971. The meeting was hold to discuss their opposition to converting U.S. Route 40 to interstate standards.

Item 30: Section III, Page 10: - The Federal Highway Administration originally objected to the relocation concept on the grounds that it would cause delay. They were also unaware
of the mounting local opposition to the reconversion of $U$. S. Route 40 , Plan A, concept.

Item 30: Section III, Page 11: - The State Highway Administration Policy is to advise those individuals requesting copies of environmental Statements that they are available at the State Highway Administration Office, Federal Highway Administration Regional and Division Office and public libraries. Copies are forwarded upon request at free of change.

Item 30: Section IV, Page 12: - The State Highway Administration cost estimates are based on unbiased evaluation of engineering principles involving the various components needed to successfully construct the project, regardless of what plan is adopted. Since the public hearing, certain contingency input has required that the cost be revised. The new cost estimates are included in Section IV-D.

Item 30: Section IV, Page 13: - Bridge costs of $\$ 26$ per square foot, based on similar projects in the area, were used to compute actual bridge estimates.

Item 30: Section IV, Page 14: - Indications are that if the North-South Highway becomes a reality, the Plan A interchange would have reverted to a freeway facility. In this event, some type of tandem interchange would have to have been considered for local access.

Item 30: Section IV, Page 15: - Right-of-way costs are discussed in Section IV-D.

Item 30: Section IV, Pase 16: - An extensive service road system would have been needed for Plan A.

Item 30: Section V: - The severe impact of Plan $\lambda$ on

Long Branch Creck must be considered.
Item 30: Section VI: - The accident statistics presented in Section IV-B of the Environmental Statement are for the expressway type facilities.

Item 30: Section VII: - The Council on Environmental Quality, the Department of Transportation, and the Federal Highway Adninistratior: have interpreted the National Environmental Policy Act to allow the State Highway Department to prepare the environmental impact statements, in close consultation with the Federal Highway Administration. This position has been recognized by the August 9, 1975 amendment to Section 102 (2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

The intent of the National Environmental Policy Act is to assure that the operating agency considers environmental impact at the earliest possible time in the plannning process. The State Highway Administration in coordination with Federal Highway Adninistration initiates a review of environmental factors related to possible routes often before initial requests for federal funding have been submitted on projects where subsequent federal participation is anticipated.

Item 30: Section VII, Page 23: - The alternative proposed by Mr. Louis Brosius (Iten 28) had been investigated by the State Highway Administration and found to be unacceptable.

Item 30: Section VII: - The location determination of any interstate highway is dependent upon adequacy of design features, including fitness or acceptability to the surrounding
community, topography, culture and environment.
Implementation of these criteria does not assure that the best alternative will be the most economical. However, economic factors are always a principle determinant in the development of route locations. Item 30: Section IX: -Mr. Murphy alludes to the following letters from state agencies contained in the draft statement concerning environmental damage as caused by alternate Plan B.

1. State of Maryland, Department of Health and Mental Hygiene - January 19, 1972 (Item 14). "Plan B would most probably have the greatest effect from an air pollution standpoint during construction," (par. \#2). While it is acknowledged that implementation of Plan B would generate more pollutants from construction activities due to the construction of a greater number of lanes, this amount would not be significantly greater than the construction of two additional lanes under Plan A:

Air pollution does not confine itself to a narrow corridor around a highway, but rather is subject to meteorological conditions including wind and temperature. The two proposed alternative routes are less than a mile apart, suggesting that there would be little difference in the degradation of air quality between the two. Air pollution impact is discussed in Section III-B.8. Also, the initial clearing and grubbing necessitated within the right-of-way will be controlled by contract provisions prohibiting contractors from burning combustible materials. "Plan B would allow for the introduction of high noise levels in territory which is not presently under environmental insult from highways," (par. \#4). While this is true, the noise impact is only one of many considerations which must be taken
into account when considering a highway alignment. Under Plan B in the vicinity of each noise sensitive area, the $L_{10}$ noise levels will be well below the design standard of 70 dbA (refer to Section III.B-7).
2. State of Maryland Department of State Planning - January 21, 1972 (Item 13A). "...it has been noted that its (Plan B) selection would require a complete reexamination of the Land Use Plan for the area between the two highways (Plan B and existing Route 40)," (Par. \#2). The land involved is changing from-agricultural to urban. The General Plan for the year 2000 indicates that the concerned area is designated for low and medium density development. Mr. Murphy's reference to the Department of Interior refer to it's letter of February 4, 1972, to Mr. Roland M. Thompson, Chief, Bureau of Location and Surveys, State Highway Administration. Mr. Murphy has accurately quoted the opening sentence of the letter's third paragraph. However, he fails to note the preceding paragraph which states in part, "in no way should our comment be construed as a complete endorsement of one alternative over the other, since, obviously there is not sufficient information on hand to form such a judgment."

In response to Mr. Murphy's statement concerning a narrow island of prime land, Mr. Edwin E. Wells' supplemental statement (Item 29) makes an accurate assessment of this practice. He states, "It would appear that the best designed interstate highways have done this in the case of every interstate road in the nearby vicinity in the attempt to be reasonably close to the existing old through highways, and yet not eliminate existing settlements, villages, and communities." The position of the State llighwy Administration is to minimize
this type of land carving, but this is not possible in all cases.
Mr. Murphy also claims that implementation of Plan B would sever the the PUD and destroy the approved use of the property for low-density residential dwellings.

Mr. Murphy's proposed PUD, Long Branch Estates, has. received only conceptual approval and has not received all the necessary approvals. While it is acknowledged that Plan B will split the proposed PUD, it will not completely destroy the potential for the land to be developed for low density residential dwellings, as well as the scenic and recreational areas that Mr. Murphy described. Access to the land would still be retained by Linganore Road, Shill Lane, and Quinn Orchard Road.

Mr. Murphy's refernce to the highway running through a 10 acre elementary school site is in error. In a letter dated March 16, 1972 from James P. Masood, Supervisor of Transportation for the Board of Education of Frederick County, to Mr. Thompson, Chief, Bureau of Location and Surveys, State Highway Administration, Mr. Masood outlines the tentative future school construction plans for the area concerned. The future school site in question is in the area of Long Branch Creek, south of Plan B and north of the present U. S. Route 40. The proposed school, to be completed in September, 1977, is located in the proposed Long Branch PUD. This location required the taking of a minimum of property of the school site. The roadway itself will be depressed in the area of the proposed school so as to reduce noise levels.

The primary reason for Mr. Murphy's strong opposition to Plan B appears to be the severence and lack of access for his proposed
sub-division, Long Branch Estates.
Plan A would not have severed the property and would have provided access by the utilization of a service/frontage road that would have been constructed with public funds.

At the Public Hearing, Mr. Murphy stated that the State Highway Administration more than a decade ago laid out a corridor for proposed I-70 clearly. identified with present U. S. Route 40 from Baltimore to Frederick. The State Highway Administration takes this opportunity to make it clear that the first 13 miles from Baltimore to Pine Orchard were constructed entirely on a new location with certain sections creating the same narrow land island effect. It can be claimed that these 13 miles are in the same I-70 corridor. The narrow island situation is found throughout the interstate highway system.
sub-division proponents are active on either side of the Murphy tract. As all these properties would be adversely affected by Plan B, two of the owners, Mr. Rovert M. Keats, President of Investors and Developers Service Inc. of Chevy Chase, Maryland (Item 31), and Mr. Morris Kanfer, President of Metro-Land and Growth Investments, Inc. of lashignton, D. C. (Item 32), have closely aligned themselves with Mr. Murphy in opposition to Plan B. All of their properties are presently farm land tracts to the north of U. S. Route 40. None have the proper access requirements to become residential developments. Plan B will require concessions and expenditures by these developers to properly qualify their land as bonified property for planned unit developments.
e. OTHER CORRESPONDENCE

Items 33 through 81: - These items are posture statements which for the most part are self-explanatory. In general, the problems and objections raised in these items have been discussed in the Environmental Statement. Thirty-four of these items favor Plan B, eight favor Plan A, two are neutral, and three are against both of the preferred plans. Many of these people nave also documented their views with various elected officials and government agencies.

APPENDIX

December 28, 1971

Mr. Roland M. Thompson, Chief Bureau of Location \& Surveys
State Highway Administration
THE ASSISTANT,SECRETAGIY OF CAME: Washington, D.C.


300 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Dear Mr. Thompson:
This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter transmitting a document entitled "Daft Environmental impact Statement for Contract No. F 605-000-772 Interstate Route 70-N Ijamsville Road to West of Monocacy River.

The National Environmental Policy Act, as implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality, requires each Federal agency contemplating a major action which may have a significant impact on the environment to prepare a draft environmental impact statemont.

Full participation by the Federal "leas agency" in the preparation and/or review of each draft environmental impact statement prior to its release is essential to conform with the spirit and letter of the Act as required by the CEQ guidelines published in the Federal Register on April 23, 1971. (Vol. 36, No. 79). Therefore, it is the policy of this Department to refrain from commenting under the Act on any document, regardless of how titled, unless the lead agency has either prepared or reviewed and officially released. the document as a Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

For this reason, we offer no comments on the report which you sent us. Undoubtedly, your comments will be most helpful to the lead agency in its preparation of the required draft environmental impact statement, which it will send te us for review and comment.

Sincerely,


Sixty シ̈raller
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Environmental Affair:

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE


Washington, D. C. 20250

Nr. Roland M. Thompson, Chief Bureau of Location \& Surveys State hizhiag Administration 300 Neat Preston Street
-Baltimore, Md. 21201
Dear Mr. Thompson:
Subject: Contract No. F 605-000-772
Interstate Route 70-N
Ifumsville Road to West of Monocaby River
'Your letter of December 22, 1971, to Dr. T. C. Byerly, orifice of the Secretary of Agriculture, respecting the above subject hes bevin referred to the Soil conservation Service state office for handling,

We are asking Mr. J. H. Gibson, Acting State Conservationist, Soil Conservation Service, 4321 Kartwick Road, College Park, Maryland 20740, to send you SCS comments and suggestions. He and his local staff people are in a better position to do so than would be the case at the National level.

## Sincerely,



Oran
Kenneth E. Grant Administrator
ce:

J. Ii. Given, Acting State Conservationist SCS, Coll ese Park, Ma.
W. B. Dave, SCS, Hush. D C.

# UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE <br> SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE - 4321 Hartwi.rk RH. . Pm. 522 <br> College Park, Maryland 20740 

January 10, 1972

Roland !r. Thompson, Chief<br>Bureau of Location \& Surveys<br>State lifliway Administration<br>300 West Preston Street<br>Baltimore, Maryland 21201

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Re: } & \text { Contract No. G05-000-772 } \\
\text { Interstate Route } 70-\mathrm{N} \\
& \text { Ifamsville Road to West of } \\
\text { Monocacy River }
\end{array}
$$

Dear Mr. Thompson:
Your letter dated December 22, 1971 addressed to Dr. T. C. Byerly, Office of the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. concerning comments on the location on the above mentioned highway has been referred to this office. The location of neither of the alternative routes involves no projects that the Soil Conservation Service foresees in the future and we have no comments concerning? the relative advisability of selecting one alternative over the other.

Thank you for the opportunity of reviewing the proposal. Sincerely,

cc: Kenneth E. Grant, Administrator, SCS C. Paul Edwards, D.C., Frederick, Md.
-
United States Department of the Interior
OFIICI: OF THE SECRETARY WASHINGTON, DC. 20240

Dear Mr. Thompson:
This is in regard to your letter of December 22, 1971, ? requesting the Department of the Interior's review and comments on proposed location alternatives for Interstat: 70-N In Frederick County, Maryland.

Interior Department agencies which may be concerned with tie locations proposed have been asked to respond directly $t$ your office in providing comments. Because of the hold $y$ period and the backlog of work at field-level offices whee re most such proposals are reviewed, it is likely that some of these agencies will not be able to offer comment by the date you indicated. We trust, however, that those desiring to comment will be able to respond by mid-February 1972.

Sincerely yours,


Bruce Blanchard, Direct ir Environmental Project Review
Mr. Roland M. Thompson
Chief, Bureau of Location and Surveys
State highway Administration
P. O. Box 717

Baltimore, Maryland 21203

BunEAU OF OUIUOOR HECREATION

> \|lllial lllll llive.
> l.1.1 111 bus $\cdot \boldsymbol{1 1 / 1 1} 1$


Mr. Roland M. Thomnson, Chtef<br>Bureau of location and Gurvoys<br>Utate llighway fidministration<br>300 liest Hreston $\dot{3}$ treet<br>- Boltimore, Maryland 21201<br>Dear Mr. Thompsoni

FEB 11972

In response to your letter doted December 22, 1971 to the Departthent of the Interior, this agency has reviewed the two alternative locations proposed for that segment of I-TUN southenst of Irederick, Maryland (ljansville lload to west of Monocacy liver), and jur comments are as follow.

Your ono and one-half parse letter, together with the map illustrating Ucliemo B. comprisn our total source of reference, se of nerosesity our remarks must be general in scope, and are offored in the nature of technical nssistance. In no way should our coniments be construed as a enmplete endoremment of one alternative over the other, since ohvinusly there is not riufficient information on hand to form such a judemment.

It appenars to us that the reconstruction of U.S. Houte 10 to three travel lanes in each direction js prefernbie to construction of a new interstate highway north of the present U. $\because$. Noute 40 . Vio bellieve that the negntive effects on the environment, including soil reosjon and subscquent siltation of the Monocacy and fender streams, and also the lose of valuable crop land, forest land, and wildife habitat will be axtmosive in the event that Scheme 13 is: purened. The rechannelization of lonel lranch will he neenscary if the formon alternative $i: s$ selereted, and this will involve the loss of eortain natural values, hat om halance wo bejjeve that recoostruction will reseult iri less ovirall deqradation af the mendroment.

Wo notr, in addition, the existence of a public recreation aren, j.en.
 urye the wtate lligheay Commission to consides the possibilitiy of

Joint development., perhaps access from the proposed interstate, and

 hie linen used successfully by the Interstate Division tor baltimore City to add to the recreation base in that municipality.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment, and trust that you flan these comments to be of some usefulness.


NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
northeast region
143 south tilird greet
philadelphia. pa. 19106

030
NER(CP)
ك解 20272

Chief
Bureau of Location and Surveys
State Highway Administration
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
Dear Sir:

We have reviewed the two proposed alternatives for location of InterState 70-N, Ijamsville Road to West of Monocacy River, Frederick

As far as we can determine, the proposals will not adversely affect any existing or proposed units of the National Park System or other programs of the National Park Service.

To Insure that the project will not affect any historical or Registogical resources, it is recommended that you check the National Officer for Historic Preservation. The inf with your State Liaison two sources should then be incorporated information gained from these statement.


raryland IIstoricsl Trust
, :lando Rldout, IV, Director
fliaicon Oificer for Maryland
; 30x $\$ 170$,
polis; Maryland 21404
(1/r. R1dout:
$\because$
This office is presently conducting hifghoy stucies on リ.s. noute 40, from kville to I-7OS in Frederick Countj. Our intent is to ungrade and convert isection of roadway to Interstate loute 70.

The ultimate improvement may be influeneed somewhat by confliction with two \$iole historical sites. In particular, we refer to the followine locations:
(1) A private residence on the noith side of the old lintionnl pike, Just west of what was the "rur: Brldus:" over the Monocncy River. It has been broucht to our atitention this may be an old toll house.
(2) A stone monument on land roaldue botween the 0id National pike (Patrick Street) and U.S. Ionic lio juit enst of City Iine of Froderick, Mryland. This mny have been a monument forwerly located on the derunct "Jug Irldec".

The enclosod vecinity map may be of use in identifying the exact joenla. Fuld appreciate your help in cotcibluhtue if these are registered hictorionl ss and if co, of what aienificouce.

Thank you for your interest and please advise if we can be of asoiatance.



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
REGION III
401 NORTH BROAD STREET
PHILADELPHIA. PENNSYLVANIA 19108
January 26,1972

OFFICE OP THE REGIONAL DIRECTOR

MAILINg. ADORES:
PoO. 10112000 - hiladi ipmia. pentarglvania isis

Mr. Roland M. Thompson
Chief, Bureau of Location \& Surveys
State Highway Administration
300 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201 .
Dear Mr. Thompson:
This is to advise you that the Regional Director of the Departinent of Health, Education and Welfare, Region III has no comment to make on the environmental impact of the following project which was ! ens to him for review.

Contract No. F605-000-772
Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$
IJamsville Road to West of Monocacy River


Edward Jon Gus
Assistant, Regional Director fo: Planning and Evaluation
ce: Robert D. Lanka HEW, Washington, D.C.

# USS. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION iII 

Eth \& Walnut Sis., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106


Mr. Roland M. Thompson
Chief, Bureau of Location Surveys
State Highway Administration
300 West Fsesion surest
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
Re: Contract No. F 605-000-772
Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$
Ijamsville Road to Fest of Monocacy River
Dear Mr. Thompson:
In response to your December 22,1971 request, reference above, we have no specific comments to present at this time. However, we offer the following general comments for your consideration.

We will assume that any significant environmental impact produced by this project will be identified during the feasibility investigations stage, and that these effects will be heavily weighed early in the decision-making process.
When the environmental impact statement is prepared for this project, the total and cinulativis effects of this highway on the surrounding area should be considered and evaluated, including the city of Frederick. In this light, you may wish to assess the impact of future $1-70$ and other adjacent highway construction plans in one overview statement rather than using the piecemeal approach usually taken by most state Highway figencies. Your attention is invited to paragraph 6. Procedures of PPM 90-1, which supports our opinion. Our staff 13 available to assist in this regard.
he appreciate the opportunity to comment.
Sincerely yours,


Robert J. Blanc, P. E.
Environmontal Impact section

## UNITED STATES

 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR EUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATIONfederal building
1421 CHERRY STREET
PHILADELPHIA. PENNSYLVANIA 19102
FEB 4 1972

Rolünd M. Thoripson, Chief

eau of Location and Surveys
die Highway Administration
: Viest Freston Street
timore, Maryland 21201
HIP Mr. Thompsons
response to your letter dated December 22, 1971 to the Depart$t$ of the Interior, this agency has reviewed the two alternative :ations proposed for that segment of I-70N southeast of Frederick, :Iland (Ijamsville Road to west of Monocacy River), and our comments as follow.
: one and one-half page letter, together with the map illustrating are $B$, comprise our total source of reference, so of necessity : femarks must be general in scope, and are offered in the nature iechnical assistance. In no way should our comments be construed ? complete endorsement of one alternative over the other, since iously there is not sufficient information on hand to form such . Igment.
ippears to us that the reconstruction of U.S. Route 40 to three
val lanes in each direction is preferable to construction of a new

- istate highway north of the present U.S. Route 40 . We believe
$\because$ the negative effects on the environment, inciuding soil erosion
: subsequent siltation of the Monocacy and feeder streams, and also
- ioss of valuable crop land, forest land, and wildife habitat will
iliensive in the event that Scheme $B$ is pursued. The rechannelization
ing Branch will be necessary if the former alternative is
$:$ :ted, and this will involve the loss of certain natural values,
: on balance we believe that reconstruction will result in less
l:all degradation of the environment.
Ote, in addition, the existence of a public recreation area, i.e.,
:iscy Pine Cliff Park, about a half mile south of U.S. 40. We
: ${ }^{\text {e the }}$ State Highway Comission to consider the possibility of

Int development, perhaps access from the proposed Interstate, and ;o the acquisition of lands in excess of highway needs. The ter is in accordance with FFWA's PFM 21-19 and IM 21-2-69, and been used successfully by the Interstate Division for Baltimore :y to add to the recreation base in that municipality.
appreciate the opportunity to comment, and trust that you find use comments to be of some usefulness.


## 17FFD 1972

Mr. Roland M. Thompson, Chief Bureau of Location and Surveys State Highway Administration 300 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

## EXECUIIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20SDS
Re: Contract No. F 605-C00-772
Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$
Ijamsville Road to West of Monocacy River

Dear Mr. Thompson:
Phillip Sanchez, Director of Office of Economic Opportunity, has asked me to respond to your letter of December 22, 1971, regarding the documents relating to the above mentioned project.

The Office of General Counsel, our Regional Office, and the affected community action agencies have carefully reviewed these documents.

The community action agency states that Plan " $A$ " would most effect low and moderate income families. It is estimated that between forty and fifty homes would be razed, the majority of which are now occupled by those of 1 imited financial means.

Plan "B" would have a minimal effect on these families. We would therefore urge serious consideration for implementation of Plan "B", unless adequate provision for property appraisal, compensation and satisfactory comparable relocation housing is assured.

We appreciate the opportunity to cament on these documents.


Arthur J. Reids Jr.


Director
Intcrgovemental Reiatiors

| $\square$ | $\ddots$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\vdots$ | $\ddots$ |
| $\vdots$ | $\therefore$ |
| $\vdots$ | $\vdots$ |
| $\vdots$ | $\ddots$ |
| $\vdots$ | $\cdots$ |
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## STATE OF MARYLAND Department of Economic and Community development

WESTERN MARYLAND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICE 100 W. WASHINGTON STREET. MAOERETOWR: MARYLAND 21740<br>TELEPMONE-781.2222

December 27. 1971

Mr. Roland M. Thompson, Chief
Bureau of Location \& Surveys
State Highway Administration 300 West Preston Street Baltimore, Ka. 21201


Subject: Contract No. F605-000-772, Interstate Route 70-N

Does Mr. Thompson:
Your letter and maps of December 22, 1971 have been reviewed by this office end we have found that since we primarily cover the three westernmost counties we have no particular interest in commenting on this project.

I m , tharofore, forwarding your material to Mr. William Braun, Chief, Fociaral \& Field Liaison Office, Div, of Economic Development, Aanapolia, in the event staff those may want to provides some input.


DNT/5B
ce: William B. Braun

STATE OF MARYLAND DEpartment of Hater resources

STATE OFFICE BUILDING
ANNAPOLIS. MARYLAND 21401

## December 29, 1971

Mr. Roland M. Thompson, Chief Bureau of Location \& Surveys State Highway Administration 300 West preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
Re: Contract No. F 605-000-772 Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$ Ijamsville Road to West of Monocacy River

Dear Mr. Thompson:
The above location studies have been reviewed by this Department. We would, however, like to know what bridge work would be required in upgrading the bridge over the Monocacy River to interstate standards as proposed in Scheme A. Also, how many stream crossings would be necessary in Scheme $B$ in addition to the structure over the Monocacy River.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. We are looking forward to attending the public hearing.


Michael A. Ports
$M A P: j k$

# STATE OF MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES 

STATE OFFICE BUILDING
ANNAPOLIS. MARYLAND 21401
March 1, 1972

Mr. Roland M. Thompson, Chief Bureau of Location and Surveys State Highway Administration 300 West Preston street Baltimore, Maryland 21201


Re: Contract No. F-605-772 Interstate Route 70 N Ijamsville Rd. to west of the Monocacy River

Dear Mr. Thompson:
As a result of a meeting between Mr. Michael Ports of this office and Mr. Charles Anderson, Chief of Landscape Bureau, this Department has further comments concerning the above referinced project. It is recommended that Scheme "B" be adopted if the following changes can be made:
1.: The twin $14^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}$ box culvert over Long Branch approximately 0.5 miles east of the Monocacy River should be eliminated and a bridge should be substituted.
2. The entire floodplain of the Monocacy River should be spanned by the proposed bridge. No piers should be placed in the river itself.

If the above conditions can be met, the Department would prefer scheme "B". It is further suggested that consideration be Given to the possibility of a scenic overlook between Long Branch and Linganore Road as well as a seperation of the east hound and west hound roadways over Long Branch. If the natural forested area is loft in tact, it will provide a beautiful sting for the overlook. It may be possible for the Department of Natural Resources to cooperate in the purchase of the Long Branch Valley to ensure that the orca remains scenic.

Mr. Koland M. Thompson
March 1, 1972
Page 2

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Michael. Ports (telephone 267-5323).

Very truly yours;
(Pobut J. ication, h.
Robert S. Norton, Jr., Chief Surface Water Management

## RSN:MP:CSC

cc: Mr. Louis Phipps
Mr. Fred Eskew
Mr. A. F. Abar

January 5, 1972

Mr. Roland M. Thomnson, Chief Eureau of Location \& Surveys State Highway Miministration 300 West Preston itreet
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
Dear Mr. Thompson:
This letter is in reference to your letter dated December 22, 1971 in reference to Contract No. F' 005-000-772, Interstate Route 70-N, Ijamsville Road to Wost of Monocacy River. I have reviewed your letter and the accompanying Schemes $A$ and $B$ and have made the following observations.

Scheme A - I request that the relocated sections of Meadow Road and Ijarasville load be built according to County Specifications and that their final alignment te approved by the County.

If Scheme $\Lambda$ is the scheme which is finaliy decided upon, the following questions are raised by the County Engineer.

1. If Bartonsville Road, Mains Lane, and Bells Lane become service roads will the be improved by the State Mighway Administration at no cost to the County? It is fuestionable whether these roads could in their present condition adequately serve 3 service road:
2. Schome A shows a service road connecting Quinn Orchard Road with existing Reic Ford liod and paralleling Dover Street within Tulip Hill Subdivision. I would :ecomend moving thit: propo:ed service rout to the couth approximately $300^{\prime}$ so the dittor conmention con be madn. I have enclooed a akotch which shows the propou. 4 limeant of Now hiede Ford lioad and how the proposed service road can be huilt :conjunction with the bropoend Reiche Ford Road. . If this proposed nervice road is : and further south f feel that traific conld be kont away from Tulip Hill Guixdiv: $\because 1$ thus elimiate and reduen truffic within this re:idential area. It is also : ineld that exi:t ing Reichi Ford Road from the City Lime to the beginning of the $\therefore$ an enotruction of linicha Ford Road can be relocated in a better location to movilo better alimment with the propo:ced corvice road and the enterchange 1 finar the M.J. Grove Lime Plant.

Mr. Roland Thompson
January 5, 1972
Page 2

Scheme B - I request: that the relocated sections of Quinn Road, Meadow Road, Linganore Road and ljum:ville Road be built to County Specifications and their final alignment be approved by the County.

I thank you for the opportunity to review these schemes and I would be happy to meet with you at your convenience to discuss these schemes in more detail if you so desire.


WSF:1b
Enc.
cc: Board of County Commissioners
Mr. Waller E. Woodford, Jr.
Mr. Hugh C. Downs
Mr. William F. Linn, Jr.
Mr. Philip R. Miller
Mr. Thomas G. Mohler
Mr. H. Thomas Summers


## MARYLAND

[dEPARTMENT OF STATE PLANNING

301 WEST PRESTON GTREET
EALTIMORE. MARYLAND 21201
TELEMONE 301.383.2481

January 10, 1972

Mr. Roland M. Thompson
Chief, Bureau of Location and Surveys
State Highway Administration
300 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
RE: Contract No. F 605-000-772
Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$
VLADIMIR A. WAKE E

Ijamsville Road to West of Monocacy River
(Part of State Clearinghouse Project No. 298)

Dear Mr. Thompson:
In accordance with your January 3, 2972 telephone request that the State Clearinghouse circulate your December 22, 1971 letter on the above project in advance of the determination of State Highway Administration procedures for handling the various types of reviews of proposed projects, we have requested (copies attached) the Department of Natural Resources, Department of Health and Mental Hygiene's Division of Air Quality Control, and Frederick County Planning and Zoning Commission to submit their comments directly to your bureau. We are also circulating your letter within the Department of State Planning, and will provide you any comments developed by that review.

Because of the lapse of time since receipt of your letter. all replies may not be available by your recuosted response date of January 21, 1972.


Edwin I. Powell, Jr. Chief, state Clearinghouse

ELS: 33
R ti.
ce: Northan D. Fico

## MARYLAND

301 WEST PRESTON STREET BALTIMORE MARYLAND 21201

TELEPHONE 301.383.243:
vLacimina. water
EECRETAMV OF sTATE PANNING
NORMAN HERDER
Deputy ecemetant

January 21, 1972
lir. Roland K. Thompson, Chief
Bureau of Location and Surveys
State llimway Administration
300 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
Dear Kr. Thompson:
In response to your request that I circulate your December 22, 1971 letter concerning Interstate Route $70 N$ from I jamsville Road to west of the Ronocacy River, 1 have received comments frontal within the Department of State Planning. I. have also received a copy of the January I'8, 1972 letter from Fir. Edward F . Molter, of the Frederick County Planning and Zoning Commission, to you. I have not received any information from the Department of ivalural Resources or the Division of Air Quality Control, in the Eavironmontall llenlth Administration, in response to my request that they forward their converts directly to you.

The comments from within the Department of State Planning tend to Savor upgrading the existing, highway alignment (Plan A). Concerning the norther alternative ( Pl an B ), it has been noted that its selection would require a complete ro-cxamination of the Land Use Plan for the area between ire two hifliways. 'the recently adopted Comprehensive Development Plan for Frederick County recominends low and molerntie density residential development, and a new elementary school in the area through which alternative $B$ would pass. Physical or water and sewer constraints must be examined in terms of their impact on development in the corridor. The impact on the Monocacy watershed would also require study.

1 trust that this information will be of benefit to you and appreciate jour cooperation with the State clearinghouse.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Sincureiy, } \\
& \text { Jean J. Schuchonan } \\
& \text { A-ticny uar } \\
& \text { :isetham B. Frjose }
\end{aligned}
$$

mARYLAND
DEPARTMENT OF STATE PLANNING
joi west pitegton ritneer
OALTIMOHI: PAITYLAND : 21201
TELEPHONE, 001.080 .04 :
vladimia a. wamee
101. - MANIJL

Ir. David ! I Visher, Administrator
'itw: th: i in hu:ay admirsistration
joi ' o:;b Presicon itreoct

 1-76: :umbic (vorlcok

inene:r. lijulirr:

The Staio Clearinhhouso has receivod tho notiflcation of intont to apply for Foderal aid for tho obovo projoct. The reviow of this project has now boon inillatod and you may oxpoct a roply from us by anch :", l!"..
If you have any quostions concoming this roviow, ploaso contact ir. Allun Files (3i3-il:71) of thia Clearinehouse.

We are interosted in your project and will mako overy offort. to onsure prompt action. Thank you for your cooperation with tho Cloaringhouso prosram.


$\because \mathrm{P}: \Omega$
re: ibneham ? . wric:n
$\therefore$ Ar F. Whodhord
:hr: Duwn:
: Fricso
$\because r$ : $\because$ hite
$\because$ har, $\because$ Hompson


# DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE Neil Solomon, M.D., Ph.D., Secretary 

Fe it hway iumanatration
A. i.0. 717
fincre, finelane alcol
ii: rinioy 1!, x\%c
ir. Thomuson:

r have received your let.ter requesting revien of the hi'. hway location sturlies
 sio choosine betwion the two attern tives, rlan wonld wo:t proo-bly have

 - x ll therere contiphbere morr molution.

 An rnopolitjes coulej be male. flan a wolld hean more traflic on the nxisting 'reffic onto two roads ons of jollutants alore the roan. rlan a wo:ll split whond experjence lower concontrations ine linediate vicinity of existing

 $\therefore j$ fricult.












 frather hot: is merited.

- Uincorejy yours,

1


ム $\dot{\sim}$ Jenr , J. chuenemar, !irector fureni of: if inality fontrul
:Miy:bac
Tuwin I. Fowell, ir., Chief
staic U]raririchone
asrael: ilner, tres te, ional Ufilice
trodericl: lounty lonlth ivepartinent

RE: State Clearinghouse Project Number 298 Widening Highway I-70N in Frederick County

Sear Mr. Thompson:
The Frederick County Planning Commission meeting in public sessions on January 13th :nd January 18th have reviewed the project for upgrading U.S. 40 to Interstate : $:$ ute $70: i$ from Ifamsville Road to west of the Monocacy River. The Commission eels that based on the information submitted, Scheme B, would appear to merit :onsideration.
ie would also like to repeat the same requests that we have made in all of our the reviews of this project, that more information be submitted so as to make : solid judgement. For example: we have not received estimates of costs, we :: : ie not received indications of what would be the difference in terms of homes -moved nor the way in which individual properties were effected. We also do not row how the interchanges are to be designed so as to see how traffic movements - 111 be handled.
ie know that this information is available and would request that it be sent to s.


EDWARD F. MOLTER Chairman

B:Linu:sic
$\therefore$ Erin L. Powell, Jr.
Chief, State Clearinghouse

## cesvand f rotten. Chairman

ED SIATES *

- 4
. ..




Roland K. Thempon, Chief
Expeall of Lijention and Eurveyo
stato Higinkny Adalinistration
300 W. Ereston Street
Ealtivorc, Md. 21201

Jnwuary 25. 2972

## De: Coniract too, 5 Cosjunabyy

 Interctatio :indic rom Ijaxicvillo i.jo to loet of ficmocaey yaverDCaF Mr. Thomnoon:
Soveral of our mewbora have considorod the roquest tinnci you mida to Mr. Ercoman by your lottor of Dorember 22. Wisst of them ao not forl that they have enough informatlon at this point to givo you a very dotailed answor.

However, we do not want you to think that thn ©amber 08 Comaerco nan no intereat in this project baccitae wo do. in of nous wo seen to frel that in wo had to choore between plaine a atid $\overline{\mathrm{b}}$, wo would probaily proiar B ; but cone of tho wea no mot co ewro that theio. may not be a better allermativo than eithor cano

At any rato, wo chould like to bo ient infornod of further devolopments and particulariy of the date of the lienerne.

Wo aro alno intoroatod in tho plane for US 15 in tho aroa of Catoctin Fumaco. Our chicf concorn hero is that the furmace add ita historical arca bo preserved.

We wenta mprecinte itt if you would incinde tise ofinco in


Eincercly,

2.:1c

il

# board of education of frederick county annex <br> ROUTE : BOX 16A <br> FREDERICK. MARYLAND 21701 

March 16, 1972
land M. Thompson, Chief
: of Location \& Surveys

* Highway Administration

Sst Preston Street
fore, Maryland 21201
Re: Contract No. F 605-000-772
Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$
Ijamsville Road to West of Monocacy River
;ir:
Tentative future school construction plans indicate a school in the vicinity : tonsville in the area bounded by Bartonsville Road, Mains Lane and US Route The proposed completion date for the school is September, 1975.
'Also, future school construction plans indicate a school in the area of Long : Creek, south of proposed scheme B $70-\mathrm{N}$ and north of the present US Route 40. :posed completion date for the school is September, 1977. The school will :lated in the Long Branch PUD.
side from the proposed schools, we are interested in knowing the effect ClImes in the present collector roads would have on school bus routes.
ie shall appreciate continued contact with your department concerning changes Route 40 to Interstate $70-\mathrm{N}$.

> Yours truly,


Mr. Gilbert U. Newly, Director
f Logistical Services

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE - 4321 Hartwick Rd., RM. 522
College Park, Maryland 20740

Mr. Roland M. Thompson, Chief
Bureau of Locations and Surveys State Highway Administration
300. West Preston Street Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Dear Mr. Thompson:

July 26, 1972


This is in response to your communication of June 5,1972 to this office and $\mathrm{Dr}_{\mathrm{r}} . \mathrm{T} . \mathrm{C}$. Byerly, U.S.D.A. Washington, D.C., requesting review and comments on a draft, "Environmental Impact Statement for Contract No. F 605-000-772." We regret that our comments below are late but offer them never-the-less.

Our primary concern is with those portions of the statement dealing with erosion and stream channel modifications. The proposed steps to minimize the unavoidable effects in Section VII appear adequate. However, we believe it would strengthen the report to give more attention to the adverse effects of erosion and sedimentation resuiting from construction operations in Section III.

We were pleased to see recognition given to the behavior of different soils types and trust your agency will avail itself to the Frederick County Cooperative Soil Survey as appropriate.

Let us know if we can assist you with this proposal in anyway and we trust our comments, though late, are helpful.

Sincerely,

cc: Dr. T. C. Feal
Kenneth E. Grant, Administrator

Cobbles

OHFICE OF THE SHCRETAKY WASIINGION, D.C. 202U0

Dear Mr. Hoodford:
Thia ia in rogand to your letter of Juno 5, 1972, requeating tha jopantmant of the Interior'a review and coment on a drale environmantal statament for Intaretate Route jos. Ijanjvilla Road to wast of Monucany Rivos IContract jo. Ec05-000-772l, Fraderick County, Maryland.

This is to inform you that the jepartment will have oomants on the drait onvironmental ntatement but will be unable to reply by the date you raquoeted af wo have fliat recaivad your oubaittal of duplicate cojiea to natiefy our intradepartinental distribution needs. Our sominencs should bo avallable around the end of Augtiat 1972.

Sincerely yours,

Bruce Blanchand, Dlreotor Environmeneal Yroject Raviaw

Mr. Walter E. Hoodford, Jr. Chief kinginaer

* Stato Mighway Administration
P. O. BOZ 717

Baltimora, Maryland 21203
cc: Mr. R. Thompson
Mr. Friese
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Mr. Roland M. Thompson, Chief<br>Bureau of Location and Surveys<br>State Híghay Administration<br>300 hest Freston Street<br>Baltimore; Maryland 21201

Dear Mr. Thompsons
Pursuant to your letter dated June 5, 1972, the Department of the Interior has reviewed the draft Environmental Impact Statement prepared for that portion of I-70N from Ijamsville Road to Vlest of Nonocacy River; in Frederick County, Maryland. We are pleased to offer the following comments.

Our overall impression is that the environmental impact. resulting from each alternative has been adequately explored. Plan A - which is essentially the upgrading of existing Route 40 to interstate standards - would require the rechannelization of approximately 5100 feet of Long Branch Stream, the taking of 20 residences and two businesses, and the need for 161 acres for added right-of-way. Plan 5, which is essentially new construction on undeveloped land, vould require the acquisition of nine improvements, together with 161 acres for right-of-way. It is unclear to us why Plan A requires the same acreage as a highay being constructed in entirely new location, especially since it appears that so much of Route 40 will be utilized If Plan A is adopted. Ne subnit that the final statement should explain the reasons why this is so.
A.s the environcental statement is now wititen, one gains the impression that the air pollution prublem, as well as the noise problem, sum to certain unknown values which remain quantitatj:Oly unaffected regardess of vitich plon is ulid..ately adopted. It apecars that the choice to be made is simp:y one of location: shouid trese urdesirable impacts be introciuced 2 nuo an area where they are now minimal, which mould be
the case with Plan B, or should they remain in that locale where people have been acclimated to them. The resulting impasse can, we believe, be solved by further exploring in the final statement what natural values will te lost - and their extent - as a result of rechanneling Lori Branch Stream. Another step should be a realistic appraisal of potential park and recreation development, by county or by state officials, along Fouche Branch under the multiple-use, foint-development concept.

Finally, we note that in comparing estimated fatalities and injuries between Plan A and Plan B, the latter included those anticipated for both I-70N and U.S. 40. It appears that other impacts, particularly air and water pollution, as well as anticipated increased noise levels, should, under Plan B, be totaled for I-70N ind U.S. 40 , and compared to those corresponding values anticipated under Plan A.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this draft statement.

.JUL 311012
contrib chicildrion
RECEIVED
mailing adonises
-. O. UX 1200 phllatielphia. PENnSYLVANIA vision

Mr. Walter E . Noodford, Ir. Chief Engineer State lifbliwy Administration 300 Vest Preston Street Baltimore, Maryland 21201
$A U G: Z \quad 1972$
DEPUTY CHIS ENGR. : DEVELOPMENT

Dear Mr. Woodford:
This 10 to advise you that we have reviewed your draft Environmental Impact Statement on Contract Ilo. for-000-772 Interstate Route 70 N , and concur with the Environmental statement.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this orate. . meat.
ce: Mr. Robert Lana
Cc. $\operatorname{Fin} \operatorname{Dis}(2)-$ (ion Prides.


8/7/72 Misers. Thompson and ling - For your information.
II. G. Downs

$$
\text { Rom } ;
$$

RECEIVED

Mr. Matler Li. Woodtom, Jr. Cubet Enerimer
Etate lidilway Administration
300 We:t lere:ton utrect
lialtimore, farydand ele01
Re: Contraci No. F iormono-lie., Jriteretate Route 70-IN, I.jam:ville :abit to We:t ol monocacy kiver, Froderisto rounty, haryland

Dear lir. Viondiord:
We have compioted our revien of the draft environmental inpact stinterment for the diove-rolerenced project and wilor our eonmentis for ;our con:jucmation in perearin: the firal ingme atatemme. Our conment: will be obanjacd in threc part:: air, wher, am land u:se. We have no amerested addition: or correction: to the account o! the nruject's impart on noi:a levels at .ile:; alome the propesed alignenentr.

## Air

The draft : tatemont note: on prace $\because /$ that $1 \cdots: \%$ CO i: enitted per vehicie mile travalled on expe:owy:i than on facilitie; such a.; the anterinl ::trect, local :trect, and centanl hainces acea noted in the table at tio bottaia of the :ano pirre. The ifmal :iatement should also eppian that althoush the proposed ware: way wilu reduce caiseions of Co per vehicle mije, jit may rememte chanim new topip: to make it:; con-





 prosint.)
 rile inereane with vehjere ipecd. mathemet to indicate the mimitude
 for io.

Cr. Kir Pismo
Ais R jinousimat

## Water

We note a :arming inaccuracy ln the : tatcment's declaration (p. 7) that "(w)ater quality $s t a m b a r d:$, adopted by the Maryland Department of Water ke:ourco:, reveal that the river below the Frederick County


 municipal water simply and water contact rocroaton. Presumably the ":standards" reburied to are in fart quality level:; that currently exist along the stream.

We mote alto in the statement: discussion of alternatives under Plan 13 , the costa; of a bridge and viaduct across: Lone Branch Stream are compared to the expense of all altomate box culvert construction (p. 37). In its discussion of the impact of crossing Long Branch under Plan $B$, however, the statement make; no mention of a box culvert but considers the relative merit:; of a bridge and a viaduct only (pp. ?3-24): If a culvert is under serious consideration, ic should be mentioned at this; point with some indication of its desirability from an environmental standpoint.

## land Use

On pare 24, the statement details the attributes of the sicenery along proposed plan 13 . In 1 fight or the added impetus to suburban growth that will be generated by the new section, wo recominend that the final impact statement :spell ont a commitment on the part of responsible state and federal highway officials, in the event Plan $B$ is selected, to enter into negotiations with Maryland': Department of Natural Resources and local bodice: that hive power to zone and acquire land for open space purposes. © Such negotiations would aim at preservation of the stream valley of the limganore crook tributary nevitinned on page 24 and help develop land use control:; that will insure development consistent with the se conic: amenities: which are described in the draft statement. If such steps are not taken, the aesthetic bandits which are cited by the draft statement as part of the strong; caste for Plan B over Plan A would be negated at least in part by plan b's very implementation.

Thank you for the opportunity forever this; impact state anent. We would ito a ropy of the final impart :abatement for our files.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { : innerrly yours, } \\
& \text { - } \\
& \text { konart: I. Blame, i. F. } \\
& \text { Acting: ChJot } \\
& \text { Finvirommentad Impact Statement Branch }
\end{aligned}
$$

DEPARTMENT OF STATE PLANNING

## SOL WEST PRESTON STREET

bALTIMORE. MARYLAND 212 EUR JUL 12

TELEPMON: 30t.383.2481

PH 203 VLADIMIR A. WAFER Pit 203 nathan op agape piamaime

NORMAN ME. $N$
ozpurv secmetany

Sinif MidAS
chidisemer
July 6, LAGATON ANO SURVEY
RECEIVED'
Mr. Walter E. Woodford, Jr
Chief Engineer
State llidhway Administration
3 Co Nest Preston Street,
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

JUL 101972
DEPUTY CHIEF ENGR. DEVELOPMENT.

Re: State Clearinghouse Project No. 72-6am23, Contract if F 605-000 772 Interstate Route 70-N Ijamsville Rd to West of Honocacy River Frederick County

Dear Mr. Wood ford:
The State Clearinghouse is reviewing the referenced proinst_. In accordance with the procedures established by tho federal Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95, we forwarded copies of this
to interested State and togional agencies for their comments and recommendations. As of this date, we have not received a reply from لircslavich conc and will therofore need an extension of time to complete our review.

We are interested in this project and will provide you with the final results of the State Clearinghouse review as soon as possible. Thank you for your cooperation.


Chief, State Clearinghouse.

ELP:8s
7/11/72 sincerely,
Mr. W. M. Thompson: For your information.
Chief, State, Clearinghouse.
cos Anthony ADar lawrence Johnson
de fit Frame
H. G. Downs
in 1000 s

## MARYLAND

 DEPARTMENT, OF STATE PLANNINGدO: WEST PRESTON STREET DALTIMORI: MAISYLANO 2.12OI

TELLIHONE TOI 3H3: AT,
August 29, 197\%

Itr. Waltcr E. joodford
Chief bupincer
St.itr: Hiphuaj hdministration 300 We:t 1rceton üucct
Baltimoro, iarjland 21201.


## Applicant: Stato IIf,

Project': I 70 N - Ijamiville Road to Noat of Monocacy River

Contract if F 6015-200-772


Statc Clcaringhouic Control Numincr: 72-6-233
Statc Clcaringhousc Contact: Eduin L。Powell, Jr。 (383-2467)


RAT
viatimin a waithe


EOWIN 1 POWELL JR.
nemutr ecchetap


## Dear ir. Moodiord:

The State Clearinehouse has reviewed the above noted Environnental Impact Sitate ont. In accordarac with the procedures established by the Office of ifinafoment and Budect Circuiar A-95, the state Clearinghouse received comments (copics attacher:) from the following:

Froderick County Planning Commission: rocommended the achoption of Plan "B' and made speciffic oujections to Plan "p-7.". The Cormission stroizely recomended that an intersection be considered for location between Chull's Lanc and Quinn Kd.

Department of Pubiic Safoty and Correctional Sorvices: noted the need for the project and speciliced an cndurwement of Plan "b".

Deparimat of Natural Mesources: notod sibong interest in the project and



 should bo nade in lice jection on air pollution.

Oin staic revicuad the statenant and found it lo bo a comperensive prenentation






tionally, our staff comented on othor aspeets of the statement as follows:

- Provision is made in both altornatives for an interchame with a proposed Fiedorick beltwayo Statcinenter relative to the beltway should be lepet vory tontative sinec it apperur that this conecpt nords ahiitional studj particularly in relation to further muliple crovising of the llonocacy liver.
- The rechannclization of Long Branch Ütram under Plan A providea an opportunity for visuai eatancomont of the roadway althumeh there will be sone short torm adverise cifcetse Fast efforts of this mature conlributc to the visual qualitics of U. S. iloutc 40 at prosent.
- The statement relative to limestone resources (pasce 6) should be clarificd.
- In vice of the resent floodinf expericnce, particularly in the Frederick area, the dosify critoria for transverse drainage structures (page 8) may noed to he reconcidered with a viev to using the Ütanclard Project Flood Critcria as a basis for structurc docign, as opposed to tice jo yoar storm critcria。
- The discuesion of additional traffic beine placed on rural roads as the resiult of Man A construction should include consideration oi provisions that vill be nade for joint development of thesc roads if plan $\Lambda$ is used.
- The traficic and aceident data (pares 19-20) is very food, but the same tralfic projections ure shom for cach allernative. In the jnstance of the "so nuthing" acheme, fiven the joak and dircetional splits shown, it is not believed that the present road could carry sucil volumes.
- The coment (paric 20) relative to linryland's share of the trucking market should be factually : anporich. Nien roquirjne support is the statement (pace 21) concorning the regaining of tax revenuce lo: t by richt-oimay açuisition。

We hope that these connents will assist you in the proparation of your final statement and lock forwaid to continued couperation with your acency in the Clearinghouse revicu oi the complete project presentation.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Sincorcly, }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Vladimir Vahbe }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Enclosures

cc: Edward Sollolter
Junre:ne úhn:jun
aimand : exath
Colonol Lalley
Antivary Abu

Charles jjxton
ce•"!t. Romo

1.. re......


Mr. Roland M. Thompson, Cite Bureau of Location and Survey: Stale Highway Administration joN West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201


Re: Interstate Route $70 \mathrm{~N}^{\circ}$ I janesville Road to West Of Monociacy River Frederick County, Maryland

Dear Sir:

The Supervisor of Transportation, Board of Education of Frederick County reviewed the draft copy "Environmental Impact statement" on the above referenced project.

Our primary comer deals with safe routing of school buses via access rods on either side of the $I 70 \mathrm{~N}$ corridor. It appears that adequate access routs will be provided in association with either plan A ar plan b.

We arceparticulioly interested in the prospect of having interstate $\because t$ malteds imposed along, the proposed I 70 N routes. The present at-
 by necessity, school bus drivers musil newoliale such crossings. Either plan d or plan 13 would eliminate these hazardous intersections.

Again we would emphasize the need for adequate access roads along the proposed I 70 N route: . The ale cess roads :should permit school bus


Your: truly,
. WC: . $119: \omega_{i}$


[^7]Governor Economic and Community

## CHIEF ENGINEER

Mr. Walter E. Woodford, Jr.
Chief Engineer
State Highway Administration
300 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201


Dear Mr. Woodford:

The staff of the Division of Economic Development have reviewed the draft "Environmental Impact Statement" on Contract No. F 605-000-772 (Interstate Route 70N Ijamsville Road to West of Monocacy River).

The only clear cut opinion derived from discussion on this project is to the effect that plan A or plan $B$ will provide a beneficial impact in terms of economic development, and the staff finds no grounds for a protest in the event that either plan is selected.

There is some inclination by the staff to favor plan $B$ due to the expectation that it may have a favorable effect on development by improving accessibility to an interstate highway for more people then would Plan A.
$\because$ We appreciate the necessity to evaluate a project such as this from many points of view, and we stand ready to assist you in our area of expertise.


- RMS: roc


FREDERICK. MARYLAND 21101 . PHONE (301) 662.4164

Mr. Walter Woodford, Jr., Chief Engineer State Highway Administration 300 Yes: Preston Street Baltimore, Maryland


Re: Contract No. F 605-000-772
Interstate Route 70 N
Ijamsville Road to West of Monocacy River, Frederick County, Maryland

## Dear Mr. Hoodford;

A number of our members including two different Committees have studied this report and have attempted to formulate a position. Some of them attended the June 296 information meeting and the July 6 h hearing.

After much discussion the consensus of opinion is:

1. We do not feel that sufficient and complete comparative cost figures are available in the study to allow a firm choice between Plans $A$ and $B$. For example the study docs not say what the final determination will be on the crossing at, Long th Branch. There is a tremendous difference between the cost of the culvert and the viaduct.
2. We generally favor the plan wi il ch is least costfy and which affects the least number of people.

The first of these considerations would seem to favor Plan a and wc believe that the second concicicration would also favor Plan $A$, If some adjustments could be made to more nearly use essentially only tho present richt-or-way.

Very truly yours,



Executive Vice President
$\mathrm{EDH} / \mathrm{Jo}$
ce: E. J. Dauchorty; J. J. Broniuo J. W. Freeman; C. Schrour

Dr.. Robert Spark

EDWIN R. TULL Y
DEPUTY SECRETARY
FOR PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Roland M. Thompson
Chief, Bureau of Location \& Surveys
State Highway Administration
300 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
Dear Mr. Thompson:
July 10, 1972

```
    ROBERT J. RALLY
    SECRETARY
public safety argo, \(\because,: 1\)
correctional serviersic: i. ....'. uliivey
```

This is in response to your June 5, 1972 letter regarding Contract No. F 605-000-772; Interstate Route 70 N , Ijamsville Road to West of Monocacy River, Frederick County, Maryland.

We have reviewed the draft copy on referred project and the Maryland State Police agree that the implementation of Interstate Route 70 N through the Eastern part of Frederick County is sorely needed. We lean toward plan B since it seems to suggest a smaller loss of tax revenue, less disruptions of the ecology, and less displacement of persons and businesses. More significant to our department is that for the most part, the construction would cause the least disruption of traffic. Under Plan $B$, the existing $U$. S. Route 40 would become a local dual highway, able to take care of traffic from an ara of the county presently under intensive development. This local traffic could move without interfering with the through traffic on Interstate 70 N .

I hone those comments are helpful.
sincerely yours,

RJL: i
COB ?E

- ArDen EMEINEER
-..ISCSTIUN
_ SUrVEY


# DEFPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MIENTAL HYGIENE 



ENVIRONMENIAL HEALIH AGMINISTRATION
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July 14, 1972



Mr. Thomas Hicks
Assistant Chief Engineer
Traffic Safety Division
Maryland State Highway Administration
130x 717
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

> Re: Draft Environmental Statement, Administrative Action for Contract \#F605-000-772

Dear Mr. Hicks:
At the public hearing held on the above question at East Frederick Elementary School on Thursday night, July 6,1972 , 1 was one of the speakers opposing dylan 13 and $13-1$ as presented in the above study. The purpose of this letter is to get to you and to amplify some of those thoughts expressed at that meeting on paper.

First, let me make it perfectly elgar that l have no property that would be involved in any takin! for any of the proposed routes in this contact, but I would personally bereft fem the construction

 for me of mowing the noise of traffic away form my property, while Ila: $\Delta$ would bring it closer. Plan 13 also would advantage

me by not requiring me to change my travel patterns and habits: in getting to and from my home. I am speakings as an interested property owner and taxpayer who, like everyone else, feels that public funds, in too many instances, are umocerssaraly wasted at a great expense to the general taxpayer. We as tax-payess cannot on one hard complot about the waste and spending of tax funds and then. on the other hand, ask for the wasted expenditure of funds in our area because it would benefit a specific few.

J do not pretend tu represent any group, though it was evident at the public hearing that there were many in attendance who strongly supported Plan A and opposed flan 13. even though, in several instances, Plan B would specifically benefit those individuals:

In reading the report I was very disappointed in government lo find that what was issued and represented as a fair comparison of two alternate proposals was, in fact, a very warped report, making many misleading comparisons and keeping out many pertinent facts. Cost comparisons were in no way true comparisons.

Plan A costs in this proposal are based on the completion of six lanes in initial construction. Plan J costs are based on the construction f only four lanes initially with provision of the tight -of way for six lanes. At the present time six lanes are being, constructed from the area of famsville Road east to Baltimore. It is obvious that if six lanes are required now from baltimore to ljamsville Road. those same six lanes are required on into Frederick. For a true cost comparison, therefore, a total of six lanes in Plan A should match a total of six lanes in Plan 3 .

In both Plan $\Lambda$ and Plan 13 the connections from Tulip fIlial into the termmes of East patrick Street are nearly identical. Yet, in lan A an witaonal moat j si shown atoms the southern boundary of Tulip
 that coaction to South Street in J lan A than in lean li. If cost comparisons. therefore are abhemare on an equal basis, that extension to the south of Tulip lille wither :home shown on both Plans. 1 and 13, or showa be removed from Plan $A$. There is nothings about dan a and the access: for the people in that area that necessitates the South Street commertiom.
lean A provides all of the rigsht-of-way and much of the eonsimuction for a fun intorehampe in the area of Main's lane and Hell': 1 , ambo to provide fur a mane morth-south expressway. Plan 13 , withe other hand, shows nothing hut a small fuse lot for the possisible future location of an interchange for the north-south beltway. If a genuine comparison is to be abate, then the right-of-ivay cost should be included in the lan 36 estimate since it is included in the flan $A$ estimate. 1 understand that there would be a ned for a crossover bridge to get to the service road, but all of the right-of-way for a future interchange need not be acquired at this time, nor would the service road have to be built as shown in Plan $\Lambda$ at that point. If it is desirable to acquire the right-of-way for Plan $A$, then it certainly also would be desirable to do so for 1 lan 13 . If, on the other hand, the State Roads engineers and designers feel there is little likelihood that a north-south freeway will be built in the forseeable future and therefore did not provide for the right-of-way on the Plan $B$ design, then the right-of-way should not be provided on Plan A. Either way you look at it, either there are wasted funds in the estimate on Plan $\Lambda$ if more right-of-way is being required than is needed, or the ultimate cost on Plan 13 is being improperly reduced in the estimate.

The Environmental Statement indicates that all right-of-ways for Plan I3 estimates are based on agricultural zoning. As wis pointed out in the public hearing Thursday night, this is totally misleading, since the State Roads Commission has exhibits in their office that have been discussed on many oecoussions with a PUD known as "Long Branch lisitates." This PUl) has been in the enrincering and planning stages with full knowledge and concentration with the State duads Commission. It ha: been filly approved by the Frederick Comity Planning and Coming Commission, and the developer hat is been requited to pity the County a substantial sum of money for the sew or and water study as a fir it means of felting the necesisiory sower and water so that


 for flan 13 and $13-1$. Therefore would he extremely high in this area. suede the owner obviously com not moly cestabibish substantial value for that land but also could establish substantial damage since
all of his engineering, design, and efforts for the last many yours would be completely wasted time and expense. He would have to completely re-plian the entire property since the proposed is plat would divide the property into two separate sections with the one to the north having a much more difficult access.

Concerning that piece of property the Environmental Statement goes on to say that it has an added advantage since it has pretty scenery and that there should be a joint effort on the part of the state and County to develop that area as a park. For the same reasons as listed above, that would be highly impractical since the land would be difficult and expensive to acquire at a price that the County or the State would be willing to pay for parkland. The Environmental Statement comments on the added beauty of the area of flan H over that of Plan A to the motoring public. The public travelling on a highway with design standards of a seventy mile-per-hour speed limit does not have a great deal of time to enjoy the scenery. In addition, this area is of such a short duration that it hardly seems worth considering. It certainly is not an area that would he devonoped as a rest stop, since the State is now developiry: rest stop): in the area of Ridgeville, a distance of about ten miles to the rust. with another rest stop already in existance on the cast withe of South Mountain, a distance of about twelve or fifteen miles from this property. 1 do not know what the standards are on the spacing of rest stops, but this would seem to indicate too many rest stops in that distance.

The Environmental Statement also states that taxes paid to the County would not be affected and would, in fact, possibly be increased because of the increased value of the land on either side of the expressway. I do not think this is a mislealjn!s statement, hut I certainly common are with the statement and think it is an error. On the contrary, the land on dither side will not he: increased in value, but hathor will be


 tax base for this area into the (empty sysistem womble delayed, since the arran now has has plans: combleacd that camille converted into at high tia base promptly, whereby with the adoption of plan Is it would take sever il more yours to re-plam and !et that same tox base established.

1 am enclosing a photocopy of an article from the frederick Post of July 5, 1!372, in which I have encircled a statement by the Planning and Zoning Commission concerning the long li ranch Estates devilopment which further substantiates my position. If that I PUD, for example, approved four units to the acre, if the right-of-way taking would require forty acres, and if the value of the land is $\$ 1500 / 1$ ing uni, that would result in a cost of a minimum $\$ 240,000$ for that are richt-of-way. To that would have to be added some substantial figure for the lost time of the owner in realizing revenue from the development of his land since all planning time and expense will have been lost. It is obvious that the right-of-way estimates given for Plan B are substantially in error.

After making the statement in the study that there is very little deference in the cost estimates as arrived at by the State, the State recommended Plan 13 . I might point out that there seems to be a reservation in the State's mind as to what will be required across the stream of Long Branch and, in their own statement, they indicate that if a viaduct would be required here the estimates given by the State would have to have another two million dollars. This one item alone, based even on the State's own study, places too high an extra cost on Plan 13 over Plan $\Lambda$.

By the State's own estimates based on an inquiry made by one of the other opponents to the state, lan 3 will require 247, 000 square feet of bridge construction. J lan $\Lambda$ will require only 30,000 square feet of bridge construction. This results in 167,000 more square feet of bridge construction in Plan 13 than in Plan $\Lambda$. $\Lambda t$ an estimated cost of eighty dollars per square foot for such bridge construction, that means that plan in will cost in bridge costs alone $\$ 13,360,000$ more than lan $n$. When you take this figure and consider the added right-of-way cost that is not refleredel in the Pan 13 studly; when you cobbler the added lam! that womble be required for the fat intercham e that was, not considered in Ital 13 ; when vol add the two

 cost many millions of collate more than lan A. All of these adjustments would be necessary in order to come to a reasonable comparison between the two pans.

In addition to the cost factor, there are other considerations. J lan 13 is contrary to all the best practices in land use and hamming!. for it will create a relatively small island of land between two major highways. In land use practices it las been generally accepted that it is unwise to plan dual highways in a roughly parallel atjenment chaser than one mile apart. To do otherwise creates land use problems and much added expense for proper access to the land he tween the highways.

I realize that the Frederick County Planning Commission several months ago endorsed Plan 13. However, I might point out that this was done with very little consideration and after only one presentation by the proponents of Plan $B$, without the benefits of comments from people who might be opposed to I'lan I3. I wonder if that same group would take the same position after careful consicieration of all the facts.

I fully understand Mr. Rosenstock's support of Plan 13, as well as Dr. Bill Thomas' and sympathize with their position. I also understand Mr. Edwin Wells' support of Plan B. However, in this particuar instance, it should be remehered that Mr. Wells bought his property and built his home very recently, being fully aware prince to the purchase of his lot that the State planned to upgrade US 40 to interstate standards and that there was some risk, and a good chance for right-of-way taking in that area.

I think the position Dr. Bill Thomas; is in is most unfortunate. I also feel that, with the proper planning and with good creative thought being directed toward the problem, the State could design for the upgrading of US 40 in interstate standards in a manner to work within the boundaries of the right-of-way as it now exists, except for that area required for an appropriate interchange.

Since the State on its Plan 13 did not show any right-of-way taking
 a great weal of reservation in their w om mind as to the probability
 that swed a highway will be more that taints years in the future and, therefore, it is questionable wheres it ran be properly paned for now.

I would like to suggest, to reduce land tai: ing, that a diamond-type exchange, which requires considerably loss land, be planned for
and built at this time. This requires considerably less right-of-way and construction expense and would handle the necols for the foreseeable future. I would also like to suppest that the Stato, in wilizing: llan $\Lambda$, move thr Monocacy River Jiridge to a location betwern the two present bridses, in lieu of one proposed immediately adjacent to and south of the present cast-bound hridece. I further sugpest that the roadway in the area of fug l3ridge llill be huilt to urhan seotion rather than a rural section to rnable the state to work within the present right-of-way and therefore not disturb the property of Dr. Bill Thomas. I would suggest that the present Md. 144 in the area of Pearl Sargain House be extended westward and connect to the present intersection of Bartonsville IRoad and US 40. Finally, I would suggest that, since it is the State's plan to lower the roadway at the top of Jug Ibridge Ifill, a bridge be constructed on curving alignment for Linganore Road, with the elevation of the present Linganore Road to connect to Bartonsville Road. This again would reduce the right-of-way taking from Mr. Benjamin Rosenstock.

The Environmental Study seemed to put a great emphasis on the necessity of re-channeling the stream of Long I3ranch. It is my view that much of long branch would not have to be disturbed if Md 144 on the north side of US 40 would be extended from its present intersection near ljamsville Road in a westerly direction, keeping the roadway just to the north of Long, Branch and with some slight realignment of the road bed of US 40 from Quinn liad to about 500 feet cast of Pearl Bargain House. The existing right-ofway in that area beginning at Quinn Road is 300-400 feet wide at the present time, with a good deal of the right-of-way space on the south side not being utilized. I realize that some of the suggestions I am making would add to the cost, but also some of the suggestions would result in reductions in cost. While the end result may be somewhat highor cost than that estimated in the proposial made for Plan 1 , it would still he substantially fower than the proposed flan IS and would fednce the takine and danate to a manher of people, as well as create a better use of the lamed.

Aftor the Envirommontal Study was completed and presented, Mr.

 I am sure Mr. 'Thompson and othors are now aware of the status of Lake limgranore at faglehead and will plan for the traffic moventerts
that have been and are beingereated by this very substintial development. Eaglohead consist: wif appoximatrly 4000 acres and ultimately will provide foe 4800 single fimily resideneres and 4800 high deasity residences ( $25,000+$ people). At the present time we have sold and deeded approximately 1300 properties. We have two lakes completed and in use, with the third dam completed but the lake not yet flooded. Ow fourth and major dam, which will create a 204 acere lake, is $35 \%$ concpleted, waiting only for a period of approimately ten days without rain to divert the water from Linganore Creek throush the diversion pipe to conplete the earth fill across the streamy hed itself. We have an eighteen hole golf course that is completed and under piay, with the club house for that course to be completed and put into use about $\Lambda$ ugust 1. Our sewer and water system in the first section is in operation; our olympic size swimming pool, bath house, sauna houss, and cabanas are completed and in use. Six tennis courts will be put into use by the tenth of August. We have twenty-five miles of roads at various stages, ranging from grading complete to three miles of finished paving and with fifteen miles of base course in. In addition to these items mentioned, work is going forward on other amenities of the project.

I hope the State will see fit to reconsider their plans for Plan $\Lambda$ and work within existing right-of-ways except for the interchange to reduce the damage to property owners and change the proposed full interchange to a diamond type interchange.

> Sincercly,
LINGANOIRE CORPOIRATION

L.IIS:ch

Enclosure
ce: john Derr. Iresident, Freaieriek Connty Commissioners James L. Bryan, Clete, Frotornck Commty Conmatisioners Lawrence $\triangle$. Dorsey Frederbly (ounty Commitssioners Donald Lewis. Frederick Cosaty Commis:siomers







 Richard Hammond, lixarutive Serretary, bidederick Chamber of Commerce Edward bangherty, Deesident, Frederick Chamber of Conmoree Jancs Freeman, New Industry Committee, Frederick Chamber of Commere Art Rejlly, 'Iransportaion Committee, Frederick Chamber of Commerce William Fout, Frederick County Engincer
State Sonator lidward I'. 'I'homati, Jr'.
State Senator Chatros II. Simolser
State Delerate Julion I'. Delphey
State Delegate Wallace E. Hutton
State Delonate C. (.lifton Virts
I. (ilemu latall. Uniter States Senate

Charles Mer:. Mathists. United States Senate
(iondloo lsyron, Jonuse of Representatives
Manuel Woinberg. Esquire
Respert Murphy

EDWIN I：．WIkIS

This memorandum is filed as a supplement to the statement in opposition of Plan $A$ and in support of Plan $B$ made at the public ara ring continued in Frederick，Maryland on the evening of July 6， 1972 regarding the proposed location of that portion of $1-70 \mathrm{~N}$ in the project hereinafter discussed．

## 1．Background

At the public information hearing and the similar public cor－ rider hearing pursuant to 23 U．S．C．Section 128 on Contract No． F605－000－772 for the creation of Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$ from U．S． Routs 40，between the old Haugh＇s Blacksmith Shop Road that leads from former Route 40 to ljamsville，now known as the Ijamsville Road．and the proposed interconnection with present dual L＇．S．Result to at or near the overpass bridge lading from Last Patrick Street Extended its traffic into U．S．Route 愒，it became apparent that the proponents of plan $A$ and plan bi ad developed into a contest between the established residents of fillip lith．south of U．S．Route fo and west of the Monocacy River，ats well as the residents of Pine－
cliff and Bartonsville-Pearl, cast of rhe river and south of present U. S. Routc $f($, and land developers on the north of 11 . S. Route fo consisting of Mr. Murphy, of Washingtom, 1). (.., and associatcis, who now own or control the old Kent farm which includes the former Flautt farm and the Scheel farm, and Mr. Kcats, of Montgomery County, Maryland, and associates, who control the lundgren farms sicept the mansion house and the curtilage of some six acres. Both of these development groups have applied to the Planning and Zoning Commission of Frederick County for planned unit devclopments, which are still in an embryonic stage.

Before the construction of U. S. Route 40 as a dual four-lane highway, the Kent farm had a sixte: foot way through the meadow, leading into old U. S. 40. This was condemned in connection with the construction of the aforesaid road. The Flautt, louche, and Scinel farms had a private road twenty feet wide leading into old 4. S. 40. In order to furnish the Kent farm with aceess to dualized Routc 40 , they constructed a service road from the private roas serving the other three farms and rebuilt the bridge after obtaming a risht-of-way to U.S. Route so. It has only bech within the last several months that Mr. Murphy and associaices hase been able te obtain sufficient land in the meadow berween their hand and present U. S. Route fo that they might mect the requirements of the Frederick County Planning and Zoning Commission of a fifty foot entrance to a public road.

At these hearings, testimony was likewise presented by Messes. William and louis Brosius, the former developers of Pinecliff and presciently developing liaglehead at I ike linganore, a P.U. 1)., extending over 4,000 acres of land. Mr. William Brosius reshes in Bethesda, Montgomery County, Maryland, and Mr. Louis Brosius resides presently at Pinceliff.

Old (1. S. Route 40, in the carly 1940 s was developed into a limited access, dual, four-lane highway mostly on a new right -ofway. At that time the unused portions thereof were designated as Maryland Route 144. In the building of the present U. S. Route 40 only a small portion of Long li ranch, draining a large area from Ijamsville to linganore Creek, was disturbed. Jlowever, ecologically speaking, this small disturbance caused the loss of all of the then existing minnows, crayfish, muskrats, and frogs that inhabited this stream from the point where U. S. 40 crosses the same to its juncture with linganore Creek. This damage was not healed by nature for from five to eight years.

Maryland Route $1+4$ (ok (.). S. Route 40) breaks at present (.. S. 40 ks than 1,00 , feet west of lamsville Road and then comtonnes on the south side of 1 '. S. Route fol some several hundred feet west thereof and robs through the north side of Pearl and part of Bartonsville, inturchensing with the original Baltimore Road by Way of Bell's and Main's lanes on the south side of the last mentioned parton of Route $1+4$, and at its cistern extremity is situated two historical white comprexations.

Bartonsville is a pique commmity, in that through the fore.. Sigh of a Mir. Miller, after lifo, his farm was divided into four. and fise-acre parcels which he sold to freed shaves, who established their modest homes; most of which are being occupied by the fourth and fifth gene. actions of the first settlers. This village grew on the north and south side of the old Baltimore Road that formerly, at the southwestern side of Bartonsville, ran to a ferry over the Monocacy River, and then proceeded to then Fredericktown until the building of the Jug Bridge and the creation of the tollpikes leading west. This village did not have the usual history of our modern situations Where the blacks became later residents of the same, but here the whites joined the blacks and have lived peaceably and harmoniously together. In Bartonsville are two churches whose congregations are black and draw not only from the village and countryside, but also from residents of Frederick.

## II. Background of $1-70 \mathrm{~N}$

leet us take a moment to review the construction of interstate routes in other states. for instance, Interstate 81, at least through the greater part of Virginia, is on a new right-of-way although paralIcel to and intercombeted at baffic intersections with old ['. 5.11 : this is likewise true in Maryland and Pennsylvania. In fact, $\ln$ ere state 70 at its beginning at the Baltimore Beltway is not built on old Route $f 0$ 's roadbed but is a half-mile approximately to the north thereof. This is a six-lane highway that merges into a four-lane
highway also built on a new right of way hat will presently merge into a six-liatic highway, being upgraded (I. S. Route 40, througle the rural portion:; of Howard, Carroll, and Frederick Counties. This portion, frown the juncture with present I-70N and U. S.. 40, originally wa:; designed to end at or about the Masseter Road but. fir practical purposes had been continued a mile or so to the west Shin would be: an excellent location on the top of a hill wast of flamsville Road, for an interchange and the beginning of Plan $B$ as a road without grades through existing dairy farms at the expense of dislocating, at the maximum, nine homeowners.

The present geometries of the western portion of this project will be much improved with its -juncture with four-lane U. S. Route 40 than now exists. It is also to be noted that $[-70$ S was not built on the old Georgetown Pike, which is new known as Maryland Route 3.55, but was constructed on a virgin right-of-way and was one of the best-planned roads in the United States. Likewise, I-7OW was not built on reconstructed U. S. Route 40, but on a new right-of-way all the way to the Pennsylvania Turnpike to Indianapolis, Indiana, and (Ven on throurfl Missimuti, is not constructed on old U. S. Route 40 or (i. S. Route 50 except for a few rural sections.

It is also interesting to wharve that Interstate 9.5 from the Delaware state line to the city of Washington, D). (. and then south, is practically all constructed on lew right-of-ways and not on the existing roads within doe several states. When U. S. Route 40 was constructed in the carly 10.10 s, the land north thereof, in the four
miles under construction, was being farmed. On the south side from the crossing of long Branch to the Monocacy River was occupied by the village of Bartonsville-Pearl. West of the river was open farm land to the (Quynn Orchard Road and then following the southcry side of the interstate highway was the development of Tulip Hill.

The opposition to Plan B, as has been stated before, is the prospective developers of two P.U.D.s.

## 111. Cost of These Plans

The proponents of Plan B are confident that the State Highway Administration has honestly estimated the cost of these two Plans.

The estimated cost of a half-million dollars of " $B$ ". over " $A$ " Plans cannot be equated with the injury to long established commonities, particularly the one occupied by our black citizens, as well as the ecology.

The reconstruction of Long Branch in Plan A will wreck the present ecology for many years to come. The construction of Plan B will create, of course like any road construction, noise and dust during the construction period, but will create a far safer highway than Plan $A$ since it will practically run from the Ifamsville Road to foin with present four-lane U. S. Route 40 on much safer geom the It is to be remembered that at least four deaths have been caused in the sharp curve of U. S. 40 from the Grove intersection to Quinn Orchard Read sole due to the geometric e plan causing motorists to collide with the abutments of the bridge leading from East Patrick Strict Extended wis (1. S. fo last.

Think of the disturbance of the four congregations serving Bartonsville and the adjoining comingsicic by being calused to travel over extended Route 144, a proposed twenty-four fect of road metal on an eighty foot right-of-way. Project, if you will, the local traffic over the five years after the completion of Plan $\Lambda$, on this reconstructed Route 144 serving approximately 3,000 additional - - llings on the Lundgren-Kent-Scheel and perhaps the Fouche Sarms, including Pinceliff, Linganore Road, and Bartonsville.

## IV. Costs

In considering the differences in the cost of Plans A and B, there should also be considercd Plan A will require at least the taking of nincteen homes and two places of small business against the nine homes required by Plan B. These nincteen residences do NOT include the damage that will be necessitated by upgrading the lanes and the main read through Bartonsville to carry the increased traffic pattern through that black village.

Since Plan B will be constructed through farm land recently actuired at a cost of from several hundred to $\$ 1200$ per acre as against the tightly buit homesites with their respective landecapes being owned by the more affluent or less affluent. who ate affected by Plan $\Lambda$, thus creating a tax loss io the state of Muryland and the County of Frederick estimated by the State to be $70 \%$ less by using Pan 13 over plan $\Lambda$.

It would stand to reason that Plan B, with its presently to be built four lanes carrying only interstate traffic would be far safer than Plan $\Lambda$, carrying a mixture of interstate and intrastate traffic; the latter consisting of residents of Frederick, who work in Balimore and its environs and the people who work in Frederick and commute to their homes situated off of present Route 40 between that city and Mt. Airy.

Likewise, from the safety standpoint, Plan B proposes a highway running along or near the tops of existing hills, with bridges that ald to its cost, but allows a road on an even level contra-distinguished to Plan $\Lambda$ with its present turns and greater changes in elevations.

The fact that motor vehicles will not have to drive up and down hills on Plan B should cause the emission of less pollutants than the up and down contours of Plan $\Lambda$.

The close proximity of Route 144 to Plan $\Lambda$ 's I-70N is bound to cause more distraction of the traffic on Plan $\Lambda$, particularly on the westbound lanes, than would ever occur by the homes built below the hills on which Plan $B$ is designed.

We must remember that the previous toll road, the used portions being now designated Maryland Route 144, from Baltimore to Frederick, was abandoned in the construction of U. S. Route 40 dualized except for that portion from the I jamsville Road to Frederick. Therefore, Plan $\Lambda$ is attempting to take the route used by the old toll
read to the Jug Bridge over the Monocacy River as its location for mexkern 1-70N. It should also be kept in mind that instead of the opposition theory that Plan $B$ will only presently contain four lanes that with the use of present (1. S. Route fo, you will have eight lanes serving not only the interstate traffic but also the intrastate traffic originating in growing Frederick and presently estimated in : - =environmental study as consisting of $25 \%$ of the existing traffic. Will not Plan $\Lambda$ be inadequate within five years after the developmint of the present paper P.U.I.s.s?

Were Plan $\Lambda$ constructed, and during construction, the presSent 20,500 vehicle daily traffic cannot certainly be funneled in the twenty-four foot service road or Maryland Route 144 with safety. There is an estimated 10,000 more in the next five years with the development of the Murphy and Keats properties.

## Y1. Environmental Damage

The great damage to long Branch has been previously alluded to. Likewise, there has been mentioned that Plan $B$, because of its construction along the tops of hills will divert the pollutents to each side of the hill rather than concentrating them in the long Branch valley, which would be done by Plan A. There is also to be considered that construction of Plan $B$ through open farm land with its attendant dust and noise will only affect fifteen to twenty homes while such construction along Man i including the cutting of Jug Bridge
 fanti of Pinceliff and bantomsville. it is to be recognized, however,
that the lowering of the roadbed on the lundgren farm will inconvenience approximately six or seven dwellings. The building of a third bridge near the two existing bridges on present Route 40 will only compound the flooding of the Monocacy valley that was witnessed in the recent llurricane $\Lambda$ genes episode. If the additional bridging as planned in " $B$ " through viaducts with adequate spacing for the passing if not only the water but the debris carried by it, there will be far less probability of flooding.

The opposition to Plan $B$ comments on "the creation of a marrow island of prime land squeezed between the two highways and only about onc-half mile in depth at its widest point constitutes a violation of every sound principle of land-use development recognized by all authorities". However, as previously indicated, it would appear that the best-designed interstate highways have done this in the case of every interstate road in the nearby vicinity in the at tempt to be reasonably close to the existing old through highways, and yet to not eliminate existing settlements, villages, and communities.

If Plan $B$ is used, it is conceded that part of its 300 foot right-of-waly will be through both paper P.(1.1).s. This would scum (6) be less of an environmental shock than the six lanes of proposed Plan A and the two -way service raid by way of Route lIft that. as explained above, must bx duali\%d to afford ingress and egress when these two paper developments ate finally developed over the next five years would be to the old established Bartonsville community, includeing Pearl, Pinceliff, and Tulip Rill.

The department of Health of the State of Maryland, the Maryland Department of State Panning, and the Ix-partment of Interior do have letters on file that would give comfort to the supporters of Plan $\Lambda$ as being in support of Plan $\wedge$, but a perusal of these letters in their entirety indicates that in each of these :-taters, its writer qualifies his tentative opinion with equally as - informing remarks to the supporters of Plan B.

Vil. Conclusion

It is the conclusion of this writer than Plan A would disturb and destroy the homes, the tranquility, and possibly the fortunes, of already established lirederick County people and taxpayers, black and white, as contrasted with Plan 13 which would disturb largely people who may or may not later be a part of Frederick or Frederick County.

The detailed opinions of the unbiased experts of the State of Maryland Ix-partment of Transportation State llighway Administration, and whose function it is to study such matters in an objective way, as indicated in the Draft linvironmental Statement, certainly have more validity as to cost, as well as to the distinctions between the iwo Plans, than he unstudied opinions of based hymen. The Draft I:nviromental Statement would tend to pretor pan 13 over plan $\lambda$, and with this, the writer concurs.
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## I. INTRODUCTION

This statement deals with two alternative proposals advanced by the Maryland State Highway Administration for the construction of a portion of Interstate 70N in a 4 -mile area lying just east of the present city limits of the City of Frederick, Maryland.

The first proposal, called Plan A, would upgrade existing U.S. Route 40 to a 6 -lane, non-access highway, with suitable overpasses, service roads and an interchange. It is compatible with the construction design and highway geometrics both to the east and west of it, since I-70N from Baltimore to Frederick is generally constructed along the existing roadbed of U.S. Route 40 . It was the only tentatively approved plan of state and federal authorities for many years. Its projected costs are estimated to be approximately $\$ 15$ million.

The second proposal, called plan B (ar B-1). would depart from the existing roadied of U.S. Route

40 east of Ifamsville Road (where it is now being upgraded to interstate 6-1and standards), would run on a sweeping arc through property lying north of U.S. Route 40 and, as a 4-lane road, would not be compatible with the 6-lane portions of I-70N both to the east and west thereof. Its "costs" have been grossly underestimated at $\$ 15.5$ or $\$ 15.6$ million. Its true effective costs, however, can be reasonably estimated at $\$ 30+$ million or double those ascribed to Plan A. It is conceded that It is a longer, less safe road than Plan $A$ and that it will not be adequate to meet the anticipated volumes of traffic for the 20 -year period following the date of its approval, as required by the Federal-Aid Highways Act (23 U.S.C.§109) unless two more lanes are constructed at a later, indefinite date.

This brief is filed as a supplement to the statement in opposition to Plan B (Including Plan B-1) made at the public hearing conducted at Frederick on the
evening of July 6, 1972, regarding the proposed location of that portion of $I-70 N$ embraced in the above project. $1 /$ The project covers about four miles of roadway and is located in the immediate vicinity of the city limits of the City of Frederick, Maryland. Its western portion is practically contiguous with those present limits.

The purpose of this opposition is not only to prevent the ruinous and destructive consequences inflicked upon the 1,286 unit 'Longbranch Estates" Planned Unit Development upon the 270 -acre Murphy tract which would be severed by Plan $B$ (including the destruction of a 10-acre elementary school site) but also to prevent a grave and costly mistake on the part of responsible state highway officials to the detriment of the' majority of people living in the area. 2 / Indeed, to recommend Plan B

[^8]would constitute such an arbitrary and capricious act as to shock the conscience of reviewing authorities in executive, legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government.

## II. QUESTION PRESENTED

Is it the policy of the Federal Highway Administration to build a more dangerous, less adequate, longer, more costly and more environmentally damaging road when the upgrading of an existing highway is feasible, suitable and practicable within the policy and standards of the Federal-Aid Highways A.ot?3/

3/ 23 U.S.C. §101 et sec.

## III. BRIEF HISTORY AND BACKGROUND OF I-7ON

In accordance with the 1956 Federal-Aid Highways Act, a corridor closely identified with U.S. Route 40 (a 4-lane highway) running form Baltimore west to Frederick was designated by the Maryland State Roads authorities to become part of I-70N. This was done more than a decade ago. - Importantly, proposed I-70N was completely identified with U.S. Route 40 in the area under question here. The proposal was to upgrade the existing 4 lanes of Route 40 to 6-lane interstate standards, eliminoting existing grade separations and providing service roads and overpasses for local traffic. This is grecisely what is being done now, both east and west of the 4-mile area covered in this project. These firm plans for so upgrading Route 40 in this area have been widely known and understood by local residents for many years.4/

4/ As long ago as November 1965, access to Route 40 for Longoranch Estates was denied asci the exact lines of the proposed service road as it affi:cind that property were officially given on a topographical ma? which was furfished to the State Highway fiministration. Renewed requests for access have zen conied by State Officials on the grounds that U.S. Route so would become I-70N (non-access) and that the service road would afford access. the planned suburban writ development on the property was specifically engineered on this basis and was so approved by the Ficiorich county Planning and Zoning Commission. Tho necessary right-of-way on Longbranch Estates has beer. offered at no cost to the gover...ar.

As the schematic plans evolved, they were the subject of consultations between State highway officials and various public representatives so that there was no mystery as to the upgrading of U.S. Route 40. The proposal was placed in a critical category in 1968 with authorization to begin preliminary engineering shortly thereafter.

From what we are able to glean from that which the State Highway Administration voluntarily chooses to disclose to date, a conference on May 13, 1968, among Frederick County Commissioners, County Planners and state Highway engineers resulted in agreement that the interchange for this portion of $I-70 \mathrm{~N}$ would be located in the vicinity of Linganore-Bartonsville roads. 5/

By September, 1968, preliminary engineering studies were completed and presented to Frederick County Commissioners and a public hearing was scheduled. This

5/ The location of this interchange has been the subject of behind-closed-doors power plays by influential local citizens so that its constant shifting lies led to long and costly delays. The impact of the interchange is more dramatic upon homes and businesses than any other phase of Plan $A$.
hearing was held in November, 1968, at Mount Airy, Maryland -.. some distance removed from the project area -- at which time it was disclosed that the interchange was to be shifted about 3 miles east to Ijamsville Road. The moving spirit behind the relocation of the interchange is not revealed.

About one year later (December 16, 1969), we were advised that during a meeting with County Comessioners and other local officials, the State Highway engineers were requested to shift the interchange to a third location -- The Mains Lane area -- at the behest of the Planning and Zoning Director. This led to a further meeting in January, 1970, between highway engineers and county officials, at which time it was determined that further studies would have to be undertaken.


#### Abstract

At a meeting on December 16, 1970, the State Highway Administration's plans for upgrading U.S. Route 40 with the interchange at Mains Lane, overpasses at Ijaminille Road and Bartonsville Road, and a new bridge across the Monacacy River, were tentatively approved by


the County Commission, The Planning and Zoning Commission and the Federal Highway Administration officials. At long last the programmed project was ready to move ahead on the basis of what is now termed Plan A -- the longheld plan which the State Highway engineers had proposed to the federal government years before this and winch was widely known to all in the community.

Within weeks, however, a small group of vocal citizens, at a meeting with the County Commission on January 25, 1971, requested the commission to prevail upon the State Highway Administration to relocate the entire project by swinging it off its existing roadbed of Ijamsville Road and projecting it on a north/northwest arc, through the scenic land north of U.S. Route 40 and back on the existing highway west of the Monocacy River near the East Patrick Street bridge. 6/ The Commission

6: The Frederick Post, January 26, 1971, referred to this proposal as the "Ganley plan" prosuanzly because a loan l realtor, Paul R. Ganiey, macio tie presentation to the County Commission on the basis oi his drawings or sketches. It is common. y referred to as such by many of the local. residents. It is now weer serious consideration herein as Plan B (or B-1), reconamaina as an alternate to the long-ield plan to upgrade Existing U.S. Route 40 (Plan A) which had already received tentative approval of all concerned.
was persuaded to make the request to the State Highway Administration that this radical departure form the normail highway corridor be studied.

We are advised that:
"Federal Highway officials initially objected to the relocation concept, but in view of the Adininistration's Policy and Prodedure Memorandums 208 and 90-1, inferring feasible alternate be held.accountable, the new studies were initiated."
(emphasis added) I/

We are not advised, as yet, of the basis for this initial federal objection. However, it is plain that the "Ganley Plan" (now recommended by the State Highway Administration as alternate Plan B or B-1) called for such a sweeping and radical departure from the tentatively.agreed proposal of many years to upgrade existing U.S. Route 40 as to constitute a complete variance with the corridor geometrics both east and west of the area in question and would demand further lengthy and expensive studies.

On or about June 1, 1972, the public wis advised for the first time that Plans $\lambda$ and $B$ would be the subject

7/ See Draft Environmental Statement, p. 13.
of a public hearing on July 6, 1972, and that maps, drawings and other information would be available to them prior to such hearing. No facilities for photocopying public information were supplied. No informal-timon on how copies of the Draft Environmental Statement could be obtained was given prior to the July 6th pubic hearing.

It was further stated that a "public inforration hearing" would be held in June. The full spectrum of Plan B and its implications thus was first publicly disclosed only a few weeks ago. Since that time, examination of Plan $B$ indicates that the State Highway Administration has grossly understated its true, effective costs and heavily slanted its Draft Environmental Statement against Plan $A$. Word of this has only recently been circulated and already this has aroused the indignation and protest of more than 150 residents of the area. In essence, Plan $B$ would require the construction of a longer, less safe, shockingly more expensive, less dequale, more damaging road than Plan $A$. Yet it has been presented as a feasible, suitable and practicable alternate -- and the only alternate -- to Plan A.
IV. FULL COSTS OF PLAN E NOT DISCLOSED

The true, effective costs of Plan $B$ have not been presented to the public. Rather, it would seem that a studied effort has been made to disregard them.

It is only as a result of citizen inquiry and lay study during the past few weeks that it has been revealed that the true costs would probably be about double the estimate of $\$ 15.6$ million which the State Highway Administration has widely circulated to the public, the press, the Federal Highway Administration, and various other agencies and officials of the state and federal government. This has led many to say that the costs of Plan B are "about the same" as Plan A or that they are "only slightly more" than the $\$ 15$ million Plan A costs. I/ Nothing could be further from the truth.

Briscirg costs
A fow minutes prior to the public hearing on
July 6, 1972, the comparative figures for bridges on both

[^9]plans were given Mr. Murphy pursuant to a request made a week prior thereto at the "public information" hearing. No information on bridging costs was presented or made available at that hearing. They are as follows:

Plan A - 87,700 square feet of bridges plan B - 231.100.9/ square feet of bridges

Thus, Plan B would require some 143,400 square feet more of bridgin than Plan A, a differential of some $263 \%$. Using the cost fugure of $\$ 80.00$ per square foot for construction costs (a figure employed by Mr. Louis Brosius on the record of the hearing of July 6, 1972), the cost difference for bridging alone is almost $\$ 11.5$ million: But even using a unrealistically low figure of $\$ 50.00$ a square foot, bridge costs alone on Plan B would exceed the total cost of construction estimated for it in the Draft Environmental Statement. $10 /$

9/ This does not include an alternate 12,100 square foot bridge for Plan B-1.
$10 / \$ 50 \times 231.100$ (sq .ft.) $=\$ 11,550.000$. The Draft Statemont estimates that total construction costs for Plan B are $\$ 11,495,000$.... The remainder of the $\$ 15.5 \mathrm{mili}$ ion estimate is for right-of-way and engineering expense. (Draft Statement, p. 37).

## Interchange Cost 3

An interchange is included on Plan $A$. It is excluded on Plan B. However, Plan B seeks to conceal such a patent discrepancy by showing several sites which are called "Future Contingency Interchanges." No reason is advanced for this strange omission. If one is needed on Plan A at a point to accomodate a future planned county beltway, it is obvious that one is likewise required on Plan B. The costs for land acquisition and construction • running into the millions is thus completely excluded from the cost estimates of Plan $B$.

## Additional Two Lanes of Highway

Plan $B$ is only a 4-lane highway and present cost estimates are based on this unusual fact. It is conceded that $I-70 N$ calls for a $6-1 a n e$ highway. It is being constructed on that basis both to the east and west of the project area here involved. Only this 4 -mile section is being relegated to four lanes. Win? Obviously, to minimize the present cost. Plan A fulfills the 6-lane requirement. We are entitled to have the true costs of these
additional two lanes included in the present estimate if any comparison of the two Plans is to be made on a common sense basis. Informed lay judgment, based on contracts recently awarded on nearby portions of $I-70 N$, estimates that these excluded costs would range from $\$ 5$ to $\$ 7$ million. Inflation in future years, of course, would increase this considerably.

## Underestimated Right-of-way costs

The estimated cost of $\$ 1,133,000.00$ for rightof -way on Plan B is grossly. underestimated. The severance damage on the Long Branch PUD, for example, is not clearly acknowledged and can scarcely be included in the above figure. The taking of some nine or more homes and several complete farms, plus the expensive completely new property required for a 300 -foot right-of-way running some four miles with its consequent adverse impact on land values, will require the expenditure of sums substantally in excess of the figure now allotted for it. In this regard, it is important to note the existing Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the county provides for the utilization of property in this area for low-density housing. This fact is not considered in the Draft statement.

## Maintenance and Other Costs

Plan $B$ would require not only continued maintendance costs for a relocated I-70N, but also for the existing U.S. Route 40 in this project area. These costs are constant and continuing. Additionally, extra bridging means extra maintenance. Section $109(a)$ of the FederalAid Highways Act states that the Secretary of Transportation may not approve state plans and specifications which fail to provide for "safety, durability and economy of maintenance."

In addition, a service road between Reich Ford Road and Quinn Orchard Road is included in the costs of Plan A and excluded in Plan B. If it is needed on one, it is required on the other since the needs of this area are the same under either proposal. Again, the true costs of Plan $B$ are deliberately minimized.

> V. PLAN B WOULD VIOLATE THE POLICY AND STANDARDS OF THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS ACT. ( 23 U.S.C.GIOl et seq.)

Section 101 of the Federal-Aid Highways Act provides in pertinent part that it is the intent of congress
that "insofar as possible .... existing highways locatedon an interstate road shall be used to the extent thatsuch use is practicable suitable and feasible....."
What are the public interest factors which would justify a complete disregard of this national policy as contemplated by the radical departure from the existing U.S. Route 40 contemplated by Plan B? There simply are none.

Section 109 of the Act provides that standards approved by the Secretary of Transportation for each construction project "shall be adequate to enable such project to accommodate the types and volumes of traffic anticipated for such project for a 20 -year period commencing on the date of approval by the Secretary .....of the plans .....for actual construction of such project."
plan $B$, as a 4-làne highway, would be obsolete as soon as it was completed. Six lanes are being provided everywhere else along the corridor of $I-70 N$. The State report stresses that a $4-1$ ane $U . S$. Route 40 has insufficient traffic capacity to meet federal interstate
standards (Draft Environmental Study, p. 38). Yet the same report seeks to suggest that a 4-lane Plan B highway would comply with federal requirements. The inconsistency of these two conflicting propositions is so apparent as to warrant no further comment.

Section 138 of the Act states, in pertinent part, that: "It is hereby declared to be the national policy that special efforts should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside and ..." The purpose of this Section is not only to preserve parks, recreation aras, historic sites, etc., but also to prevent the environmental waste and damage resulting from drastic departures from existing highways such as is the case with Plan B. If there are compelling public interest reasons for doing so and if there are no feasible alternatives available, then, of course, the scenic beauty of the countryside must be relinquished. That, however, is not the case here, since plan $A$ is clearly feasible, practicable and suitable.

## VI. HIGHWAY SAFETY IS LESSENED UNDER PLAN B

It is highly important to note that the accident projections outlined in the Draft Environmental Study (pages 14-20) clearly indicate that Plan A is superior to Plan B. It will be observed that the retention of U.S. Route 40 in its present state as a so-called service road with its numerous grade separations, plus those that will have to be added in the future, compounds an already hazardous highway safety problem for this area.

Highway safety is a factor which cannot be minimized in any road-planning program. Its importance to the federal interstate system, however, is particularly significant. The one Congressional mandate in the Federal-Aid Highways Act which specifically restricts the discretion of the secretary is that which forioids approval of any plan which, inter alia, compronises safety. (23 U.S.C. §109(a)).

Recently the Secretary of Transportation, John
A. Volpe, has stated that the prime goal of his administration is to achieve substantial improvements in highway
safety and to curtail the mounting toll of highway accidents. In the present circumstances, therefore, it is inconceivable that Plan $A$ can be rejected by responsible highway officials.

## VII. REVIEW PROCEDURES REQUIRE AVAILABILITY OF A FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) 42 U.S.C. $\$ 4332(2)(c)$ requires all federal agencies to issue a "detailed statement" on the environmental impact of all "major federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment..." 1 [ This section is an essential "action-forcing" provision. It is a mandate to consider environmental values at every stage of the federal agency process. The primary and non-delegable responsibility for fulfilling that function in this case lies with the United States Department of Transportation. Calvert cliffs Coordinating Committee, Inc. V. United States Stomic Enercy Comission, 449 F. 2d 1109,1119 (D.C. Cir. 1971).
11.' There is no doubt that a Feceral-ìid iighway Project in the $\$ 15$ milliont category is : "major federal action", Namad miviounl venbers of San Antonio Conservation Society v. Texas Highway Department, 446 F. 2c 1013 at 1024-1025 (5it. Cir., i971).

Up to now, the only such statement available to the public is the draft prepared by the Maryland State Highway Administration. This statement is heavily oriented in favor of Plan $B$ and is deficient in many respects. It is respectfully submitted that the State Highway Administratron is an applicant for federal funds to construct this project and consequently its statement may be influenced by that fact. Its study cannot be regarded as compliance with NEPA and the seeming abdication of the federal agency in this regard deprives the public of an informed participation in the public hearing process.

Obviously the lay public is in no position to bring to bear the necessary resources and technical expertise to provide an effective analysis of environmental factors. This is the function of the federal agency. It cannot be delegated to other persons and certainly not to interested applicants for federal funds. Greerecounty planning Board V. Federal Power Commission, 455 F. 2 ai 412 (2nd Cir. 1972).

Section 102 of $\operatorname{MaPA}$ explicitly requires the federal agency's own detailed statement "to accompany the proposal
through the existing agency review process." Here, however, we are now in the midst of a review process and no such federal independent study is available to us.

It would appear reasonable that if the responsible federal highway ${ }^{\text {fithorities }}$ were actually to view the site of this project, to study the affected area and to conduct its own independent appraisal of envirormental factors and cost factors, the destructive consequences of Plan B would be readily apparent. Conceivably, we would not now be at this stage of the decisional process where the "Ganley Plan" is being heavily supported and proposed as a suitable alternative to Plan $A$.
 cating its responsibility to local parties, can create an almost inflexible situation. The early preparation of a federal environmental statement would not only accelerate the construction of the best road for the lowest cost, but it would insure that the public interest in environment, safety, and other important considerations would be properly protected. Thus in the recent case of Arlinaton Coalition v. Volpe, 3 E.R.C. 1995 (4th Cir. 1972), the court specifically
stressed the need for such compliance with the spirit as well as the letter of the NEPA. As that court noted, once the highway planning process has reached latter stages, flexibility in selecting alternative plans has, to a large extent, been lost.

For example, in the instant case, a thoughtful alternative proposal was advanced by Mr. Louis Brosius at the July 6, 1972, public hearing. This alternative would work within the existing Route 40 right-of-way, utilizing the 50 -foot median strip for the added lanes, relocating the new bridge across the Monocacy so as to avoid impact on residential dwellings, utilizing a diamondshaped interchange instead of the wide circular one proposed, etc.

This feasible alternative was not even discussed in the environmental study prepared by the State Highway Administration. Yet by the time this matter is reviewed by the Federal Highway officials in Baltimore and Washington, there will be extreme pressure to get the job done and to avoid a loss of time through more studies.

These recent federal court cases all underscored the need for responsible federal officials to comply with the plan provisions of the NEPA. The duty is squarely placed upon the federal agency to make the requisite studies. It is respectfully submitted that a study prepared by the state officials cannot be substituted for it.

At hearings conducted before the Senate Public Works Committee on August 25, 1970, F. C. Turner, Federal Highway Administrator, indicated that his agency would delegate this precise responsibility to regional federal highway administrators with highly controversial projects continuing to be forwarded for review by FHWA Headquarters in Washington. Senator Muskie, however, expressed reservations about the possibility that federal regional administrators will rely to heavily upon state highway departments for the detailed environmental analysis required by NEPA.

It is recognized that there is a high degree of delegation to state government:; which characterizes federal-
aid highway development. However, the cases cited above as well as the plain language of the Act, clearly require the responsible federal officials to do the job.
VIII. THE BEST ROAD AT THE LOWEST COST IS PLAN A

The fundamental objective of government, both state and federal, is to build the best road at the lowest cost. From the foregoing review, it is clear that Plan $A$ meets this test.

At the public information hearing held in June, Mr. Roland Thompson of the Maryland State Highway Administration, stated that the relative cost of $P 1 a n B$ as compared to Plan A was a matter of indifference to the state authorities, since $90 \%$ of the funds would be furnished by the federal government. We cannot believe that such an attitude is consistent with either law or policy which governs the Federal-Aid Highways program.

It should be emphasized that the states have no inchoate right to funds apportioned to them prior to the actual approval of a project by the secretary of Transportation.

42 Op. Atty. Gen. Feb. 25. 1967. The view expressed by Mr. Thompson would eliminate every incentive for good management and the practice of common sense economy which is incumbent upon the executive branch of government. 0

Indeed, it is clear that there is no mandate requiring that funds made available for any government program must be fully expended. This principle has received statutory recognition in the Anti-Deficiency Act, 31 U.S.C. $\$ 665(c)$. In any event, such a philosophy is inconsistent with every known principle of government management and fiscal responsibility.
IX. ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE

The environmental damage which would result from the adoption of Plan $B$ is substantially greater than that resulting from Plan A. This fact is recognized in at least three comments from responsible government agencies contained in the Letter File relating to this project. They were not alluded to in the Draft Environmental Statemint.

Thus the Department of Health of the State of Maryland has asserted that Plan B would have the greater adverse effect on air pollution, particularly during the construction phase. With two construction phases necessary under Plan $B$. this environmental damage would thereby be compounded.

The Department of Health likewise pointed out that Plan $A$ is the more desirable alternative from a noise standpoint.

The Maryland Department of State Planning has stated that the comments from within that department favor the upgrading of the existing highway alignment -Plan A. They point out that the selection of Plan $B$ would run counter to the comprehensive development plan of Frederick County which calls for the dedication of this property to low-density housing development. It suggests that its selection would require a complete reexamination of the land-use plan for that narrow island of property which would be created between the two highways.

This approach is proper and specifically required by $\because$ Section 102(2) of NEPA which states that environmental statements must weigh short-term uses of the environment against long-term productivity.

The Department of Interior asserts that the negative effects on the State of Maryland will be externside in the event plan $B$ is pursued. They affirmatively state: "It appears to us that the reconstruction of U.S. Route 40 to three travel lanes in each direction is presferable to construction of a new interstate highway of the present U.S. Route 40."

The creation of a narrow island of prime land squeezed between the two highways and only about one-half mile in depth at its widest point, constitutes a violation of every sound principle of land-use development recognized by ali authorities.

Likewise the severance of the PUD, Long Branch Estates, would completely destroy the approved use of this property for low-density residential dwellings and the
scenic park and recreational areas set aside therein. Importantly, the highway would run directly through a 10-acre site set aside for an elementary school. These factors which have been completely disregarded or lightly cast aside in the Draft Environmental Statement.
X. CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that plan $B$.the "Ganley Plan" -- is 1ll-conceived, excessively costly and injurious to the area. It must be rejected. Its adoption would constitute an arbitrary and capricious judgment on the part of governmental authorities.

Plan $A$, on the other hand, is the shorter, safer, less costly and less damaging road. There are no comfelling public interest reasons to abandon this longapproved proposal.
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SUITE 1610
5530 WISCONSIN AVENUE Chevy Chase. Marrano 20015

Phi: 301-652-5032

December 6, 1972

Maryland Department of Transportation State llighway Administration 300 West preston Street P.O. Box 717

Baltimore; Maryland 21203
RE: Interstate 70 N


East of Ijamsville Road to West of Monocacy River

## Gentlemen :

I wrote a letter to Mr. Mole dated October 18, 1972, which he forwarded to you on October 20, 1972. I am awaiting your reply. What is the current status of the alternate Routes of 70N?

Sincerely,
INVESTORS, AND DEVELOPERS SERVICES, INC.

Robert M. Keats
President
Enclosure
RMK: Is

## Metro－Land and Growth Investments．Inc．
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FREDERICK. MARYLAND 21701. PHONE (301) 662.4164

Mr. Walter Goodford, Jr., Chief Engineer State Highway Administration
300 Vest Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland


Re: Contract No. F 605-000-772
Interstate Route 70N
Ijamserille Road to West of
Monccacy River, Frederick
County, Maryland
Dear Mr. Hoodford;
A number of our members including two different Committees have studied this report and have attempted to formulate a position. Sore of them attended the June 29w information meeting and the July 6th hearing.

After much discussion the consensus of opinion is:

1. We do not feel that sufficient and complete comparative cost figures are available in the study to allow a firm choice between Plans A and B. $\circ$ For example the study does not say what the final determination will be on the crossing at Long Branch. There is a tremendous difference between the cost of the culvert and the viaduct.
2. We generally favor the plan whit ch is least costis and which affects the least number of people.

The first of these considerations would seem to favor plan A ard we believe that the second consideration would also favor
 essentially only the present right-of-way.


Very truly yours,

504/90
cc: E. J. Nakgerty; L. J. Brosius
minim 3 J. U. Freeman; C. Schrocr
 D... Robert Snarks
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State Sighuvin Adrainestration 300 Weat Preston \& trut Bultimize, Mangland 2/201
 for Plonning and $X^{2} \operatorname{lig}^{2}$ 年
Rearkia:
C am $n$ raident farmes in Fredivick Cownty Lown applofiriaitly 175 accus of $\operatorname{lon}$ d in the area whew "Pican $B$ peuma to ble "suashed" byrnstate amoi bical -Fificisila. Cwant to vigorealy proteit againat this Blaw. Hown can you justify splnding $\$ / 5$ or 20 nillion move for puch a road instiad of paing "Plin A"?

Feng tuly Youn, - Vaury w. J. Jouche' Rointe 6 Frestuck, Md. 2170,


In order to provide a method by which th more complicated or controversial questions $-j n$ be answered, please fill in the following Erformation:

NAME
Raymond J. Reilly
ADDRESS Maryhill, Route 6
COUNTY Frederick ZIP CODE 21701

Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.
Ecology is not for the birds, it is for people and their relation to
their environment.
Plan A disrupts this relationship by adding new eastbound lanes
through people's homes and affecting the balance of environment for many

## more.

Plan $B$ disrupts the relationship by increasing the cost of the project (when 6 lanes and Frederick Beltway Interchange are included), and by increased taxation reducing one's ability to maintain one's personal ecology or balance.

Mr. Lou Brosius' Plan - Six lane urban interstate in the existing right -ef-wisi-despesed cut at Lingamore hoad to reduce the grade land noise bevel. double deck bridge for local and west bound lanes, simplified diamond interchange and service roads and service road from State 144 to fartonsville

Road to parallel the interstate on the south side - this fulfills the function while Please Mail To:

Mr. Thomas Hicks
Acting lleputy Chic Enginecr-Planning and Safety

## enhancing the ecology.

Please give it full consideration - it will work.
Motley
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INFORMATIONAL PUBLIC HEARING 6/22/72. Pdmilicated or controversial questions answered, please fill in the followingminfor- N motion:


Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas Hicks
Acting, Deputy Chief Enginecr-Planning and Safety
State llighway Administration
300 west Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
LSF-35 [7/12/71]

IUII:OUION ANH/OR RI:OMMMINUNTION FOER
Contract: No. $1:(1) S-1) 01-772$
Futcrstate Routc 71 - N
ljamsvillo Ramd to west of Monocacy.
Fredorick County, Maryland
In arder in provide a method by which the moser complicated or controversial questions can be answared, please lill in the folluwins :rformation:
nni: Drietered 722 Daneat
NHDRLS: St * 6
COUNTY of sederesa 211 conl 2120/
Short statcinent concerning question or other inquitry.
Llans in frases of Plan $A$, egfond to Plavis
$\qquad$ Tinguray bie untanieslarit had bexavdow yo t-

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please Majl To:
Mr. Thomas Hicks
Acting leptuy (hici lins! ineor-llanning and Safety
Statr Highlsay Amininistration

Maltimurc, Marylamd 2:201
1.55-35 [7/12/71]

Trango Gorcrinar

JUL 211972 Development

July 19, 1972

## CHIEF EMGITJEET

Mr. Waller E. Woodford, Jr.
Chief Furinecr
State Highway Administration
300 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

## RECEIVED

JUL $\because 11972$
DEPII Y CHIEF EI:CRR.
NFVIIOPMENT

Dear Mr. Wood ford:

The staff of the Division of Economic Development have reviewed the draft "Environmental Impact Statement" on Contract No. F 605-000-772 (Interstate Route 70N Ijamsville Road to West of Monocacy River).

The only clear cut opinion derived from discussion on this project is to the effect that plan $\Lambda$ or plan B will provide a beneficial impact in terms of economic development, and the staff finds no grounds for a protest in the event that either plan is selected.

There is some inclination by the staff to favor Plan $B$ due to the expectation that it may have a favorable effect on development by improving accessibility to an interstate highway for more people than would plan $\Lambda$ 。

- We appreciate the necessity to evaluate a project such as this from many points of view, and we stand ready to assist you in our area of expertise.


RMS: roc
cis Dumas


Division Of Economic Development Tel: 301-267-55012525 Reva Road, Amapolis, Mad. 21401

PUBLIC HEARING $7 / 6 / 72$


SION ANU/OR RECOMMENDATION IORKM
Contract No. F 605-000-772
Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$
Ijamshille Road to west of Monocacy Rive Frederick, Maryland

$$
\text { JUL : } 1 \text { TR }
$$

In order to provide a method by which thérore co complicated or controversial questions can be answered, please fill in the following informmotion:
NAME Steverhy (ti) Fipple. $\qquad$
ADDRESS $A, D .6 B+B E E$
COUNTY firicrescet, lief ZIP CODE $\sim / Z 0 /$
Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.
Lice, Sis












Mr. Thomas llichs
Acting Deputy Chief Fngineer-Planning and Safety

Baltimore, Maryland 21201
LSF-35 [7/12/71]
$\cdots \cdots, \dot{2}$
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INFORMATIONAL PUBLIC LiFARING 6/22/72
(UH:STION ANI/OR RI:COMMI:NDATION DORM
Contract No. F 605-000-772
Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$
ljamsville Road to west of Monocacy Fiver
Frederick County, Maryland
In order to provide a method by which an more complicated or controversial questions $x .3$ be answered, please fill in the following motion:
NNE Dhow etui Mitchell $\frac{N}{G}$
.
Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.

FRIFSE
(i) Mbere rift ketue






 -ice eráo ore
屎 位


## Dear Sir:

I, Edwin E. Wells, Route 6, Box P-1A, Jug Bridge Hill, Frederick, Maryland 21701, request permission to speak at this July 6, 1972 public hearing in opposition to Plan A and in support of Plan B. I will speak on behalf of myself and those other persons in the Tulip Hill, Pinecliff, Jug Bridge Hill, and Bartonsville Road areas who signed petitions opposing Plan A and which petitions were presented to the State Highway Administration some time ago.

Respectfully submitted,


Edwin E. Wells

thin Yokel hríe a The fo Luteraf to conke, niciterives vout if it:

保me in vickt, pite Dhame it grome Arobivatinn.
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$\operatorname{TEM} 47$


on Dralip tíll Ulexty of Gand orithe othw lite tritice honces ace nort tatefliokef. he put eriugtaing wide one, Hones ithen to jume ituam-zete Dive will fue the 3 ed time the liane phored feewow if teighiraigh tre pecked the thinking tre were prefe. Shope ticiot time facriney: don't, tek theng buy ou-stras
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PUBLIC HEARING 7/6/72

IU!:GTION ANU/OR RECOMMENDATION FORM
Contract No. F 605-000-772 Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$ Road to west of Monocacy Rive Frederick, Maryland


4jesville comp lated or controversy; al questions can be


 adDress $\# 6,13 \times 24.3$

Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.


NAME MANUEI, Te PADILLA ADDRESS Route 6 - Pinccliff COUNTY Frederick ZIP CODE 21701 Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.

I live in Pinecliff and will obviously be affected by the final decision on the proposed road changes from Liamsville Road to West of the Monocacy. Getting into and out of Pinccliff will be more difficult and time consuming for me if Plan A is implemented, During the course of a years time, it will add considerable mileage to my cars and add to the amount of time getting into town (Frederick) or going to Baltimore. The close proximity of the road to my home will also greatly increase noise pollution. Plan A will greatly increase traffic in front of East Frederick Elementary School, thereby increasing the danger to the children that attend this school. I have two children there.

I also feel that the true cost in tomb of money and human misery have not been show, I an curtain, though not by design. If plan A is implemented, some ore would have to impose and widen Bartonsville Road. How much will this
(Continued on attached)
Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas Hicks
Acting Deputy Chief Engincer-Planning and Safety
State llighway Adiainistration
300 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

269 cost? Who will pay for it? The County? This will probably be a County project. How many families will be displaced? tho will relocate them and also pay fur the relucation? Because, if this is a county project, these people will not be elifible for relocation assistance by the state or federal Government. The people that live on bartonsville Road are predominantly black, also some whites, and most of them ate of small financial means. It would be a gross injustice to them to tear up these homes, when a road could be built where there are no homes, or very few, affecteri as Plan B proposes. Also, these people on Bartonsville Road would have a very difficult problem in firding adequate housing in the Frederick City area because of limited financial resources and beca:sce they are black. That is where the human misery would come, where you cannot place a dollar and cents figurc. The opponents of Plan $B$ are only concerned about the amount of money they would not make if their proposed resitiential development does not come into being.

I have lived in Pinecliff for six ycars. I consider the people on . Bartonsville Road as excellent to outstanding people. They live and let live, even though we do not wisit with each other, I consider them, as do the people of Pinccliff, to be good neighbors.

It would be tragic to disrupt thesc people, when there is land available on which people do not live with very few exceptions.


UUISTION ANIM/OR RECOMMENDATION FORM
Contract No. F 605-000-772
Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$
Ijamsville Road to west of Monocacy River Frederick, Maryland
In order to provide a method by which the more complicated or controversial questions can be answered, please fill in the following informotion:


Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas Micks
Acting lloputy Chief Engincer-Planning and Safety State Highway dimatistration
300 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201


PUBIIC HEARING 7/6/72
병
ION ANITOIR RECOMMIENUATION HOLKM Contract No. F 605-000-772

Interstatc Route $70-\mathrm{N}$
Ijamsiville Road to west of Monocacy Rive Frederick, Maryland mation:
NU:E Majr and MRs. Jchen Boucher ADDRESS Rt. 6

- county Fredinich zip cone 21701

Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.
I ain in favorof and enderse- whale hoantedly your Plan B far. Interstate $70-N$. \&fice thit to, uqfubbih an ald Liginuray (us 4o) ie not anly íke puttiny a pated
 fiolac crenomy. Ca viow to gothy mantencol in the pubie. haring, Plan B woull a Wo he a safer Tienturay avel That in meney une erexpent in my apinions.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ Den Hzack

Please Mail To:
Hr. Thomas llicks
Acting Deputy Chicf Engincer-Planning and Safety State Hisheray Adrinistration 300 licst preston stroct
Baltimore, haryland 2201
LSF-35 [7/12/71]
Contract No. F-605-000-772

Interstate Route 70-N Ijamsville Road to west of Murocacy Riv Frederick, Maryland
In order to provide a method by which the more $G$ complicated or controversial questions can be answered, please fill in the following irfor: motion:

ADDRESS $1 i^{i} / \operatorname{O}$
 $\qquad$

Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas lines
Acting Deputy Chief Engineer-Planning and Safety State Highway Administration
Sub hest Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland E1201

PUBLIC HEARING 7/6/72

IUISTIUN ANU/OR RECOMMIENIMATION DORM Contract No. F 605-000-772 Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$ Ijamsville Road to west of Monocacy Rive Frederick, Maryland complicated or controversial questions cine be answered, please fill in the following informmotion:


Butavinike
Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas Hicks
Acting Deputy Chief Engineer-Planning and Safety
State Highway Administration
300 hest preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 2i201
questions can be complicated or controversial questions can be
answered, please fill in the following irforanswered

## NAME

$\qquad$ ADDRESS $S$ Rt 6 Prusitetor


Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.
 ond sirong intorati in the location of ITCN. 'n are nlready confronted




 -

 but aion losa nisu to risperge rine trafric, eopmoially since it will
 …
 む̆


 Please Mail To: (ovar)

Mr. Thomas Hicks
Acting Devuty Cince Kinsincer-rlanning and Safety State llighway Aiministration 300 kest Prestua Street Baltimore, Maryland 21201








PUBLIC HEARING 7/6/i2

OUI:STION ANIM OR RECOMARNUATION POM Contract No. F 605-000-772 Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$ Ijamsville Road to west of Monocacy Rivorif Frederick, Maryland

In order to provide a method by which the more complicated or controversial questions can be answered, please fill in the following informmation:


Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas licks
Acting Deputy Chief Enginecr-Planning and Safety
State llighary Administration
300 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

PUBLIC HEARING 7/6/72

UUISTION ANH/OR RECOMMENDATION DORM Contract No. F 605-000-772

Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$
Ijamsville Road to west of Monocacy Rivera: Frederick, Maryland
In order to provide a method by which these complicated or controversial questions coze answered, please fill in the following in
mame_Loliu Wecilon
COUNTY Firedericis 2IP CODE 21701
Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas licks
Acting, Deputy Chief Enginecr-Planning and Safety
State Higimay diministration
300 hest Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Contract No. $: 005-000-772$
Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$
Ijamsville Road to west of Monocacy Frederick, Maryland
In order to provide a method by which ti complicated or controversial questions answered, please fill in the following mation:


NAME $\qquad$ NR \& MRS CHARLES R EROOKS $\qquad$ $\cdots$ ADDRESS RFD \# $\underline{6}$ (Bartoncville)

COUNTY $\qquad$ 2IP CODE $\qquad$
Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.

A lot of the homes on Partoncville Road are owned by
retired and low income peonle.To pit these homes closer
to the road would be quite disturbing as well as being
hazardous to the children. One man had to move his property
when the dual was putin, would now be moved closer to the
wideninf of bartonsville koad-this man is now retired.
The plan that would widen the Bartonsville Road would disturb more families than otner palns that you may have.

In order to build, the county madn me build approximately
70 fett from isartonsville road, and would not let me build
on the ulamesite nibh wouteaztiftenfoct more

will witny home clusur to the road. For thib reabon I am
in favor of vlan "E "
Pleasc Mail To:
Mr. Thomas Hicks
Acting Denuty Chicf Engincer-Planning and Safety State llighoiy diainistration
300 hest Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Contract No. F 605-000-77.2
Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$ lie Road to west of Monocacy R
Jul 15 :IT $\qquad$ Frederick County, Maryland JUL 15 In opec to provide a method by which ton more $\frac{n}{\infty}$ candidate or controversial questions can be nation:
mwideleut IKELNEDy

COUNTY fredenak ZIP CODE 21201
Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.
Luth in vive of cratpean of fixture


 Contectuig with a be or to ply, Pause hames
 Game suifult ty elan ot 'one remain as then an atsocent.
ore-dinit that $\Delta$ horde be Cousidizel- Mritiad of Pilling how bias som to ? Dines trow, why



 Please Mail To:

Mr. Thomas Hicks
Acting Deputy Chief Engineer-Planning and Safety
Stale llighay Administration
300 Vest Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
LSF-35 [7/12/71]
170158

Mris Mherisié Af tínmestiry
Nu 10 Berge 3.3
Frealeuite. Ind 21.701
I beluere that Plax $B$ toention D $I$ - 70 N is the best andi novat puackinal horation for the folkuring reasors:"

1. Concikenation' phould be gevien more for the dis-
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PUBIIC HEARING 7/6/72
IUIISTION ANI/OR RECOMMIENUNTION LOOM Contract No. F 605-000-772 Interstate Route 70-N Ijamsville Road to west of Monocacy Ri Frederick, Maryland
In order to provide a method by which tiff mores complicated or controversial questions can be answered, please fill in the following $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{s}}$ formotion:
 COUNTY $\qquad$ ZIP CODE $\qquad$ 2220

Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.


Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas Hicks.
Acting Deputy Chief Engincer-planning and Safety
State lifgnay Administration
300 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

PUBLIC HEARING $7 / 6 / 72$

In order to provide a method by which the more complicated or controversial questions can be answered, please fill in the following informotion:
$\qquad$
ADDRESS Route 6 BS O269 COUNTY Irsfencén_2IP CODE $\qquad$ 21701
Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Plosive Rail To:
Ra. Thomas Hicks
Acting Donate Chief En-rinecr-plaming and Safety
Stare dismay Acmindstation
300 West preston Stroot
Baltimore, sazyicad 21201

PUBLIC HEARING 7/6/73

mation:
NAME $\qquad$
ADDRESS $\qquad$
COUNTY FREDERICK_ZIP CODE $\qquad$ 21701

Shore statement concerning question or other inquiry.
 bether accen withot demaliofroppepatio

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please Mail To:
M-. Thomas Hicks
Acting bequa (aiof Engheer-i'saming and Safoty
State llighasy Abinistration
300 West Preston Strcet
Baltinore, fatyland 23201
Fitil62

QUESTION ANI/OR RECOMMENDATION FORM contract No. E . 605-000-772

Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$ Ijamsville Road to west of Monocacy Rive Frederick, Maryland
In order to provide a method by which the more complicated or controversial questions can be answered, please fill in the following irformotion:

NAME $\qquad$ il 11 $i \cdot 2 \quad i, a l$


Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.


Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas Hicks
Actins Deputy Chief Enpinecr-Plannang and Safety State HIghway Administration
300 hest preston siret
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

GU!:STION ANI)/OR RECOMMENDATION FORM $\mathbf{S}^{\boldsymbol{8}}$
Contract No. F 605-000-772
Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$
Ijamsille Road to west of Monocacy $R$ Frederick County, Maryland
In order to provide a method by which fe mores complicated or controversial questions tan be answered, please fill in the following irfor- $\bar{a}$ motion:


Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas licks
Acting Deputy Chief En ineer-planning and Safety
State llighay Administration
300 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
LSF-35 [7/12/71]
(4)

## Ijamsville Road to west of Monocacy

In order to provide a method by which the more $\bar{a}$ complicated or controversial questions can be answered, please fill in the following f formotion:

\} q l ~ l i w s u l i f ~ S h o r t ~ s t a t e m e n t ~ c o n c e r n i n g ~ q u e s t i o n ~ o r ~ o t h e r ~ inquiry.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas Hicks
Acting: Denuty Chief Engincer-planning and Safety Sate lifghay ciministration
300 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

PUBLIC HEARING 7/6/72
qUESTION ANI/OR RECOMMINUITION DORM Contract No. F 605-000-772

Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$ Ijamsville.

In order to provide a method by which the more complicated or controversial questions can be answered, please fill in the following infermotion:
NAME Wm Betel, Ir.
ADDRESS RA. O $\qquad$
COUNTY Erederke ZIP CODE 21701
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.
From the postie. as a resident on Bartensville Rood, Plan $B$ has many aduintajes over Plan $A$. The three major advantages are as follows; ; The upgrading of Bartonsville Rood by the Skate will not be needed; 2 , There will be no ned th Shooter the front yards of exerting homie T. ollocatier the incensed traffic; mat lay, The use of Pouf ${ }^{4}$ as wall allow the general oread between Frederick and Fjamsuile Read to developer nsectiz an adsyente jerviernsad.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas Hicks
Acting beauty Chief Engincer-Planning and Safety
State lit hila administration
300 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

PUBLIC HEARING 7/6/72

QUESTION ANU/OR RECOMMENDATION DORM
Contract No. F 605-000-772
Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$
Ijamsville Road to west of Monocacy Riv
Frederick, Maryland
In order to provide a method by which the more $\dot{\mathbf{a}}$ complicated or controversial questions can be answered, please fill in the following infomotion:

COUNTY fr e ciesict ZIP CODE 2! 7C1
Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas Hicks
fAcing Deputy Chief Engivacr-planning and Safety
State Highway Administration
300 west preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

PUBLIC HEARING 7/6/72

QUESTION ANIM/OR RECOMmENDATION FORM Contract No. F 605-000-172

Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$
Ijamsville Road to west of Monocacy Frederick, Maryland
In order to provide a method b; which the more complicated or controversial questions can be answered, please fill in the following inform-

adDress RF
COUNTY Hhedenleck 2IP CODE 2 , 1711
Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas Hicks
Acting llonuty Chief Engincor-Planning and Safety
State Highway Administration
300 Rest Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
LSF-35 [7/12/71]
(QUESTION ANI)/OR RECOMMENIMATION FORM Contract No. F 60S-000-772

Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$ Ijamsville Road to west of Monocacy River Frederick, Maryland
In order to provide a method by which the more complicated or controversial questions can be answered, please fill in the following irformation:


COUNTY facturneelf IIP CODE_ $2 / 7 c \%$
Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.


Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas Hicks
Acting Denuty Chief Engincer-Pianning and Safety State Highway Administration
300 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

LSF-3S $[7 / 12 / 71]$

PUBLIC HEARING 7/6/72.

QUESTION ANU/OR RECOMMENDATION FORM
Contract No. F 605-000-772
Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$
Ijamsville Road to west of Monocacy River Frederick, Maryland

In order to provide a method by which the more complicated or controversial questions can be answered, please fill in the following informarion:



Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas ticks
Acting. Denuty Chief Engineer-Planning and Safety
State lliginay administration
300 Rest Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
LS:-35 [7/12/71]

PUBI.IC HEARING 7/6/72
!!H:STION ANU/OR RI:COMMIENUATION FORM Contract No. F 605-000-772
 complicated or controversial questions can be answered, please fill in the following irformotion:
NME Mra E(leti) \& Ray
counv-Zrederi. 2 ZIP cone $\alpha 1>01$
Short statement concerning question or other inquiry. $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas Hicks
Acting Deputy Chic Engineer-planning and Safety
State HIghway Adamistration
300 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

PUBLIC HEARING 7/6/72
QUESTION ANIIOR RECOMMENDATION I:ORM
Contract No. F 605-000-772
Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$
Ijamsville Road to west of Monocacy Riv
Frederick, Maryland
In order to provide a method by which the more complicated or controversial questions can be answered, please fill in the following infer: motion:
NAME Alice D. fill
county Fred'K. 2IP COLE_2ATO1
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas Hicks
Acting Deputy Chief Enginoer-Planaing and Safety
State Highway Administration
300 Nest Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
SF- 35 [7/12/71]

PUBLIC HEARING 7/6/72
(UU:SUION AN!/OR RECOMMENDATION HOLM
Contract No. F 605-000-772
Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$
Ijamsville Road to west of Monocacy Frederick, Maryland
In order to provide a method by which th. ...ore complicated or controversial questions ci be answered, please fill in the following irformotion:


Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.

 the Bartonsville area.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas Hicks
Acting, Deputy Chief Engincer-Planaing and Safety
State lligimey Administration
300 West preston Stree:
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

PUBLIC HEARING 7/6/72
IUI:STION ANU/OR RE:COMMI:NHATION DORM Contract No. F 605-000-772 Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$ Ijamsville Road to west of Monocacy Rive Frederick, Maryland
In order to provide a method by which the complicated or controversial questions cath be answered, please fill in the following informmotion:


Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please Mail To:
Mr. Thomas Hicks
Acting Deputy Ciniof Fingincer-planning and Safety
State llighivay dministration
300 Hest Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
$2^{3} \quad \operatorname{LSF}-35[7 / 12 / 7 i]$

In orcier to pruvide a method by which the more complicated or controversial questions can be answered, please fill in the following, irformation:

NAME $\qquad$
ADCRESS Imerliff, irnuto in oroierick, iriryland COUNTY ZIP CODE_ $\quad \therefore 701$

Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.








以リ!?!!.




Please Miall ro:
Mr. Tlinat: : Ilick:
Actiun lleputy Cinjef Fnginter-Plaming and Safety State llighway Adminiotration
300 West proston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
LSF-35 [//12/\%1]
(!USSTON ANIMOR RECOMMENDATION BORM
inntract No. F 605-000- 72
Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$ Ijamsville Moad to kest of Monocacy River

Frederick, Maryland
In order to provide a method by which the nore complicated or controvers;al questions can be answered, please fill in the following Erformation:

NAME ilichord l.e finver
 COUNTY_______ $21 P$ CODE

Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.



future imosing irvolorment lingt wouli be affeotod by ilan k.
Sero arain, il won that we aro ruttoine the intential future



Mho ituto Rosis Comelssione the slectod officinls of

 $\qquad$


Please Majl To:
Mr. Thura, ilicks
Acting licpui; Shict lingincer-planning and Safety State llipinery Adarinistration 300 west Preston street Baltimare, Maryland 21201


Mr. \& Mrs. W. C. Ambrose re "ma
Rt. u Quinn Rd.
Fredaricis tia.
21701

Mr. Thomas Hicks


Asst. Chief Engr.
Traffic Planning
State Hwy. Adm.
P.O. Box 717

300 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Dear Sir:
For what it is worth, take plan B, or BI DO NOT TAKE PLAN A, if you will look on the map you will see, it comes right through my pond. And it will cost a hell of a lot of money to replace a
 of the water we have.

Lets face the facts the shortest distant between two points is a stright line, look on the plans and you can see.


Thank you,


Wilmer C. Ambrose Sr.
Rt. 6 Quinn Road
Frederick, Maryland 21701
$\xi \because \cdot$

 Stete Thininay ídnembetrateri 3 er $h i$ : riviotru 51.



OCT: 1972


Cuer man Ttajy",










 ricus houte to cur plase.



 lemelopers witl hare te gu's up senies of teice ferefits?

louns cery fialy
yíarivila $x$ jumd
$\bar{\pi}+6$
7arisuch, día 21701


PUBLIC HEARING $7 / 6 / 72$
140. uni MuLla

In order to provide a method by which the more PHILIP R. MILLER
complicated or controversial questions can be CHIEF EUREAU OF, nation:
NAME Me + Men Relivean SEechent
ADDRESS
 CouNTY Fradecent ZIP CODE $2170 /$

Shore statement concerning question or other inquiry.

crecicive on the poxes selection?

LAND EEVELORMENT ASSOCIATES inc. bbl kenilworth avenue riverdale.maryland rose SUITE GOB. 301/277.110S

September 7, 1972

Mr. Roland Thompson, Chief
Bureau of Location \& Surveys
Room 500, 301 W. Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201


Dear Mr. Thompson:
Let me take this opportunity to thank you for the time that you spent with Tom Munz and myself in discussing the routing of $1-70$ in the Frederick area on Tuesday. We appreciated your comments on the various plans as they affected our property and your insight into the problems in that area.

It is always nice to discuss a particular situation with a person like yourself who is fariliar with the area and is thoroughly experienced with the project. Once again, thank you and we. look forward to the possibility of working with you in the future.

## Sincerely,

Land Development Associates of Baltimore; he.

C. Dennis Webster, President

CD'N:mrs

PUBLICC HEARING 7/5/72
(IUISTION ANI/OR RECOMMENINTION HOR最
Contract No. F 605-000-772 $\because$ 후ㅈㅜㅗ
Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$
Ijamsville Road to west of Monocacy Reser Fredorick, Maryland $\sum_{0}^{2}$ 웅
In order to provide a method by which fine more complicated or controvers;al questions 飞an be $\bar{\infty}$ answered, please fill in the following infor-


Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.


Pioase llail To:
Mr. Thonas licks
Acting Denuty Chief Engineer-Planning and Safety

300 bicst Preston Sereet
Balcimore, Baizyland 21201
LE:-35 [7/12/71]

- $\quad 300$


## JUL $10 \quad 152$

1) II:CTION ANU/OR RFCOMMENIATION HORM Contract No. F 605-000-772 Interstate Route $70-\mathrm{N}$
SireT Dirctamsville Road to west of Monocacy
In order to provide a method by which the fore complicated or controversial questions can be complicated or controversy,
answered, please fill in the following
in formarion:

PUBL.IC HEARING 7/6/72

NAVE Manuel M. Weinberg Esquire
ADDRESS 10 West College Terrace, Frederick, Md.
-
COUNTY Frederick ZIP CODE 21701
Short statement concerning question or other inquiry.
Within the next 10 years there will be approximately 10,000 new homes in the Ijamsville area which will be occupied by approximately 30,000 people. Linganore Corporation has already sold over 1300 home sites with more than $10, n 00$ sites available In this development. My client, M. Robert Ritcnie, Jr. owns several hundred acres of $l$ and immediately East and West of the Ijamsville Road which eventually could be developed into sites for 2,000 homes. I cannot understand how $I-70^{\circ}$ can be improved with/an interchange at the Ijamsville intersection which is already servicing a large number of people.

Plassa Nail To:
Mr. Thomas Hicks
 State lifo say Administration
300 lest preston Street
Balciffore, Maryland 21201
LS: - 85 [7/12/71]

REFERENCF：Upgrading RE 40 to interstate standards
TO：
State Highway Administration
County Commissioners of Frederick County，Maryland
Gentlemen：
The undersigned，being homeowners in Tulip til area， request approval of scheme $B$ ；and further request that the proposed iloverlcaf shown on the westerly end be moved just cast of the limits of the City of Frederick．
riciale lii lis amen



$$
\begin{aligned}
& \because \therefore \cdots ?
\end{aligned}
$$

－ionired Solely


Fillies $:$ E ousarify

（ilion it，Stare．

（ $\because$ in
Line vi ́RN

就 人j＜eルく：







Flounce $i_{i}$ cusk

alice E wallace
fowond mo we alt Caroline，H．Welty


Reference: Upgrading. Rt 40 to interstate standards
TO:
State Highway Administration $\quad \therefore \quad \therefore \quad i r r ?$
County Commissioners of Frederick County, Maryland
Gentlemen:

The undersigned, being homeowners in Tulip Hill area, request approval of Scheme $B$; and further request that the proposed cloverleaf shown on the westerly end be moved just east of the limits of the city of Frederick.


C/extir is xalecter

- Fomutione ofrisitucustit Giciti teritiiverion
'sine 'Yitutice
(


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Jiecín i }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \because \mid i l: \quad \therefore j)!+2 ;
\end{aligned}
$$



LIvery Mi Olen,

$\uparrow$ REFERLNCE: Upgrading Rt 40 to interstate standards

TO:
State Highway Administration
$\therefore$ I ? ?
County Commissioners of Frederick County, Maryland
Gentlomen:
Les.ifi
The undersigned, being homeowners in Tulip Hill area, request approval of Scheme $B$; and Eurther request that the proposed cluverleaf shown on the westerly end be moved just east of the limits of the City of Erecicrick.
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mation:
inquiry.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ C. $\qquad$
() $\qquad$

$$
\because \ldots: \quad: \cdot
$$



$$
1.65-15 \quad[7 i 1 \therefore 1]
$$

gn: lin, wivile juci
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The following questions should be answered by placing a check in the appropriate column (s). If desirable, the "comments attached" column can be checked by itself or in combination with an answer of "yes" or "no" to provide additional information or to overcome an affirmative presumption.

In answering the questions, the significant beneficial and adverse, short and long term effects of the proposed action, onsite and off-sitc during construction and operation should be considered.

All questions should be answered as if the agency is subject to, the same requirements as a private person requesting a license or permit from the State or Federal Government.

*See appropriate section of the Environmental Impact Statement for further information on each question.
11. Will the action-alfect the use of a puislic recreation area, park, forest, wildlife management area, scenic river or wildiand?
X
12. Will the action affect the use of any natural or man-made features that are unique to the county, state or nation?
13. Will the action affect the use of an archaeological or historical site or structure?
B. Water Use Consideration:
14. Will the action regijere a permitfor the change of the course,current, or cross-section of astream or other holy of water?- $\quad \mathbf{Z}$15. Will the action require theconstruction, alteration orremoval of a dam, reservoir orwateinws obstruction?
16. Will the action change the overland flow or storm water or reduce the absorption capacity of the ground?
17. Will the action require a permit for the drilling of a water well? $\qquad$
18. Wile? the action require a permit for water appropriation?
19. Will the action require a permit for the construction and operatron of facilities for treatment or disicribution of water?

```
- X
```

20. Will the project require a permit for the construction and operation of facjitites Er sewage treatment bandier land disposal of liquid waste derivatives?
21. Will the action result in any diturintge into surface or subsurface water?
22. If so, will the discharge affect ambient rater quai icy parameters and/or require a ol.scharge permit?

## C. Air Use Considerations

23. Will the action result. in any discharge into the air?
24. If so, will the discharge infect ambient air quality parameters or produce a disagreeable odor?
25. Wall the action generate duitonal noise which differs in character of lever? from present conditions?
26. Will the action preclude future use of related air space?

- X

27. Will the action generate any radiological, electrical, magnetic, or light influences?
$-\quad \underline{X}$
D. Plants and Animals
28. Will the action cruse the disturbance, reduction or loss of any rare, unique or valuable plant or animal?
$-\quad \underline{X}$
29. Will the action result in the significant reduction or loss of any fish or wildlife habitats?.
— X
30. Will the action require a permit for the use of pesticides, nerbicodes or other biological, cherical or radiological control agents?
E. Socio-Economic.
31. Will tho action result in a predemption or division of properties or impair their economic u:ie?

[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Labor Force and Employment Characteristics, Maryland Departinent of State Planning, 1970.

[^1]:    1 State of Maryland, Department of hater Resources and the Department
     and Significant Sources of Wastanator viscinros in mary and 1970 135 pp .

[^2]:    

[^3]:    1 U. S. Department of Interior, Fish and iillidice Scrvice recomicaded Wetland Classification System, Circ. \#39.

[^4]:    1 Soil Survey - Frederick County, U. S. Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, September 1960, pit.

[^5]:    * Sourcc: U. S. Department of Transportation PPM 90-2

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ Scientific American, The fuel Consumption of Autos, January 1975.

[^7]:    re: : Ir. Gourde C. Myers

[^8]:    1/ The regulations of the pedern. Zichove faninistration province that "...it is dusirab: that the division engineer or his representative attend a public hearing as an observer. At a hozrins, he may properly explain procedural and technical matters." zEjicy and procedure Momoranium 20-8, §8(d)(9); 23 C.F.天. App. A (1972). Not a single Federal Higherey official was in attendance.
    2/ Petitions objecting to Plan B. (or Plan $\dot{j}-1$ ) have been signed by more than 150 residents of the affected area and filed with the State Highboy administration on the evening of July 6,1972 . 'ane silent majority thus seeks recognition and consideration.

[^9]:    8/ The Division Engineer of the Feacral Highway Administration in a July 12, 1972. letter to Mr. Murphy indicated that he too has loan led to believe that the costs of Plans $A$ and $B$ are anout equal.

