

IV. SECTION 4(f) EVALUATION

*SR 26, Atlantic Avenue from Clarksville to Assawoman Canal
Environmental Assessment and Section 4(f) Evaluation*



U.S. Department of Transportation
FHWA



STATE OF DELAWARE
Department of Transportation

DELMAR DIVISION

NATIONWIDE SECTION 4(f) EVALUATION for MINOR INVOLVEMENT WITH HISTORIC SITES

Project: #24-112-10, ESTP – S026(6)

Description: SR 26, Atlantic Avenue, from Clarksville to Assawoman Canal

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
A. APPLICABILITY		
1. Are the historic sites adjacent to the existing highway?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Does the project require the removal or alteration of historic structures, objects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Does the project disturb or remove archeological resources that are important to preserve in place rather than recover?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Is the impact to the 4(f) site considered minor (i.e. no effect, no adverse effect)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Has the DESHPO agreed, in writing, with the assessment of impacts and proposed mitigation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Does the project require the preparation of an EIS?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Is the project on new location?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8. The scope of the project is one of the following:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A. Improved traffic operations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Safety improvements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. 4R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Bridge replacement on essentially the same alignment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Addition of channelization and turning lanes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED		
1. The do-nothing alternative has been evaluated and is considered not to be feasible and prudent.	✓	□
2. An alternative has been evaluated which improved the highway without any 4(f) taking and it is considered not to be feasible and prudent.	✓	□
3. An alternative on new location avoiding 4(f) taking has been evaluated and is considered not to be feasible and prudent.	✓	□
MINIMIZATION OF HARM		
1. The project includes all possible planning to minimize harm	✓	□
2. Measures to minimize harm include the following: *		
* Please refer to the Documentation of a Finding of No Adverse Effect approved for the SR 26 project.		
COORDINATION		
1. The proposed project has been coordinated with the following:		
A. SHPO	✓	□
B. ACHP	N/A	□
C. Property owner, private	✓	□
D. Local/State/Federal agencies	✓	□
E. U.S. Coast Guard	N/A	□

Note: Any response in a box requires additional information prior to approval.
 Consult Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation.

SUMMARY and APPROVAL

The project meets all criteria included in the programmatic 4(f) evaluation approved on December 23, 1986.

All required alternatives have been evaluated and the findings made are clearly applicable to this project.

The project includes all possible planning to minimize harm and that there are assurances that the measures to minimize harm will be incorporated in the project.

_____ Approved _____
Date **Division Administrator**

IV. SECTION 4(f) EVALUATION

Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act (DOT Act) of 1966 (49 U.S.C. 303 [c]) requires that the proposed use of any land from a significant publicly owned park or recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site that is on or considered eligible for the NRHP be given particular attention. Final action requiring the taking of such land must document that there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to its use. Additionally, a full evaluation of measures to minimize harm to that resource must be made and documented. The *Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation for Minor Involvement with Historic Sites* on pages IV-1 and IV-2 was utilized for federal approval because the impacts to historic sites, as explained in this chapter, concluded *A Finding of No Adverse Effect* to the historic 4(f) resources.

A. Description of Proposed Action Under the Preferred Alternative

The proposed action would involve widening SR 26 from its intersection with Omar and Powell Farm Roads in Clarksville to the Assawoman Canal, a distance of approximately 3.94 miles (see **Figure I-2**). Access to businesses along this length of SR 26 would also be improved to provide safer ingress and egress for adjacent properties.

The typical section for this project under the Preferred Alternative (Revised Alternative D) would be two 11-foot wide travel lanes, 5-foot wide shoulders on both sides and a 12-foot wide continuous shared center left-turn lane. Safety grading along the outside will also be provided based upon a 40 MPH Design Speed. The segment of SR 26 from Clarksville to west of Railway Road will be an open section with roadside drainage ditches. The section from west of Railway Road to the Assawoman Canal will be a closed section with curb, gutter, and closed drainage. The majority of the closed section will also have a 3-foot grass strip behind the curb and gutter that will be used for utilities. Five-foot wide sidewalks will be provided from Windmill Road to the Assawoman Canal.

Right turn lanes are being added at most intersections. The intersection of SR 26 and Central Avenue will be realigned, and turn lanes will be added in each direction. The following intersections with SR 26 would be improved: Powell Farm Road; Irons Lane; Whites Neck Road; Railway Road; Windmill Road; Clubhouse Road; Old Mill Road; Doc's Place; Cedar Drive; Woodland Avenue; Central Avenue; West Avenue; and Tyler Drive. The Preferred Alternative, Revised Alternative D, provides a continuous shared center left-turn lane between these intersections and mid-block areas.

The proposed improvements are consistent with the project purpose and need as recommended in the *SR 26 Planning Study* and by the SR 26 Advisory Committee. The majority of right of way acquisitions within the project limits will be linear strips along the roadway. The exception to this is land needed for the stormwater management facilities. The historic resources that will be impacted by this project will be subjected only to the strip acquisitions; no historic structure will be impacted by this project.

B. Description of Section 4(f) Resources

There are no publicly owned parks, recreation areas, or wildlife and waterfowl refuges impacted by this project.

DelDOT conducted a Cultural Resources Survey for the project APE in 2002. Field surveys in Spring 2002 resulted in the identification of eighty-two additional resources meeting the fifty year old or older requirement for historic evaluation within the APE. The NRHP Criteria for Evaluation were then applied to these eighty-two individual resources, the twenty-nine previously surveyed resources, and three potential linear village districts for Clarksville, Millville, and Ocean View. As a result of this evaluation, fourteen resources were recommended eligible for the NRHP. This recommendation was submitted to the DESHPO and received their concurrence.

Criteria used to determine whether a resource is eligible for listing on the NRHP are as follows:

- **Criteria A:** Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- **Criteria B:** Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- **Criteria C:** Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- **Criteria D:** Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The following is a list of properties that are either listed or eligible to be listed on the NRHP within the SR 26 project limits. Photographs of these properties are located on **Figures IV-1** through **IV-14** and their location are provided on **Figures II-4, II-5, II-8, II-10, II-11, II-12, II-13** and **II-14** in **Chapter II**.

1. **Edmund J. and Sadie E. Evans House S-243 (Criteria C)**
This house's architecture is an example of a vernacular I-house with Colonial Revival detailing. See **Figure II-4** and **IV-1**.
2. **M.C. Webb House S-2484 (Criteria C)**
This house displays architectural significance as an I-house property type with vernacular Gothic Revival detailing. See **Figures II-4** and **IV-2**.
3. **Spring Banke Property S-454 (Criteria C)**
Spring Banke was listed on the National Register in 1976. Spring Banke is a rare example of a well-preserved, eighteenth-century, small house of a type that was occupied by tenants, small farmers, and other colonists of limited means. See **Figures II-5** and **IV-3**.
4. **The Campbell Farm S-9771 (Criteria A)**
This property is recommended eligible for the NRHP because of its long-standing association with local agriculture. See **Figures II-6** and **IV-4**.
5. **Mark Hiestand House S-2439 (Criteria C)**
The Mark Hiestand House is a relatively intact example of Colonial Revival/ Cape Cod architecture in the area. See **Figures II-5, II-6** and **IV-5**.
6. **Russell Banks Property S-9766 (Criteria A)**
This property's former use as a car dealership, and current use as a pet store, has directly linked the property with the growth of the automobile, and subsequent growth of communities along Route 26. See **Figures II-8** and **IV-7**.
7. **Howard Hickman Property S-9757 (Criteria C)**
The Hickman Property, which includes the house and adjacent work shed, serves as a good example of a 1925 Bungalow type dwelling. See **Figures II-9** and **IV-8**.
8. **Paul and Margaret McGinn Property S-9753 (Criteria C)**
This small barn, with its one and one-half stories and steeply pitched, front-gable roof, is a good example of local agricultural architecture. See **Figures II-9** and **IV-9**.
9. **Grace D. Wolf House S-9119 (Criteria C)**
This property retains architecture significance through its Colonial Revival style and clinker brick construction. See **Figures II-10** and **IV-10**.
10. **Blaine T. Phillips Property S-9741 (Criteria C)**
This property's Gothic Revival style of symmetrical two and one-half stories, and three bays wide, makes it a significant architectural example of an I-house. See **Figures II-10** and **IV-11**.

11. Townsend Store and Dwelling S-9120 (Criteria A and C)

The Townsend Store is not only significant for its vernacular architectural style but also for its role as a hub of commerce for the Town of Millville, Delaware during the early- to mid-twentieth century. See **Figures II-10** and **IV-12**.

12. Ralph H. and Geraldine B. West Property S-9115 (Criteria C)

This property is a relatively intact example of Colonial Revival architecture and clinker brick construction along the Route 26 corridor. See **Figures II-11** and **IV-13**.

13. Mark and Paul Brown Property S-9737 (Criteria C)

The Mark and Paul Brown Property serves as an example of a Colonial Revival, four-square dwelling featuring a hipped roof with a hipped roof dormer, a screen-enclosed full-width front porch, and original 4/1 windows. See **Figures II-12** and **IV-14**.

14. Lord Baltimore Elementary School S-9133.001 and S-9133.002 (Criteria A and C)

Lord Baltimore Elementary School's significance comes from its Colonial Revival style of balanced symmetry and through its role as an educational institution used to improve Delaware's school system in the early twentieth century. See **Figures II-13** and **IV-15**.

With the exception of the Lord Baltimore Elementary School, the Section 4(f) resources are privately owned. The elementary school is owned by the Indian River School District.



Figure IV-1: Edmund J. and Sadie E. Evans House



Figure IV-2: M.C. Webb House



Figure IV-3: Spring Banke Property



Figure IV-4: The Campbell Farm



Figure IV-5: Mark Hiestand House



Figure IV-6: Russell Banks Property (formerly a service station)



Figure IV-7: Howard Hickman Property



Figure IV-8: Paul and Margaret McGinn Property



Figure IV-9: Grace D. Wolf House



Figure IV-10: Blaine T. Phillips Property



Figure IV-11: Townsend Store (left) and Dwelling (right)



Figure IV-12: Ralph H. and Geraldine B. West Property



Figure IV-13: Mark and Paul Brown Property



Figure IV-14: Lord Baltimore Elementary School

C. Description of Impacts to Section 4(f) Resources

Table IV-1 compares the impacts of the Combination Alternative ABC, Alternative D and Revised Alternative D. All impacts would involve fee simple right-of-way acquisition. No historic structures would be impacted under any of the alternatives. Furthermore, none of the build alternatives would adversely impact any archeological resources.

Of the fourteen National Register Eligible/Listed Resources identified within the project limits, the Combination Alternative ABC would impact two historic properties for a total of 0.10 acres, Alternative D would impact six historic properties for a total of 0.20 acres of impacts, and Revised Alternative D would impact five historic properties for a total of 0.18 acres of impacts. The impacts were assessed and resulted in a *Finding of No Adverse Effect* on all of the historic properties as detailed in **Appendix B**. This finding has been reviewed and approved by the DESHPO. Concurrence of *No Adverse Effect* was received on December 14, 2007 (See **Appendix B**).

D. Avoidance and Minimization Alternatives

1. Preliminary Alternatives A, B and C

As shown on **Figures II-3 to II-15** the fourteen historic resources within the project area are located on both sides of SR 26 (seven sites are located on the north side and seven sites are located on the south side). Typically, it is the goal to widen SR 26 about the existing centerline, thus equally distributing the right-of-way impacts between both sides of the roadway. When sensitive resources (such as historic sites) are encountered, Section 4(f) requires substantive efforts be made to avoid and/or minimize impacts by shifting the widening to one side of the road or the other.

The location of the historic properties is such that four distinct sections were identified where alignment alternatives could be evaluated for avoidance and minimization of impacts to these resources. Within each section up to three alternative alignments were developed to accomplish the goal of the project improvements. Alternative A maintains the widening about the existing roadway centerline. Alternative B shifts the alignment a maximum of 10 feet to the north of the existing roadway centerline and Alternative C shifts the alignment a maximum of 10 feet to the south of the existing roadway centerline. Based on the goal of avoiding and/or minimizing impacts to the historic sites, a preliminary Preferred Alternative was developed using a combination of alternative alignment shifts throughout the study area. The various alternatives and the Preferred Alternative were reviewed with FHWA and DESHPO at a meeting on August 23, 2004. On October 15, 2004, a meeting was held in the project corridor with FHWA and the DESHPO to verify and concur on a preferred alignment for the SR 26 improvements. The Preferred Alternative was presented at a Public Workshop on November 17, 2004.

The four sections of historic properties are as follows:

a. Section One

Section One includes the Webb, Evans, Spring Banke, Campbell and Hiestand properties. The combination alternative in this section avoids the Webb, Evans, Spring Banke and Campbell properties but requires right of way from the Hiestand property. The roadway alignment in this

section was shifted to the south to avoid takes from the Spring Banke and Campbell properties that are near each other on the north side of SR 26. The Hiestand property, which is on the south side of SR 26 could not be avoided, since it is directly opposite the Spring-Banke and Campbell properties.

b. Section Two

Section Two encompasses the Banks property. The Banks property, formerly a gas station, was converted into a Pet Store is located on the northwest corner of SR 26 and Whites Neck Road. The Preferred Alternative in this section will shift the roadway to the south to avoid right-of-way acquisition from the Banks property. Currently, this parcel has open (non-controlled) access on both SR 26 and Whites Neck Road. This project, *while not acquiring permanent right-of-way*, will modify the entrances to create controlled access points. The DESHPO noted that part of the historical significance of the property is the commercial aspect and that the entrance modifications should ensure that the gas station function could be maintained. If the property could not function as a gas station, the commercial viability of the property as it exists today may be limited. The controlled access does not alter the functionality of the property as a gas station.

c. Section Three

Section Three includes the Hickman property. The combination alternative in this section will shift the roadway to the south to avoid right-of-way acquisition from the Hickman parcel. The Hickman property is in an area where the houses on the south side of SR 26 are close to the roadway. The alignment shift will cause one additional acquisition on the south side of the roadway.

d. Section Four

Section Four includes the Wolf, Phillips, Townsend, West and Brown properties. The combination alternative in this section shifts the alignment first to the north and then to the south to minimize the right-of-way acquisitions from these properties. A small amount of land will need to be acquired from the West property; acquisition was avoided on the remaining four properties. The Townsend Store is located such that the overhang of the building is within the existing roadway right-of-way. Acquisition of this property was avoided, but the overhang will be a safety issue.

2. Build Alternatives

a. Combination Alternative ABC

Following extensive coordination with the DESHPO, the FHWA, and DelDOT, it was decided that in Section One, a combined Alternate A and C would be used because it provided a balance between impacts to historic sites and residential relocations. In Section Two, Alternative B would minimize impacts to the NRHP eligible Banks property. Alternative B was used in Section Three to eliminate the need to relocate the house on the McGinn property and Alternative C would be used in Section Four to minimize impacts to six NRHP-eligible properties. These alternatives were combined into a single alternative referred to in this

document as Combination Alternative ABC. The remainder of the project (outside of the section limits) will be widened about the existing roadway centerline.

This alternative widens the existing roadway to create two 11-foot travel lanes with 5-foot shoulders/bike lanes. The western portion of the project, from Clarksville to west of Railway Road incorporates an open drainage section with no sidewalks. The eastern portion of the project, from west of Railway Road to the Assawoman Canal was designed with a curb and gutter, closed drainage and a 5-foot sidewalk. In both the open and closed drainage sections, all utilities would be relocated beyond the clear zone.

Under this alternative three intersections would be improved beyond the addition of left turn lanes: SR 26/Omar Road/Powell Farm Road (Clarksville), Central Avenue and West Avenue. The Clarksville intersection would be realigned to allow for SR 26 to have the through movement, and additional turn lanes would be incorporated. This would allow for a safer intersection with fewer points of conflict. The SR 26/Central Avenue intersection would be realigned to allow for a smoother through movement on Central Avenue. Turn lanes are also being proposed for this intersection. A new traffic signal is proposed for West Avenue, as well as left turn lanes from SR 26 onto West Avenue. Additional improvements, such as bypass lanes at unsignalized intersections, as well as continuation of the proposed bike lane through the signalized intersections are included in this alternative.

This alternative includes the delineation and channelization at many of the open access points within the project limits. The addition of curb and gutter, grass strips and the removal of pavement within the entrances would allow for more controlled movements at these points. Each proposed entrance meets DelDOT's standards for either residential or commercial entrances.

During the analysis of the Combination Alternative ABC alternative, it was determined that the shared center left turn lane was needed to help control traffic at the numerous access points. Without the shared center left turn lane, considerable traffic back-ups would occur mid-block. This creates a safety issue as well as a congestion problem. Therefore, through this analysis, Combination Alternative ABC was found not to meet the two of the four stated goals of the project.

b. Alternative D

This alternative is similar to the Combined ABC alternative, including the creation of travel lanes and shoulders, the limits of open and closed drainage sections, proposed intersection realignments and creation of defined access points. But it also adds a continuous shared center left turn lane for the entire project limits instead of adding left turn lanes at intersections.

This alternative widens the existing roadway to create two 11-foot travel lanes with 5-foot shoulders/bike lanes and 12-foot wide continuous shared center left turn lanes. The western portion of the project, from Clarksville to Old Mill Road, incorporates an open drainage section with no sidewalks. The eastern portion of the project, from Old Mill Road to the Assawoman Canal, was designed with a curb and gutter, closed drainage and a 5-foot sidewalk. In both the open and closed drainage sections, all utilities will be relocated beyond the clear zone.

In addition to the shared center turn lane, this alternative also includes the re-alignment of the SR 26 and Cedar Drive intersection, in addition to the three intersections mentioned under Combination Alternative ABC. Presently this intersection is at a skew to SR 26. The intersection would be re-aligned to be perpendicular to SR 26. This would improve safety and traffic flow at this intersection.

The horizontal alignment of Alternative D would generally follow the historic resource minimization alignment shifts developed for Sections One, Two, Three and Four. In order to minimize impacts to the Hickman property and several residences on the south side of SR 26 in Section Three, a closed drainage system with no sidewalk would be utilized. **Table II-5** compares the impacts of the original Combination ABC alternative with the continuous shared center left-turn lane alternatives (Alternative D and Revised Alternative D). The typical cross section for Alternative D is shown on **Figures II-1** and **II-2**.

c. Revised Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)

Revised Alternative D is a refinement of Alternative D and shares the same typical section. Once Alternative D was developed, DelDOT continued coordination with the DESHPO and FHWA in order to minimize impacts to the historic and natural resources within the project limits. In some areas, certain design details, such as reducing the width of the grass strip, adding closed drainage within the open section, and adding retaining walls were incorporated into Alternative D. These details helped to minimize impacts to the historic resources and allowed for some relocations to be reduced to strip acquisitions instead. Stormwater management and drainage needs have also been refined in this Alternative.

One change to the proposed horizontal alignment of preliminary Alternative D has been implemented in this Alternative. This change consists of a shift in the alignment, beginning at a point approximately 300 feet west of Tyler Avenue, which will avoid displacing two parcels, effectively reducing their impacts to strip acquisitions. As design advanced, the storm-water management pond locations, areas and sizes were also revised. The changes to the linear right-of-way to avoid and minimize impacts has also resulted in revised drainage, grading and final relocation of utilities. Drainage in front of the historic Hiestand property, located on the south side of SR 26 near Irons Lane, was originally designed under Alternative D as an open drainage section; however, in order to limit acquisition from this NRHP-eligible property, Revised Alternative D included a redesigned closed drainage system with curb and gutter.

Revised Alternative D is the Preferred Alternative because it meets all four of the project goals, while minimizing impacts to the historic and natural resources within the project limits. As stated above, Combination Alternative ABC was found not to satisfy the goals of reducing congestion or improving safety. While Preliminary Alternative D met all the project goals, the design was conceptual and would not meet all State and Federal design requirements.

The Preferred Alternative meets the goals of reducing congestion and improving safety by adding the continuous shared center left turn lane. This additional lane provides room for emergency vehicles to respond. The lane may also be utilized during an evacuation for any weather or homeland security event.

The shared center left turn lane also allows motorists who wish to make left turns mid-block to do so outside of the through travel lanes. Without this lane, vehicles waiting to turn left would have to stop in the through travel lane, thereby impeding traffic flow, because the proposed 5-foot shoulder would not be wide enough for through vehicles to pass around them. This situation would not only add to the congestion on the roadway, it would also create an unsafe condition.

The center lane widening improvements will physically encroach on the property boundaries of four NRHP-Listed/Eligible properties S-2439, Mark Hiestand House; S-9771, Campbell Farm; S-9757, Howard Hickman Property; and S-9115, Ralph H. and Geraldine B. West Property.

The physical take under 36 CFR, 800.5 (a)(2)(i) will occur, but no character defining features will be adversely affected. Additionally, the contributing elements are set back in distance to the road. Drainage in front of the historic Hiestand property was originally an open drainage design; however, to limit acquisition from this NRHP-eligible property, it was redesigned as a closed drainage system.

There are right-of-way impacts to the NRHP-listed/eligible property S-9753, the Paul and Margaret McGinn Property. Despite the need for right-of-way on the McGinn property the portion impacted is not in a NRHP-listed/eligible boundary. The small barn located behind the main house is the only portion of the McGinn property that is NRHP-listed/eligible.

Table II-5 compares the impacts of Revised Alternative D with the original Combination ABC Alternative and with Alternative D.

E. Coordination and Mitigation

Extensive and ongoing coordination with the DESHPO was conducted throughout the development of project alternatives and is documented in detail in **Appendix A**.

Despite right of way impacts to five NRHP-eligible/listed properties under Revised Alternative D, mitigation will be in the form of design refinements to assure there are no adverse physical or visual impacts to any of the properties. The impacts were assessed and subsequently resulted in a Finding of No Adverse Effect on any of the historic properties as detailed in Section IV of this document the *Section 4(f) Evaluation* and **Appendix B**, the *Finding of No Adverse Effect*, prepared pursuant of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and the implementing regulations contained in 36 CFR Part 800. This finding was reviewed and approved by the DESHPO on December 14, 2007 (see **Appendix B**).

Table IV-1: Permanent Right-of-Way Impacts to NRHP-Listed/Eligible Properties for Each Alternative

Description of Resource			Impacts in Square Feet (sf)		
CRS#	Resource Name	Tax Parcel	Combination Alternative ABC	Alternative D	Revised Alternative D
S-2483	Edmund J. and Sadie E. Evans House	1-34-11-158.02 (.273 ac)	0	0	0
S-2484	M. C. Webb House	1-34-11-192.00 (2.02 ac)	0	914 sf	0
S-454	Spring Banke (listed 1976)	1-34-11-172.00 (3.13 ac)	0	0	0
S-9771	The Campbell Farm	1-34-11-171.00 (13.8 ac)	0	991 sf	991 sf
S-2439	Mark Hiestand House	1-34-11-182.00 (0.797 ac)	3,484 sf	3,354 sf	2,834 sf
S-9766	Russell Banks Property	1-34-12-14.00 (0.275 ac)	0	0	0
S-9757	Howard Hickman Property	1-34-12-50.01 (0.968 ac)	0	1,581 sf ac	1,581 sf ac
S-9753	Paul and Margaret McGinn Property (small barn only)	1-34-12-354.00 (1.13 ac)	0	1,487 sf	1,487 sf
S-9115	Ralph H. and Geraldine B. West House	1-34-12-164.00 (2.095 ac)	871 sf	579 sf	579 sf
S-9119	Grace D. Wolf House	1-34-12-400.00 (5.0 ac)	0	0	0
S-9741	Blaine T. Phillips Property	1-34-12-404.00 (0.88 ac)	0	0	0
S-9120	Townsend Store and Dwelling	1-34-12-405.00 (0.79 ac)	0	0	0
S-9133 .001 and .002	Lord Baltimore Elementary School	1-34-12-424.00 (10.15 ac)	0	0	0
S-9737	Mark and Paul Brown Property	1-34-12-287.00 (0.615 ac)	0	0	0
Total (in Acres):			0.10	0.20	0.17