

Heim, Kimber

From: Heim, Kimber
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 6:31 PM
To: Morgan, Douglas; Thompson, Tyrell; Wooldridge, John
Cc: Gwinn, Julie; Durant, Allison; Boyer, Benjamin
Subject: 110412 FAI-37/256 PCL 001 EICHHORN

I have been in touch with Eichhorn, PCL 001, and would like to run a suggestion by everyone. I have made a field visit to location, taken photos and want to suggest handling this building as a "training" exercise for our Fairfield County garage professionals and raze this building as we did on SR 60 "the building on the pipe". If we handled on a ROE when our people would have the time in the next few months, we could save the "T" compensation and the dollars for the building, even though this building is unusable, no power, no water, no gas service, the property owner could request larger compensation due to current Administrative Settlement guidance. It would also be a great real-life training opportunity for Ben and I to complete the asbestos inspection, testing and EPA filing.

I have a call with Mr. Eichhorn 7/22 to discuss project and could propose this option. When I spoke with him last week he discussed the cost to remove the building was something he did not think he could afford which is why it is still standing. Also, Mr. Eichhorn leases this space as a "field office" for a utility company, and if the building removal was handled as mentioned above, ODOT could avoid relocation costs for the 48 utility poles, two storage/trash bins, and Mr. Eichhorn also suggested if ODOT was willing to lay some rock down, ODOT construction team could also utilize the area as a laydown yard and to store equipment during the project. Wanted to inquire whether this is an option worthy of consideration. Enough space to have actual work trailer with facilities as well.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Kimber L. Heim

Realty Specialist Manager
ODOT – District 5
9600 Jacksontown Road
Jacksontown, OH 43030
Ph: 740-323-5422 (direct) Cell: 740-814-0708
FAX: 740-323-5125



OHIO DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

From: Miller, Jared
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 2:02 PM
To: Wooldridge, John <John.Wooldridge@dot.ohio.gov>; David Weber <dweber@wearehls.com>
Cc: Norton, Harvey <Harvey.Norton@dot.ohio.gov>; Heim, Kimber <Kimber.Heim@dot.ohio.gov>
Subject: RE: FAI-Parcel 4 and 1 on PID 110412

John,

Yes, as long as the agency, appraiser and reviewer all agree the appraisal problem is simplistic and meets the requirements of a VF with the exception of the dollar limit, a waiver can be granted. I will need to know what is the anticipated FMVE. Is this for two separate parcels?

Jared

From: Wooldridge, John <John.Wooldridge@dot.ohio.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 1:43 PM
To: David Weber <dweber@wearehls.com>; Miller, Jared <Jared.Miller@dot.ohio.gov>
Cc: Norton, Harvey <Harvey.Norton@dot.ohio.gov>; Heim, Kimber <Kimber.Heim@dot.ohio.gov>
Subject: RE: FAI-Parcel 4 and 1 on PID 110412

Hello Jared,

Do you approve using a VF format for a parcel that may be over \$65,000 with no damages to the residue? In the past, Kevin required his approval for exceeding the 65000 threshold, but I cannot find such a exception in the P&P today. The original scope was to do LSUM for these parcels unless under \$65K (see checklists attached). David believes this to be acceptable and the reviewer has no issue with it. District concurs that the issues hear are simplistic. We have heard that the building condition on parcel 1 is "roofless." Thank you Jared for letting us know if utilizing the VF format is OK even if the total exceeds \$65,000.

Please let me know if you have any questions, comments, or concerns. Thank you.

Respectfully,

John R. Wooldridge

Real Estate Administrator

ODOT District 5

9600 Jacksontown Road, Jacksontown, OH 43030

740.323.5427

transportation.ohio.gov



From: David Weber <dweber@wearehls.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 1:07 PM
To: Wooldridge, John <John.Wooldridge@dot.ohio.gov>
Cc: Norton, Harvey <Harvey.Norton@dot.ohio.gov>; Heim, Kimber <Kimber.Heim@dot.ohio.gov>
Subject: FW: FAI-Parcel 4

John,

Please see the email request/response below between Harvey and I.

The appraisal problem on parcel 4 appears to be simplistic. I am unsure at this second if the amount will go over \$65K, it will likely be in the neighborhood. There does not appear to be any residual damage to the land so an "after" appraisal would not be necessary as it would just reflect the same unit value as in the "before".

Therefore I am requesting permission to perform a Value Finding on parcel 4 with the understanding that it may exceed \$65K while remaining simplistic. This format appears to be sufficient to answer the appraisal problem.

Please let me know how you would like me to proceed.

Thanks

David M. Weber
Heritage Land Services
4150 Tuller Road, Suite 214
Dublin, Ohio 43017
(614) 918-2988 direct
(614) 918-2998 fax
dweber@weareHLS.com

From: David Weber
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 12:31 PM
To: 'Harvey.Norton@dot.ohio.gov' <Harvey.Norton@dot.ohio.gov>
Subject: FAI-Parcel 4

Harvey,

Similar to parcel 1 I feel like this parcel 4 has no residual damages in the after situation. I am not sure on the amount yet and it could go above \$65K. I believe we have a couple options here. I don't think doing an after is necessary as the value is going to be the same as before, same comps, same unit value. I know that with a simplistic acquisition the district can extend the \$65,000 amount.

I believe a VF on this parcel would be applicable with the understanding it may get above \$65K but is still simplistic.

If that is not acceptable then I think a limited summary with just the "before" would be the other option.

What are your thoughts?

Thanks

David M. Weber
Heritage Land Services
4150 Tuller Road, Suite 214
Dublin, Ohio 43017
(614) 918-2988 direct
(614) 918-2998 fax
dweber@weareHLS.com

CAUTION: This is an external email and may not be safe. If the email looks suspicious, please do not click links or open attachments and forward the email to csc@ohio.gov or click the Phish Alert Button if available.