

Wooldridge, John

From: Wooldridge, John
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 2:03 PM
To: Morgan, Douglas; Heim, Kimber; Schmelzer, Edward; Deitrich, William
Subject: RE: PID 110412, FAI-37/256 safety project

Thanks Doug,

That was very quick! I have reviewed the changes. I think the acquisition cost will be a net savings but the utility cost (greater cost) is unknown until Ed and Bill are able to provide an estimate. I do not know if Ed and Bill can provide us a number today or tomorrow before our 8:30 am meeting with Leadership; nor by Tuesday afternoon for the group meeting (Monday is a Holiday). Here are my thoughts for the acquisition costs but I would be very interested to know how Kimber views it since we may see the amounts differently.

- PCL 20 would be a no take; so a decrease in the FMVE of \$17,500 and an elimination of the \$200,000, \$280,000, or \$395,000 proposed possible costs. We would need to officially rescind the offer if we elect to do this plan change. There is a possibility that we could be asked to pay attorney fees for work related to the take but we currently are unaware of any such costs.
- It appears there will be no changes to Parcels 1, 6, & 16 nor any other parcels not listed as the takes would not be changing.
- PCL 17 (Alexis Howard) would likely have no change in value although she may be unhappy that we did not avoid her property too.
- PCL 18 (Hutchison son) is likely unchanged in cost. The offer amount could likely be reduced as the take can likely be reduced on the side (by 20 to the E) but I believe they will still want either the same or more as I would anticipate some ill-will from them regarding their parents safety concerns since these plans may not be perceived as fixing the safety concerns and issues of PCL 20 (parents).
- PCL 9 would have an increase in cost. My best guess is that this could be accomplished rather quickly and I would anticipate an increased cost for this parcel in the amount of \$25,000 more since their property is Commercial and valued at \$45K/AC (less than Hutchison because they are 13 acres) as I assume the take is maybe around ½ acre or less with some minor improvements in take (2 very small signs). The take may be that big to accommodate Utility Relocation for poles.
- PCL 19 (new take) I would estimate at \$10,000 as it would be a VA for the Rural Residential land at about \$5,500/AC based on the other large track RR parcels already completed.

Therefore, I see the increased acquisition costs as plus \$35,000 and less around 285K (or some other agreed number or jury verdict) for a difference of \$250,000.00 LESS.

The Utility cost estimate will be needed. I know that Ed and Bill are working on it but I do not mind taking a guess:

- If Gas is impacted, I think the relocation will MORE than offset the \$250,000 difference and looks to possibly be reimbursable based on what little information I have heard. If the Gas is impacted; this plan change is likely not financially feasible. Based on the location of the aerial overlay and the survey over plans; I would guess that it is impacted by a ditch for drainage unless it is deeper than I imagine it to be. We will need to hear from Utilities to know.
- The poles will need relocated. I would guess that they may not be reimbursable but maybe they are due to project timing. Regardless, I would guess that the cost, reimbursable or not, is possibly \$125,000 MORE for about 6 poles with multiple users on them.

I think Ed and Bill would be better at estimating this than I have but I do understand you would like this information for the meeting tomorrow.

There were other non-monetary concerns expressed regarding the possible change that may also be worth discussing too.

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: Morgan, Douglas

Sent: Tuesday, February 9, 2021 8:43 AM

To: Wooldridge, John <John.Wooldridge@dot.ohio.gov>; Heim, Kimber <Kimber.Heim@dot.ohio.gov>; Schmelzer, Edward <Ed.Schmelzer@dot.ohio.gov>; Deitrich, William <William.Deitrich@dot.ohio.gov>

Subject: PID 110412, FAI-37/256 safety project

All,

The attached pdf's show the construction limits for the revised alignment that is being considered for this project. Please look at the impacts to the utilities and additional ROW needed and provide a high level cost due to these new impacts. We need any additional costs so that we can compare these changes to a relocation cost for Parcel 20.

Thanks,

Douglas N. Morgan, P.E.

(p) 740.323.5122

From: Spurlock, Derek <DSpurlock@trccompanies.com>

Sent: Tuesday, February 9, 2021 8:32 AM

To: Morgan, Douglas <Doug.Morgan@dot.ohio.gov>; Brown, Greg <GBrown@trccompanies.com>

Cc: Shoemaker, Timothy C. <TShoemaker@trccompanies.com>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: FAI-37 Alignment shift

Doug,

Please find attached two drawings showing R/W and utilities. One is zoomed in on the house with aerial photo and the other shows the entire east leg of the intersection.

Let us know if you need anything further.

Thanks,

Derek

From: Doug.Morgan@dot.ohio.gov <Doug.Morgan@dot.ohio.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 8, 2021 3:06 PM
To: Brown, Greg <GBrown@trccompanies.com>
Cc: Spurlock, Derek <DSpurlock@trccompanies.com>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: FAI-37 Alignment shift

This is an **EXTERNAL** email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe.

Greg,

Could I get a pdf showing the existing ROW, utilities and approximate location of the proposed pavement for this revised alignment? Also, it looks like the stationing does not match up to what we have for SR 256 (ROW or construction).

Give me a call if you have questions.

Thanks,

Douglas N. Morgan, P.E.
(p) 740.323.5122

From: Brown, Greg <GBrown@trccompanies.com>
Sent: Friday, February 5, 2021 11:55 AM
To: Morgan, Douglas <Doug.Morgan@dot.ohio.gov>
Cc: Spurlock, Derek <DSpurlock@trccompanies.com>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: FAI-37 Alignment shift

Doug,

Please see the attached pdf, which reflects 30 minute curves, as we discussed. There is a concern for the property owner's fence, which appears to be different from our original survey. The fence for the property owner to the west seem to be on target. Have these people moved their fence since we started?

Greg Brown
Senior Design Engineer



1382 West Ninth Street, Suite 400, Cleveland, OH 44113

T 216.505.6230 C 513.407.1283

[LinkedIn](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Blog](#) | [TRCcompanies.com](#)

Please note that our domain name and email addresses have changed

From: Doug.Morgan@dot.ohio.gov <Doug.Morgan@dot.ohio.gov>

Sent: Friday, February 5, 2021 7:18 AM

To: Brown, Greg <GBrown@trccompanies.com>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: FAI-37 Alignment shift

This is an **EXTERNAL** email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe.

Greg,

Can you give me a call today before 9:00 am?

Douglas N. Morgan, P.E.

(p) 740.323.5122

From: Brown, Greg <GBrown@trccompanies.com>

Sent: Thursday, February 4, 2021 3:07 PM

To: Morgan, Douglas <Doug.Morgan@dot.ohio.gov>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: FAI-37 Alignment shift

Doug,

I'm still working on the photo for the background, but wanted you to see the attached.

Greg Brown
Senior Design Engineer



1382 West Ninth Street, Suite 400, Cleveland, OH 44113

T 216.505.6230 C 513.407.1283

[LinkedIn](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Blog](#) | [TRCcompanies.com](#)

Please note that our domain name and email addresses have changed

From: Doug.Morgan@dot.ohio.gov <Doug.Morgan@dot.ohio.gov>
Sent: Thursday, February 4, 2021 7:16 AM
To: Brown, Greg <GBrown@trccompanies.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: FAI-37 Alignment shift

This is an **EXTERNAL** email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe.

Thanks, Greg.

Douglas N. Morgan, P.E.
(p) 740.323.5122

From: Brown, Greg <GBrown@trccompanies.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 4, 2021 7:04 AM
To: Morgan, Douglas <Doug.Morgan@dot.ohio.gov>
Subject: FAI-37 Alignment shift

Doug,

I'm continuing to look into this issue. So far, I've seen that we currently have a PI at the intersection that deflects 00-38'-20", which can be increased to 00-55'-00". This would offset the pavement edge an additional 4 feet from the corner of the house. I will continue to look into this and let you know. I have not yet determined the absolute necessary turn lane length. I do note that we are permitted to have centerline deflections of 55 minutes at 200 foot intervals, which may help.

Greg Brown
Senior Design Engineer



1382 West Ninth Street, Suite 400, Cleveland, OH 44113
T 216.505.6230 C 513.407.1283
[LinkedIn](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Blog](#) | TRCcompanies.com

Please note that our domain name and email addresses have changed

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.