**STATE OF OHIO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION RELOCATION ASSISTANCE AGENT’S NOTES**

|  |
| --- |
| LIC – Thornwood Crossing |
| County Route Section  12-O 87642 |
| Relocation Parcel No. PID  David Mark Flinn |
| Relocatee’s Name(s) |

*NOTE: All entries must be typed and signed or initialed by the Agent on the date of entry.*

*To add an additional row, tab from the end of the last Entry field.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Entry** |
| 08/19/21 | On this date, I met with Mr. Flinn, who goes by “Mark”, sole occupant of the property to be acquired at 2182 Reddington Road, Newark, Ohio 43055.  Please note: Mark is currently married to Candy Flinn, per the title report within the acquisition file; and they are working through a divorce. Mark and Candy have confirmed that all personal property found on the site and within the structure are the belongings of the occupant, Mark Flinn. Therefore, Mrs. Flinn is not eligible for certain relocation benefits within this parcel.  The acquisition of the property will be a total acquisition of approximately 1.5 acres per the appraisal report. Mark was aware of the project and was clear that he would have relocate to a replacement residence.  I informed him that my role was to provide potential Relocation Assistance (RA), should he qualify under the Relocation Assistance Program (RAP). I explained that Heritage Land Services (HLS) had been contracted by the City of Newark in order to provide this service. I additionally explained that the RAP is a Federally mandated program whose purpose was to provide certain benefits in order to help those being displaced by a roadway project in their transition to a replacement site.  In attendance were me (Jack B. Hughes – HLS) and David Mark Flinn, sole occupant of the subject property. Contact information was recorded for him and can be found within the file. It should be noted, I arranged for the appraiser to attend this meeting as well; however, Mr. Flinn denied access by the appraiser. Mr. Flinn was in the process of going through a divorce with his wife Candy Flinn, who was reflected as 50% fee owner of the property, per the title report. Mark confirmed Mrs. Flinn’s 50% ownership and explained that Mrs. Flinn no longer lives at the property nor pay the taxes on the property. He further confirmed that Mrs. Flinn doesn’t own any of the personal property at the subject property, all personal property items belonging to him. I advised Mr. Flinn that in this case, Mrs. Flinn would be entitled to 50% of the FMV that would be established; and further Mrs. Flinn would not be eligible for any of the relocation benefits were going to discuss based on his assertion of Mrs. Flinn having no personal property on the subject site. I also explained the qualification for the benefits would also be impacted by his 50% ownership and how the spending requirement worked. He understood. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | With that, I provided him with the Residential RAP brochure (which included my business card for contact information). I explained that the intent of the brochure is to give an overview of the RAP and potential benefits to which he may qualify. I further explained that due to the acquisition of his residence and garage, he may become eligible to receive those RA benefits once both an acquisition and relocation offer is presented in writing.  Next, I reviewed the potential benefits he may be eligible to receive, including: Move Costs, Replacement Housing Payment (RHP), Incidental Expenses and Increased Interest.  First, I went over the Move Costs. I asked Mr. Flinn to refer to the moving expenses area of the residential brochure where move types were discussed. I explained that there were essentially three different move types which may be opted.  The first possible move type is known as the Fixed Payment Move Schedule (FPMS), or self-move. I stated that if this move type was chosen, it would be based on a residential room count with the possibility of additional “pay rooms”. I showed him the residential room count schedule within the residential brochure and explained that a room count would be taken based on the number of residential rooms within the home. I stated that a residential room was a room where typically families would gather. This would include such rooms as: family rooms, living rooms, kitchens, dining rooms, bedrooms, finished recreational rooms, etc. I also stated that those areas not included in the residential room count would include: bathrooms, utility rooms, hallways, closets, unfinished areas, outbuildings, garages, etc. I informed him that a residential room count would first be taken to establish a base for the FPMS payment and that if there were additional areas not included in the residential room count, an inventory of those area’s would be taken. From that point, a “pay room” determination would have to be made in order to add payment to the established residential room count. I stated that a pay room is equal to a residential room in terms of personal property to be removed and that they were paid at $200.00 per pay room. I stated that once a total cost FPMS amount is determined, it was the responsibility of the displacee to complete the move in total (including removal of all personal property, trash and/or debris). I informed him that the FMS was an all-inclusive move amount and that the monies provided are determined to complete the move in its entirety. It was explained that the move schedule includes a dislocation allowance for the first two rooms to compensate for utility hook up expenses (i.e., reconnection of phone, cable and/or appliances) as well as removal of personal property items from areas of the residence not considered in the residential room count, such as hallways, utility rooms, etc.  Next, I reviewed a residential Contract Move (CM). I explained that the CM was a move to be completed by a professional mover. I stated that either he or myself would need to contact two reputable movers in the area (licensed, bonded, insured, etc.) and have them come out to the property to provide a firm bid (aka “not to exceed”) estimate as to the amount it will take to complete the move in its entirety (packing, crating, transporting, unpacking and uncrating costs, as well as full replacement value insurance). I stated that the two signed and dated estimates from authorized representatives of the moving companies contacted will need to be received (please note: on a low- cost move, a move anticipated to be under $2,500, only one reasonable bid will need secured) and will be reviewed with the lower of the two move estimates to be established as the maximum amount the agency will reimburse for completion of the move. I explained that any bid is found to be unreasonable, additional bid(s) will be secured until at least two acceptable bids have been secured.  It was noted that he was not required to choose the lower of the two bidders as his actual mover and he may choose whomever he wished, however, the agency will only reimburse up to the amount of |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | the low bid received or the actual amount of the final signed and dated move invoice (which will need to be marked as “paid in full”), whichever is less. It was noted that he can pay the mover directly upon completion and submit an invoice and proof of payment for claim reimbursement or the agency can pay the mover directly through execution of a letter of assignment. It was noted that in either case, it would take time for reimbursement to be received (approx. 6-8 weeks) and if an assignment is elected, the mover would need to be informed of the waiting period to receive payment prior to submission of the move bid. I said that if the final move invoice is more than the approved bid amount as a result of unforeseen circumstances or changes in the condition of the move not the fault of the displacee or mover, the agency may reimburse a higher amount upon approval and the conditions surrounding the increase will need documented fully. If additional move expenses are added not as a result of unforeseen circumstances, the additional amount will be the ultimate responsibility of the move contractor. I also explained that if the move was a distance of more than a 50-mile radius from the displaced site, the bid(s) to be secured will only include the cost for the first 50 miles and they would be responsible for the actual transportation costs only beyond the 50-mile marker (unless otherwise pre-approved by the agency). I additionally noted that as a part of this move, reimbursement of disconnecting, dismantling, removing, reassembling and reinstalling relocated household appliances and other personal property is applicable (this includes but is not limited to cost to reconnect telephones, cable TV, gas dryers to nearby gas lines, refrigerator ice makers to water lines, etc.). I stated that major plumbing alterations to the replacement site to accommodate appliances are not reimbursable, however.  I then reviewed the final move type, the residential Actual Cost Self Move (ACSM). I stated that this move was completed as a self-move by the displacee. I noted that the first action to occur when electing this move type is to draft a signed and dated written statement estimating total move costs, including estimates for time, labor materials and equipment and must be reviewed and approved prior to the start of the move. I said that hourly labor rates may not exceed the cost paid by a commercial mover for a beginning laborer and equipment rental fees should be based upon local rental fees. Should an agreement of estimated move costs be disputed, and a reasonable estimate cannot be received from the displacee, I stated that a move estimate(s) will be obtained to establish a reasonable cost and used only as a basis to determine reasonableness of the displacee estimate and not to be used as a basis for actual reimbursement. It was noted that during the move itself, they must keep track and document the actual costs incurred in the move, including receipts for rented equipment as well as costs for time, labor and materials would need to be submitted for review and comparison to the estimate originally submitted in order to determine the actual reimbursement amount. I additionally noted that as a part of this move, reimbursement of disconnecting, dismantling, removing, reassembling and reinstalling relocated household appliances and other personal property is applicable (this includes but is not limited to cost to reconnect telephones, cable TV, gas dryers to nearby gas lines, refrigerator ice makers to water lines, etc.). I stated that major plumbing alterations to the replacement site to accommodate appliances are not reimbursable, however. Finally, I explained that if the move will be a distance of more than a 50- mile radius from the displaced site, the estimate and final move invoice can only include the transportation cost for the first 50 miles (unless otherwise pre-approved by the agency).  I also informed him that upon selection and determination of the move type and actual or estimated (or bid) amount, a move authorization letter will need to be issued which will note the type of move selected and approved amount, the agreed upon date of move completion, notification of move  completion will be the responsibility of the displacee, a post move inspection will be completed to ensure completion of the move and finally, if all items are not moved and the site was not considered |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | as “broom clean” the agreed upon amount may be justified. I advised that if the move was started or completed prior to receiving a written move authorization letter he could potentially lose his eligibility for a move payment. I stated that after the move was completed, I would need to be contacted immediately to perform a post move inspection of the displaced site to ensure removal of all personal property, trash and/or debris. I stated that this inspection must be considered as passed before any move payment(s) are distributed. I informed him that the move authorization letter will be received either on or after the actual offer date (which establishes RAP benefit eligibility). I finally informed him that if needed, a combination of these moves could be utilized to complete the move in its entirety, if required due to an unusual circumstance and also approved by the agency.  After explaining the different move types, I next reviewed the potential Replacement Housing Payment (RHP) benefit. I informed him that this benefit establishes the “replacement gap” (if any) between what the property’s value is established at (which is the Fair Market Value Estimate  {FMVE}, based on a completed and approved appraisal of the property) and the listing price of a comparable style property for potential purchase, which must be available at the time of the offer. I stated that the next step with regards to the purchase of their property would be completion of an appraisal. I noted that the appraiser’s responsibility is to gather site information and prepare an appraisal report in order to establish the FMVE of the acquired site. After the report was completed, it was then sent to the agency where it will go through a review process to ensure that the appraisal was completed utilizing correct policy and procedures. Then, after the appraisal review has been completed a copy of the approved appraisal was sent to me in order to complete relocation functions. I explained that from that point, my job was to go out on the open real estate market utilizing various sources to try and locate three homes, but at the very least one home, which were comparable to his: on an equal or better than basis. When I stated comparable, I informed him that I did not mean identical. Comparable in terms of points of comparability in regards to Gross Square Footage (GSF with regards to the displacement site was established by appraisal information and with regards to potential comparable properties is established by county auditor records), total number of rooms (including useable bedrooms and number of bathrooms) and certain amenities such as basement, garage, home-style, type of neighborhood, age of home, air conditioning, utilities, public transportation, local public schools, distance to employment, etc. It was additionally noted that any home located will need to be considered as Decent, Safe and Sanitary as well. I informed him that of the comparable homes located, one was chosen as the prime comparable which best meets either the various points of comparability and/or functional equivalency in comparison to his subject site, if there was any difference between the appraised value of the home and the listing price of the prime comparable, that amount was offered to him in terms of a RHP. However, I stated, in order to qualify to receive the RHP; he must “spend it to get it”. Meaning, the actual cost(s) spent in association with a replacement site must exceed the acquisition settlement amount and extend up to the listing price of the comparable home in order to receive a portion or all the potential RHP monies. Further, based on the factional ownership, the spending requirement is upon his percentage of ownerhsip. It was also noted that he would need to purchase a replacement dwelling (which includes purchase of a replacement property, building a new replacement property or utilizing a previously purchased replacement property) and occupy the replacement dwelling as his permanent place of residence.  I then gave him an example: if the appraisal on the property comes in at $100.00 and the prime comparable home located has a listing price of $110.00, then he must spend his percentage of the FMV and the additional $10.00 in order to qualify for the entire RHP ($50+$10=$60). If less than  $50.00 was spent then he would not qualify for a RHP payment, if more than $60.00 is spent, any amount above this would have to come out of his pocket, and any amount spent in between $50.00 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | and $60.00 will establish the actual eligible RHP amount. I stated that he did not have to purchase that prime comparable home I locate in order to qualify for the possible RHP money. I informed him that he could purchase, build or even rent whatever he wanted, but if he wanted to qualify for the RHP monies, he must meet spending requirements. I did state that if he decided to build a replacement site or become a tenant in the after situation, certain processes will need to be followed; however, I noted that that we would “cross that bridge if we came to it”. He understood.  I finally stated that before the potential RHP monies would be considered as qualified for him to receive, the replacement site will need to pass what is known as a Decent, Safe and Sanitary (DS&S) inspection. This inspection basically consists of a RA counselor’s viewing of the replacement home to ensure that it meets RAP standards as an RHP qualifying home (in terms of utility connection, adequate heating, water, sewage, electrical, bathroom standards, etc.). Once the DS&S inspection is considered as passed, RHP monies may be distributed. If the home was not up to DS&S standards, RHP monies cannot be provided until the home is brought up to said standard. This inspection includes purchased homes as well as new build homes (and even rental properties, if applicable).  I then reviewed the Incidental Expenses (IE) reimbursement with him. I stated that Incidental Expenses include reimbursement for necessary and reasonable costs actually incurred that are incident to the purchase of the replacement dwelling and customarily paid by the buyer, i.e. the Normal Buyer’s Closing Costs. I informed him that the RAP provides reimbursement for many, but not all, closing costs. I stated that some costs which were not eligible for reimbursement include: seller’s costs and prepaid expenses. However, it was noted that since each closing statement and costs associated with closing can be different depending on a variety of factors, I asked him to request a “Good Faith Estimate” statement as soon as possible prior to the actual closing. Once the statement was received, I asked that a copy be sent to me so I may review the statement as if it were his actual closing / settlement statement and I’ll be able to inform him of what expenses (or portions of expenses) would be deemed as reimbursable, which expenses are not reimbursable and, of course, the reasoning why (based on RAP policy). I advised that this was the easiest way to have a good idea of what kind of reimbursement he may receive so that it was not a surprise once the actual closing statement was received (also it identifies potential questionable charges that can be brought up prior to closing). I finally advised that actual reimbursement would need to be based upon the final settlement / closing statement established by the closing on his replacement property. It was noted they would need to pay these costs up front and the actual reimbursement amount would be determined and claimed shortly after the closing.  I finally reviewed the last potential benefit, known as the Increased Mortgage Interest Costs (IMIC). I stated that the IMIC is a payment established in cases of incurrence of a mortgage at a replacement site that had a higher interest rate (based on prime rate for the area, or other potential factors) than the existing mortgage on the site. If a new mortgage at the replacement site was incurred, but was at a lower interest rate than the existing, he would not qualify for this payment. However, if a new mortgage was incurred at a higher interest rate than his current, he may qualify for the IMIC reimbursement. I advised that this payment was commonly known as “buy down” and the payment for IMIC was the amount which will reduce the new mortgage balance to an amount which could be amortized with the same monthly payment for principal and interest and for the same duration as that for the mortgage(s) currently active at the site. It was noted that information regarding his  current and new mortgages would need to be received and the actual computations for the IMIC amount are determined through a computer program used as a part of RAP procedure. I advised |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | that I would be able to provide him with an IMIC estimate shortly after the offer and would need to receive current mortgage information from him at that time to compute and provide to him for his reference. He understood. We agreed with the rates being so low, it may not be a reimbursement he would be eligible to claim; however, he did understand the concept of the payment.  We briefly discussed working situations. Mark works locally and has a short duration to and from work. He intends to remain local. He is currently going through a divorce with the other 50% fee owner; Mark is the sole occupant of the property, and the other fee owner has no personal property on site. There are no children on site or any handicap accessible features of the property that must be met at the replacement.  We toured the property; as noted, the property is noted at 1.5 acres. Inside, the home was built in 1890 as a 2-story style dwelling. Approx. 1,560 SF, 3 bedrooms and 1 full bath. The interior of the home had differed maintenance; however, was sound and solid. The home was found to be DS&S.  After the tour, I reviewed the RE-95 form with him and explained the purpose was to identify what was real property (purchased through acquisition) and what was personal property (moved as a result of acquisition) and further, who owns what. Based on our conversation, it was clear that Mark understood he owned everything of personal property on site and Candy had no items of personal property to be moved on the subject property. I explained that this document would be signed by both he and Candy, for the purpose of documenting ownership. He said he would like to wait and sign after Candy, as he wanted her concurrence on his claim that he owned all. I told him I understood, and he could sign the document later. With that, he also declined to sign the receipt for brochure as well. Mark was a bit guarded, and I let him that it was okay and that he could document he received the brochure another day.  With no further questions, I explained that I would be in touch once the appraisal was completed and we were ready to proceed with the relocation analysis. I asked him to call me with any questions  or concerns until then. Meeting ended. |
| 08/31/2021 | On this date, the market was reviewed to find very few homes that provided the lot size that the subject property possessed; although a few were located, the suggested additive suggested undue enrichment. |
| 09/13/2021 | On this date, the market review was updated to find similar results to what was found during the last check. |
| 09/30/2021 | On this date, the search effort was updated. 30 days had passed since the search effort began. The average listing inventory had fluctuated from a low of 43 properties active, to a high of 77 properties. As of this date, there were 54 properties available for sale within the proximity of the subject. Out of the 54 properties, 4 were noted as options for comparability; however, none had the lot size of 1.5 acres or more. Of the 4 that would be considered as comparable; 2 were lacking a garage space, leaving only 2 considered possibly comparable, and depending the level of the  FMV could be further pursued. The appraisal is set to be reviewed and approved in the next two weeks. |
| 10/11/2021 | On this date, the appraisal was approved by the Agency. The fair market value was established at  $180,000.  Later this date, the search effort was updated. There were 61 properties available on the market with 5 having eligible criteria for consideration of being used as a comparable. Of the 5 available, |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | none suggested an RHP of below $150,000. The search will continue for more economical options. |
| 11/22/2021 | On this date, the market review was updated to find results consistent with the last several weeks; however, the list prices have increased as well as inventory decreased. The end of November will mark 90 days of consistent market results. In order to address the relocation problem, in the most effective and fair manner of providing the displaced person ample time and meeting the agency’s project timeline; utilizing the typical home site calculation (THSC) on this parcel would provide means of establishing a fair RHP.  It should be noted, that while larger parcel properties have been located; the additional improvements to the properties would suggest an undue enrichment through approx. RHP levels of $200k or more. In addition, the properties boasting larger lot sizes also had high end detached structures and swimming pools, further elevating the listing prices of the possible comparable units. Utilizing these comparable units for only the purpose of providing equal to or greater lot size, would not reflect the intent of the assistance program. In either case, THSC or no THSC, the additive will be exceptionally large; therefore, this the THSC was viewed as the most economical of the two options.  For these reasons, this agent finds the only course forward was to reduce the lot size of the subject property, for comparison purposes, through a THSC. |
| 12/13/2021 | On this date, a 3-comp determination in last resort housing was completed and submitted for review. It should be noted that the determination being in last resort housing was unavoidable due to the reduction of land value alone through the typical home site calculation. As documented, the THSC was established using 0.5 acre; therefore, the prime comparable list price was $274,900 resulting in an RHP of $130,200.00.  It should be noted that the appraisal and the auditors card reflect 5 rooms with 3 bedrooms. The appraiser was not allowed access to the property, so his information was based off of the auditors information, as the appraiser reflects within the report. However, an interior inspection revealed a kitchen, dining room, living room on first level and 4 true bedrooms on the second level of the  home. Photos are in the file that provide the evidence of the layout. |
| 12/16/2021 | On this date, the determination was reviewed and approved by the relocation reviewer and the ODOT District 5 office. |
| 12/20/2021 | On this date, I confirmed the comparable was still available then; although it would not be available for long as there were multiple offers on the property.  Later this same date, I met with Mr. Flinn at the subject property. Once the acquisition offer was completed, we discussed the relocation. I first reminded him of the information we covered within the pre-acquisition meeting, he recalled and still had his brochure.  We first covered the THSC, the valuation within the appraisal and the reduction of land size of the subject relative to the comparable selection, and how that was calculated. He understood. We covered the property and where it was located, he knew of the property. We discussed the qualification of RHP and how the required “spend it to get it amount” was different due to the fractional ownership and the THSC, he understood.  He was aware of the property, and the location. He explained that he recently accepted a new job and that he would not need to remain local in the future. I explained where he would move would |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | be his decision; however, we attempt to use comparable properties as close to the subject as possible for example purposes. He understood.  We then discussed the move options, he indicated that he would decide what direction he would go when he found where he would be moving. I then discussed the reimbursement of a home inspection and the incidental expenses that were typically reimbursed, he understood. We acknowledged the current interest rate in the market was low; he stated he currently had a 3.25% interest rate on the mortgage in place at the subject property. I explained that should he incur a higher interest rate on a replacement mortgage, the agency had a program to calculate that payment. I explained when the time came, and if applicable, I would need updated information on both the current mortgage and the replacement mortgage in order to forecast what that payment would be. He understood.  We then covered the DS&S standards, the requirement for me to inspect any potential replacement prior to agreeing to rent / purchase said replacement. I outlined the 90-day notice within the notice of relocation assistance. I emphasized the date was not a vacate notice but rather a guarantee of occupancy to at least this date. I did advise the project was scheduled to be clear by June 2022, which meant he would need to be relocated by then. He understood.  I explained that if he would like, our office could provide referral properties to consider as replacement properties. Mr. Flinn advised his niece was a real estate agent and he would be working with her to locate a replacement property; however, if he needed any assistance with referrals, I told him to let me know. He said he would.  Mark was overwhelmed but understood the nature of the situation. He was eager to review the content of both offers and requested time to review and further to see that Candy agreed to the  RE-95 before he signed it. I understood and told him to reach out with any questions or concerns. With no further questions, meeting ended. |
| 12/30/2021 | On this date, Mark signed the contract of sale and purchase with the City. |
| 01/13/2022 | On this date, I spoke with Mark regarding is current mortgages and information relative to the pay offs in preparation for his closing.  We also discussed the market and his search efforts relative to finding a replacement property. Mark stated that he had a potential property; however, it turned out to be an auction property. He also explained his sister Brei was a real estate agent and she would be assisting him in his effort of securing a replacement property. |
| 01/24/2022 | On this date, I communicated with Mark. He advised that he was interested in a property, but later found out it was in contract. He has decided that he will have to spend $220k or more to find what he currently has. He reported he has a meeting with the bank this coming weekend to gain his  pre-approval for a mortgage. |
| 01/28/2022 | On this date, the displaced person called me to report he had found a house for sale by owner and  that he was going to look at it over the weekend. I explained that if he was interested in the property, I would make myself available to complete the DS&S inspection. |
| 01/30/2022 | On this date, the displaced person called and reported that he was interested in the property and agreed verbally to purchase a property for $225,000 and wanted me to meet him to complete the  inspection. I told him I could mee t him tomorrow. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 01/31/2022 | On this date, I met with the displaced person and the trustee who represented the trust, to tour the property and complete the DS&S inspection. The home was warm, tight windows, operational doors, functional plumbing, adequate lighting and ventilation.  Upon determining that the property was DS&S, the displaced person stated that he signed the contract to buy the home yesterday even though he knew I still had not looked at the house or the contract. The Trustee that was on site, Tim Belhier advised that he was open to changes.  The purchase price was for $225,000, down from a listing price of $245,000. There was an earnest money deposit of $2,000, to be closed on or before 3/12/2022. The displaced person obtained pre-approved financing and the contract that the financing commitment shall be received by 02/15/2022.  Upon review, there were a few things I requested be changed so that it better represented the situation. The first was that all cash offer was checked, and it was not since the displaced person would be obtaining a mortgage in the amount of $101,000 as part of the transaction. The displaced person advised that the bank should have commitment by 2/15/22 and that was noted within the contract as well as the property to be sold, the subject property within this parcel.  The other was that the offer was not contingent upon the sale of the home; however, the displaced person likely could not be approved if the mortgage on the subject was not satisfied.  The last observation was simply an explanation. The home was noted as being sold “as is” and that the seller, the Trust would not be offering to make revisions / corrections to the property should something be found via home inspection. I advised the displaced person that it was their right to have a home inspection done, including but not limited to: structure, radon, termite, pest etc. The displaced person determined that from his personal inspection and understanding of structures, he felt confident the home was in good working order. Further, I explained any of those inspections, should he elect to have them completed, would be reimbursable under the relocation assistance program.  The displaced person advised he was aware that he had the eligibility to be reimbursed for the inspections, further that he understood that if he did have the inspections and found something that would prevent him from purchasing the home, he would jeopardize his earnest money deposit of $2,000. I again explained the DS&S inspection was not provided to ensure the structure or well being of the structure; but to ensure the funds being used were so on Decent, Safe and Sanitary Housing, which I concurred it was in fact DS&S. He understood.  With the discussion being held, and the seller willing to modify the items discussed, both were made and the seller advised he would send a copy of the contract with initialed changes to my  attention as well as share it with the lender at the bank. Meeting ended. |
| 02/02/2022 | On this date, a meeting was held to discuss the THSC calculation and thus the RHP driven from the THSC amount. It was determined that the manner in which the THSC was calculated was in error. This will require the determination to be revised and the amounts updated, along with the notification to the displaced property owners. NOTE: the notes were also updated to correct the  manner in which the THSC was calculated. |
| 02/03/2022 | On this date, I updated the determination information and resubmitted it to the relocation reviewer for approval. The notes were updated to remove the calculation method of the THSC. Once |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | approved, the claim for RHP will be submitted as the displaced person has secured a contract on a replacement property.  Later this date, the relocation reviewer approved the RHP determination. The approved documents were forwarded to the District for review and approval. |
| 02/04/2022 | On this date, the District approved the updated determination that was submitted upon receiving approval from the relocation reviewer.  Later on this date, I updated these notes and submitted the RHP claim for review and approval. |
| 02/05/2022 | On this date, the RHP claim was reviewed and approved by the relocation reviewer. |
| 02/08/2022 | On this date, I received the claim back from Mr. Flinn signed. |
| 02/14/2022 | On this date, I updated the notes and submitted the parcel for further check processing. |
| 03/10/2022 | On this date, the closing on the replacement property was held. I received a copy of the settlement statement and reviewed the potential items that would be reimbursable. We discussed the increased interest payment and the information I would need from the old mortgage and the information for the new mortgage; in order to determine the reimbursement on that. He said he  would provide the info. |
| 03/22/2022 | On this date, I submitted the move establishment based on the fixed rate schedule move with additional pay rooms. As the write up outlines, the displaced structure consisted of a full attic, bedrooms, dining, kitchen and family room. Full basement. There was also a detached 2+ car garage, 2 boats, 3 vehicles, 3 motorcycles, and many other items around the site.  Later this date, the claim was approved.  Also on this date, I called Mr. Flinn and informed him that the move amount was approved and I would be sending the claim to him for his signature and return. He understood. I reminded him that if he wanted the personal property or didn’t, that it all must go. He understood. I asked him to inform me as to when the move would be complete so I could perform a post move inspection to  ensure all was removed from the property. |
| 03/29/2022 | On this date, I received he claim back signed from Mr. Flinn. |
| 03/31/2022 | On this date, I updated these notes and submitted the parcel for further check processing. |