ORDINANCE NO. 3-15

AN ORDINANCE ACCEPTING THE APPRAISALS (FAIR MARKET VALUE ESTIMATES) FOR THE WEST SMITH RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

WHEREAS: In order to complete construction of West Smith Road between the Wheeling and Lake Erie railroad tracks and State Road, the City must acquire several easements; and

WHEREAS: In accordance with ODOT guidelines, the City has engaged O.R. Colan to acquire the right-of-ways and Fair Market Value Estimates; and

WHEREAS: A total of 2 temporary easements must be acquired from Gowe Leasing Limited.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MEDINA, OHIO:

SEC. 1: That the City of Medina hereby authorizes the appraisals of O.R. Colan and accepts the Fair Market Value (FMVE) for the following parcels as follows:

Property #	Owner Name	Acquisition	FMVE
9A	Gowe Leasing Limited	1-temporary easement	$ 300.00
9B	Gowe Leasing Limited Partnership	1-temporary easement	$ 300.00
		TOTAL	$ 600.00

SEC. 2: That a copy of the appraisals are marked Exhibit A, attached hereto, and incorporated herein.

SEC. 3: That the funds to cover these appraisals are available in Account 106-0610-54410.

SEC. 4: That it is found and determined that all formal actions of this Council concerning and relating to the passage of this Ordinance were adopted in an open meeting of this Council, and that all deliberations of this Council and any of its committees that resulted in such formal action, were in meetings open to the public, in compliance with the law.

SEC. 5: That this Ordinance shall be considered an emergency measure necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety, and for the further reason to expedite the sometimes lengthy process; wherefore, this Ordinance shall be in full force and effect immediately upon its passage and signature by the Mayor.

PASSED: January 12, 2015

SIGNED: John M. Coyne, III
President of Council

ATTEST: Kathy Patton
Clerk of Council

APPROVED: January 13, 2015

SIGNED: Dennis Hanwell
Mayor

Revised 09-2012

ORD. 3-15
Exh. A

VALUE ANALYSIS ($10,000 OR LESS)

OWNER'S NAME

Gowe Leasing Limited

COUNTY MED
ROUTE West Smith Road
SECTION N/A
PID# 81334

Federal Project # E060 (657)

Based on comparable sales, which are attached, the following compensation has been established.
Temporary taking(s) have been based on a 18 month period.

Parcel #	Net Take Area	Land	Improvement	Remarks	Total
9A-TV1	0.0058 acres (253 SF)	@ $35,000/Ac. x 10% x 1.5 years = $30.45		Rounded to	$50
				State minimum award per ODOT 4000.7 D (Discussed below)	$300

Conflict of Interest Certification [49CFR 24.102(n) and OAC 5501: 2-5-06(B)(3)(a)]

1. My engagement in this assignment was not contingent upon developing or reporting predetermined results.
2. My compensation for completing this assignment is not contingent upon the development or reporting of a predetermined value or direction in value that favors the cause of the client, the amount of the value opinion, the attainment of a stipulated result, or the occurrence of a subsequent event directly related to the intended use of this compensation recommendation.
3. I have no direct or indirect present or contemplated future personal interest in such property or in any benefit from the acquisition of such property valued, and no personal interest with respect to the parties involved.
4. In recommending the compensation for the property, I have disregarded any decrease or increase in the fair market value of the real property that occurred prior to the date of valuation caused by the public improvement for which such property is acquired, or by the likelihood that the property would be acquired for such improvement, other than that due to physical deterioration within the reasonable control of the owner.
5. I have no bias with respect to the property that is the subject of this report or to the parties involved with this assignment.

Douglas J. Firca — 5/5/2014
SIGNATURE OF PERSON PREPARING ANALYSIS — DATE
TYPED NAME: Douglas J. Firca

Dean Smith — 05/14/2014
REVIEWER'S CONCURRENCE — DATE
TYPED NAME: Dean T. Smith, MAI

NAME OF AGENCY (IF DIFFERENT FROM ODOT)
City of Medina

TITLE: Mayor

Dennis Hanwell — 1-13-2015
AGENCY SIGNATURE ESTABLISHING FMVE — DATE
TYPED NAME: Dennis Hanwell

ADMINISTRATIVE SETTLEMENT:

SIGNATURE — DATE
TYPED NAME:

F.M.V.E. AMOUNT
ADDITIONAL AMOUNT
TOTAL SETTLEMENT

(SEE FOLLOWING PAGES FOR ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION)

Value Analysis (continued)	
Identify the Larger Parcel:	Considering unity of title, unity of use and contiguity, the subject larger parcel consists of one tract of land, identified as auditors parcel number 029-19A-20-012 consisting of 2.09 gross and net acres (91,040 SF) with no portion of the parcel is located within P.R.O. My research indicates there are two adjoining parcels with the same ownership or use as the subject. Because each parcel is an improved property with established access easements and can support their own highest and best uses, only parcel 029-19A-20-012 is considered to be the larger parcel for purposes of this report. The subject is located at 717 W. Smith Road, Medina, Ohio which is on the north side of W. Smith Road two parcels west of State Road. The site is predominantly rectangular in shape, is improved with a light industrial building and has one access drive located on the north side of W. Smith Road. The property is owned by Gowe Leasing Limited and is located in the Buckeye Local School District. The subject property along with parcels 029-19A-20-011 and 029-19A-20-013 transferred on 9/12/2012 for $1,000,000 per the Auditor's records, and the appraiser has not been informed of any current listing as of the effective date of this report.
Zoning Code:	I-1, Industrial District
Coding Definition:	The purpose of the I-1 District is to provide for and accommodate industrial uses in the fields of repair, storage, manufacturing, processing, wholesaling and distribution, free from the encroachment of residential, retail and institutional uses. The uses allowed are those which because of their normally unobjectionable characteristics, can be in relatively close proximity to residential and commercial districts.
Minimum Site Size:	

	I-1, Industrial District
Minimum Site Size	1/2 Ac.
Minimum Lot Frontage	100 feet
Minimum Lot Width at building line	100 feet
Minimum Front Yard Setback/Depth	50 feet
Minimum Side Yard Setback (each side)	25 feet
Minimum Rear Yard	25 feet
Maximum Building Height	50 feet
Parking	Contingent on use

Utilities:	All public utilities are available to the subject property.
Highest and Best Use:	As vacant the highest and best use for the subject is for commercial purposes. The existing improvements appear to be legally nonconforming as side setbacks do not meet the minimum zoning requirements. Because the building improvements are not impacted by the project, no further discussion of the improvements is warranted.
Valuation/Analysis of Sales:	

Sale Number:	2	3	4	5	18
Address	360 Ryan Rd.	Beta Dr.	Johnston Pkwy.	York Beta Dr.	York Rd.
Location:	Seville	North Royalton	Garfield Heights	North Royalton	North Royalton
Sale Date:	2/1/2010	11/16/2012	9/30/2011	7/18/2012	6/28/2013
Sale Price:	$25,000	$60,000	$65,000	$115,000	$185,000
Area:	1.1348 Ac. 49,432 SF	1.855 Ac. 80,804 SF	1.8844 Ac. or 82,084 SF	3.373 Ac. or 146,928 SF	3.9733 Ac. or 173,077 SF
Unit Value:	$22,030/Ac. $0.51/SF	$32,345/Ac. $0.74/SF	$34,494/Ac. or $0.79/SF	$34,094/Ac. or $0.78/SF	$46,561/Ac. or $1.07/SF

Discussion:	Land valuation is based on the attached comparable sales. Medina County predominantly consists of single-family residential uses with limited number of areas used for industrial purposes; therefore, the geographic search for comparable sales has been expanded to other counties with similar industrial areas and market appeal. The sales have average and median unit values of $33,905 and $34,094 per acre respectively and all sales are given equal consideration.
Reconciliation:	Based on the comparable sales, a reconciled unit value of $35,000 per acre is reasonably supported by the comparable sales. Per ODOT Policies & Procedures Appraisers Operating Manual, Section 4000.07 D, "The minimum amount of compensation offered to an ownership is $300. The minimum offer applies when the aggregate total compensation of a parcel series is less than $300." The FMVE stated in this report is the estimated value of the part acquired based on a unit value of the whole property plus the contributory value of the improvements located within the take area and any cost to cure if applicable.
Analysis Of Site Improvements (support for contributory value):	There are no compensable site improvements situated within the proposed take area. Any asphalt, concrete, gravel, and/or seeded lawn site improvements situated within the temporary construction easement area (if applicable) will be replaced in kind, as such; no compensation for these items is warranted. All site improvements situated within existing right-of-way are non-compensable in the State of Ohio; therefore, no compensation is warranted for these items.
Summarize the effect of the take on the residue property:	The purpose of the proposed project consists reconstructing approximately 2,300 feet of West Smith Road from the Wheeling and Lake Erie Railroad to just east of State Road and reconstructing 600 feet of state Road from West Smith Road to the north. Major work items include pavement replacement and widening, waterline replacement, storm sewer and box culvert replacement, and a new traffic signal at West Smith Road. There is one proposed acquisition from the subject property, which is a Temporary Easement identified as 9A-TV1. The easement is irregular in shape extending across the eastern drive along the southern property line and has a maximum width of 28 feet. The Temporary Easement consists of 0.0058 acres (253 SF) and will be acquired in the name of the City of Medina, Medina County, Ohio for drive construction and grading. This easement will encumber the specific area for no longer than 18 months with compensation based upon a ground lease at 10% per year. Upon completion of the project the owner will retain all rights to this area. Once the proposed project is complete, the subject will consist of 2.09 gross and net acres (91,040 SF) with no portion of the parcel located within P.R.O. Because the subject will continue to have a similar highest and best use after the acquisition and the area in the temporary easement will return to the owner with 100% of ownership rights, it is the appraisers' opinion that the subject property as vacant or improved will not be adversely affected due to the easement(s) or nominal grade changes in the acquisition areas.
	Are there Severance Damages? | YES | | NO | X
Other Comments:	The appraiser signing this report made all conclusions and analysis as to the estimation of value.

RE 25-13
Rev. 01/2012

Review Checklist for the Value Analysis

County: MED
Route: West Smith Road
Section: n/a
Parcel(s): 9A TV-1
PID #: 81334
Owner: Gowe Leasing Limited

		Yes	No
Appraiser:	Douglas J. Firca		
Is appraiser pre-approved by ODOT to perform V.A.'s?		☒	☐
Reviewer:	Dean T. Smith		
Is the Reviewer pre-approved by ODOT to review V.A.'s?		☒	☐

		Yes	No
1.	Is the valuation problem uncomplicated and is it obvious that there are no damages to the residue property?	☒	☐
2.	Is the estimated compensation $10,000 or less?	☒	☐
3.	Has the appraiser used the correct forms? (Value Analysis front and back)	☒	☐
4.	Have all parts of the form filled out and are mandatory attachments included? (Comparable Sales)	☒	☐
5.	Do the take areas on the V.A. correspond with the take areas on the R/W Plan?	☒	☐
6.	Is the V.A. mathematically accurate?	☒	☐
7.	Has the appraiser accurately identified improvements within the take area	☒	☐
8.	Has the larger parcel been identified?	☒	☐
9.	How large is the larger parcel?	2.0900 ac. net	
10.	Has the appraiser considered Unity of Title, Unity of Use and Contiguity?	☒	☐
11.	Has Zoning been identified?	☒	☐
12.	Has the appraiser indicated what uses are permitted by Zoning?	yes	
13.	Has the appraiser indicated if the existing use conforms to zoning?	☒	☐
14.	Has the appraiser indicated what the minimum site size per zoning is allowed?	yes	
15.	Has the appraiser indicated if the property before the take conforms to site size?	☒	☐
16.	Has the appraiser indicated if the Residue conforms to site size?	☒	☐
17.	Has the Highest & Best Use been identified?	☒	☐
18.	Has the appraiser indicated whether the Highest & Best Use is permitted under zoning?	☒	☐
19.	Has the appraiser discussed the effect of the take?	☒	☐
20.	There can be no adverse effect to the residue other than a nominal cost to cure. Is there a cost to cure and if so is it nominal? no cost to cure	☐	☒
21.	Do the Comparable sales comply with ODOT standards?	☒	☐
22.	Are comparable sales analyzed and compared to the subject?	☒	☐
23.	Is a range of value described?	☒	☐
24.	Has the appraiser concluded which sales received the greatest weight and explained why?	☒	☐

25.	Do the sales share the same or nearly the same Highest & Best Use?	☒	☐
26.	Do the sales have the same or nearly the same zoning as the subject?	☒	☐
27.	Has the appraiser concluded a unit value for the subject property?	☒	☐
28.	Is it within the value range indicated by the sales?	☒	☐
29.	If not, has adequate information been given?	☐	☐
30.	Has the allocated value of the site improvements taken been adequately supported?	☒	☐
31.	Have cost to cures or temporary takes been adequately discussed and supported, if any?	☒	☐
32.	Do you approve the compensation estimated as the basis for the agency to establish FMVE.	☒	☐
33.	If yes, what is that amount? (Minimum award)	$300	
34.	If no, then Why Not?		
35.	If rejected, has a deficiency letter been sent to the agency and the appraiser?	☐	☐

Reviewer's Certification

I hereby certify that:

☒ I have reviewed the R/W Plans

☒ I have physically inspected the take area of the subject property.

☒ I have field reviewed the comparable sales used in the valuation.

☒ I concur that the Value Analysis format is the proper valuation format in that it is obvious that the taking does not adversely impact the residue property, that the valuation problem is uncomplicated and that the FMVE is $10,000 or less.

☒ I concur that the Value Analysis complies with ODOT's Policies and Procedures Manual.

☒ I have no present or prospective interest in the subject property.

☒ My employment and compensation is not contingent on an action or event resulting from this analysis, opinions or conclusions or reporting pre-determined results.

49 CFR 24.104(a)
The review appraiser shall identify each appraisal report as recommended (as the basis for the establishment of the amount believed to be just compensation), accepted (meets all requirements, but not selected as recommended or approved), or not accepted.
Please check one of the selections below:

☒ *Recommended* = This means that the report meets the many Federal and State requirements and is the basis for the acquiring agency's offer.

☐ *Accepted* = This means that the report meets the many Federal and State requirements but is not being used as the basis for the acquiring agency's offer.

☐ *Not Accepted* = This means that the report does not meet the many Federal and State requirements and will not be used as the basis for the acquiring agency's offer

DATE: 05/14/2014

Signature

Appraisal Reviewer: Dean T. Smith

Revised 09-2012

VALUE ANALYSIS ($10,000 OR LESS)

OWNER'S NAME

Gowe Leasing Limited

COUNTY MED
ROUTE West Smith Road
SECTION N/A
PID# 81334

Federal Project # E060 (657)

Based on comparable sales, which are attached, the following compensation has been established.
Temporary taking(s) have been based on a 18 month period.

Parcel #	Net Take Area	Land	Improvement	Remarks	Total
9B-TV	0.017 acres (741 SF)	@ $35,000/Ac. x 10% x 1.5 years = $89.25		Rounded to	$100
				State minimum award per ODOT 4000.7 D (Discussed below)	$300

Conflict of Interest Certification [49CFR 24.102(n) and OAC 5501: 2-5-06(B)(3)(a)]

1. My engagement in this assignment was not contingent upon developing or reporting predetermined results.
2. My compensation for completing this assignment is not contingent upon the development or reporting of a predetermined value or direction in value that favors the cause of the client, the amount of the value opinion, the attainment of a stipulated result, or the occurrence of a subsequent event directly related to the intended use of this compensation recommendation.
3. I have no direct or indirect present or contemplated future personal interest in such property or in any benefit from the acquisition of such property valued, and no personal interest with respect to the parties involved.
4. In recommending the compensation for the property, I have disregarded any decrease or increase in the fair market value of the real property that occurred prior to the date of valuation caused by the public improvement for which such property is acquired, or by the likelihood that the property would be acquired for such improvement, other than that due to physical deterioration within the reasonable control of the owner.
5. I have no bias with respect to the property that is the subject of this report or to the parties involved with this assignment.

Douglas J. Firca — 5/5/2014
SIGNATURE OF PERSON PREPARING ANALYSIS — DATE
TYPED NAME: Douglas J. Firca

Dean Smith — 05/14/2014
REVIEWER'S CONCURRENCE — DATE
TYPED NAME: Dean T. Smith, MAI

NAME OF AGENCY (IF DIFFERENT FROM ODOT)
City of Medina

TITLE: Mayor

Dennis Hanwell — 1-13-2015
AGENCY SIGNATURE ESTABLISHING FMVE — DATE
TYPED NAME: Dennis Hanwell

ADMINISTRATIVE SETTLEMENT:

SIGNATURE — DATE
TYPED NAME:

F.M.V.E. AMOUNT
ADDITIONAL AMOUNT
TOTAL SETTLEMENT

(SEE FOLLOWING PAGES FOR ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION)

Value Analysis (continued)	
Identify the Larger Parcel:	Considering unity of title, unity of use and contiguity, the subject larger parcel consists of one tract of land, identified as auditors parcel number 029-19A-20-013 consisting of 2.1415 gross and net acres (93,284 SF) with no portion of the parcel is located within P.R.O. My research indicates there are two adjoining parcels with the same ownership or use as the subject. Because each parcel is an improved property with established access easements and can support their own highest and best uses, only parcel 029-19A-20-013 is considered to be the larger parcel for purposes of this report. The subject is located at 755 W. Smith Road, Medina, Ohio which is on the north side of W. Smith Road three parcels west of State Road. The site is predominantly rectangular in shape, is improved with a light industrial building and has one access drive located on the north side of W. Smith Road. The property is owned by Gowe Leasing Limited and is located in the Buckeye Local School District. The subject property along with parcels 029-19A-20-011 and 029-19A-20-012 transferred on 9/12/2012 for $1,000,000 per the Auditor's records, and the appraiser has not been informed of any current listing as of the effective date of this report.
Zoning Code:	I-1, Industrial District
Coding Definition:	The purpose of the I-1 District is to provide for and accommodate industrial uses in the fields of repair, storage, manufacturing, processing, wholesaling and distribution, free from the encroachment of residential, retail and institutional uses. The uses allowed are those which because of their normally unobjectionable characteristics, can be in relatively close proximity to residential and commercial districts.
Minimum Site Size:	

	I-1, Industrial District
Minimum Site Size	1/2 Ac.
Minimum Lot Frontage	100 feet
Minimum Lot Width at building line	100 feet
Minimum Front Yard Setback/Depth	50 feet
Minimum Side Yard Setback (each side)	25 feet
Minimum Rear Yard	25 feet
Maximum Building Height	50 feet
Parking	Contingent on use

Utilities:	All public utilities are available to the subject property
Highest and Best Use:	As vacant the highest and best use for the subject is for commercial purposes. The existing improvements appear to be legally nonconforming as side setbacks do not meet the minimum zoning requirements. Because the building improvements are not impacted by the project, no further discussion of the improvements is warranted.
Valuation/Analysis of Sales:	

Sale Number:	2	3	4	5	18
Address	360 Ryan Rd.	Beta Dr.	Johnston Pkwy.	York Beta Dr.	York Rd.
Location:	Seville	North Royalton	Garfield Heights	North Royalton	North Royalton
Sale Date:	2/1/2010	11/16/2012	9/30/2011	7/18/2012	6/28/2013
Sale Price:	$25,000	$60,000	$65,000	$115,000	$185,000
Area:	1.1348 Ac. 49,432 SF	1.855 Ac. 80,804 SF	1.8844 Ac. or 82,084 SF	3.373 Ac. or 146,928 SF	3.9733 Ac. or 173,077 SF
Unit Value:	$22,030/Ac. $0.51/SF	$32,345/Ac. $0.74/SF	$34,494/Ac. or $0.79/SF	$34,094/Ac. or $0.78/SF	$46,561/Ac. or $1.07/SF

Discussion:	Land valuation is based on the attached comparable sales. Medina County predominantly consists of single-family residential uses with limited number of areas used for industrial purposes; therefore, the geographic search for comparable sales has been expanded to other counties with similar industrial areas and market appeal. The sales have average and median unit values of $33,905 and $34,094 per acre respectively and all sales are given equal consideration.
Reconciliation:	Based on the comparable sales, a reconciled unit value of $35,000 per acre is reasonably supported by the comparable sales. Per ODOT Policies & Procedures Appraisers Operating Manual, Section 4000.07 D, "The minimum amount of compensation offered to an ownership is $300. The minimum offer applies when the aggregate total compensation of a parcel series is less than $300." The FMVE stated in this report is the estimated value of the part acquired based on a unit value of the whole property plus the contributory value of the improvements located within the take area and any cost to cure if applicable.
Analysis Of Site Improvements (support for contributory value):	There are no compensable site improvements situated within the proposed take area. Any asphalt, concrete, gravel, and/or seeded lawn site improvements situated within the temporary construction easement area (if applicable) will be replaced in kind, as such; no compensation for these items is warranted. All site improvements situated within existing right-of-way are non-compensable in the State of Ohio; therefore, no compensation is warranted for these items.
Summarize the effect of the take on the residue property:	The purpose of the proposed project consists reconstructing approximately 2,300 feet of West Smith Road from the Wheeling and Lake Erie Railroad to just east of State Road and reconstructing 600 feet of state Road from West Smith Road to the north. Major work items include pavement replacement and widening, waterline replacement, storm sewer and box culvert replacement, and a new traffic signal at West Smith Road. There is one proposed acquisition from the subject property, which is a Temporary Easement identified as 9B-TV. This easement is irregular in shape extending across the driveway near the southeast corner of the site and has a maximum width of 57.47 feet along the southern property line. The Temporary Easement consists of 0.017 acres (741 SF) and will be acquired in the name of the City of Medina, Medina County, Ohio for drive construction and grading. This easement will encumber the specific area for no longer than 18 months with compensation based upon a ground lease at 10% per year. Upon completion of the project the owner will retain all rights to this area. Once the proposed project is complete, the subject will consist of 2.1415 gross and net acres (93,284 SF) with no portion of the parcel located within P.R.O. Because the subject will continue to have a similar highest and best use after the acquisition and the area in the temporary easement will return to the owner with 100% of ownership rights, it is the appraisers' opinion that the subject property as vacant or improved will not be adversely affected due to the easement(s) or nominal grade changes in the acquisition areas.
	Are there Severance Damages? | YES | | NO | X
Other Comments:	The appraiser signing this report made all conclusions and analysis as to the estimation of value.

RE 25-13
Rev. 01/2012

Review Checklist for the Value Analysis

County: MED
Route: West Smith Road
Section: n/a
Parcel(s): 9B TV
PID #: 81334
Owner: Gowe Leasing Limited

	Yes	No
Appraiser: Douglas J. Firca		
Is appraiser pre-approved by ODOT to perform V.A.'s?	☒	☐
Reviewer: Dean T. Smith		
Is the Reviewer pre-approved by ODOT to review V.A.'s?	☒	☐

		Yes	No
1.	Is the valuation problem uncomplicated and is it obvious that there are no damages to the residue property?	☒	☐
2.	Is the estimated compensation $10,000 or less?	☒	☐
3.	Has the appraiser used the correct forms? (Value Analysis front and back)	☒	☐
4.	Have all parts of the form filled out and are mandatory attachments included? (Comparable Sales)	☒	☐
5.	Do the take areas on the V.A. correspond with the take areas on the R/W Plan?	☒	☐
6.	Is the V.A. mathematically accurate?	☒	☐
7.	Has the appraiser accurately identified improvements within the take area	☒	☐
8.	Has the larger parcel been identified?	☒	☐
9.	How large is the larger parcel?	2.1415 ac. net	
10.	Has the appraiser considered Unity of Title, Unity of Use and Contiguity?	☒	☐
11.	Has Zoning been identified?	☒	☐
12.	Has the appraiser indicated what uses are permitted by Zoning?	yes	
13.	Has the appraiser indicated if the existing use conforms to zoning?	☒	☐
14.	Has the appraiser indicated what the minimum site size per zoning is allowed?	yes	
15.	Has the appraiser indicated if the property before the take conforms to site size?	☒	☐
16.	Has the appraiser indicated if the Residue conforms to site size?	☒	☐
17.	Has the Highest & Best Use been identified?	☒	☐
18.	Has the appraiser indicated whether the Highest & Best Use is permitted under zoning?	☒	☐
19.	Has the appraiser discussed the effect of the take?	☒	☐
20.	There can be no adverse effect to the residue other than a nominal cost to cure. Is there a cost to cure and if so is it nominal? no cost to cure	☐	☒
21.	Do the Comparable sales comply with ODOT standards?	☒	☐
22.	Are comparable sales analyzed and compared to the subject?	☒	☐
23.	Is a range of value described?	☒	☐
24.	Has the appraiser concluded which sales received the greatest weight and explained why?	☒	☐

25.	Do the sales share the same or nearly the same Highest & Best Use?	☒	☐
26.	Do the sales have the same or nearly the same zoning as the subject?	☒	☐
27.	Has the appraiser concluded a unit value for the subject property?	☒	☐
28.	Is it within the value range indicated by the sales?	☒	☐
29.	If not, has adequate information been given?	☐	☐
30.	Has the allocated value of the site improvements taken been adequately supported?	☒	☐
31.	Have cost to cures or temporary takes been adequately discussed and supported, if any?	☒	☐
32.	Do you approve the compensation estimated as the basis for the agency to establish FMVE.	☒	☐
33.	If yes, what is that amount? (Minimum award)	$300	
34.	If no, then Why Not?		
35.	If rejected, has a deficiency letter been sent to the agency and the appraiser?	☐	☐

Reviewer's Certification

I hereby certify that:

☒ I have reviewed the R/W Plans

☒ I have physically inspected the take area of the subject property.

☒ I have field reviewed the comparable sales used in the valuation.

☒ I concur that the Value Analysis format is the proper valuation format in that it is obvious that the taking does not adversely impact the residue property, that the valuation problem is uncomplicated and that the FMVE is $10,000 or less.

☒ I concur that the Value Analysis complies with ODOT's Policies and Procedures Manual.

☒ I have no present or prospective interest in the subject property.

☒ My employment and compensation is not contingent on an action or event resulting from this analysis, opinions or conclusions or reporting pre-determined results.

49 CFR 24.104(a)
The review appraiser shall identify each appraisal report as recommended (as the basis for the establishment of the amount believed to be just compensation), accepted (meets all requirements, but not selected as recommended or approved), or not accepted.
Please check one of the selections below:

☒ *Recommended* = This means that the report meets the many Federal and State requirements and is the basis for the acquiring agency's offer.

☐ *Accepted* = This means that the report meets the many Federal and State requirements but is not being used as the basis for the acquiring agency's offer.

☐ *Not Accepted* = This means that the report does not meet the many Federal and State requirements and will not be used as the basis for the acquiring agency's offer

DATE: 05/14/2014

Signature

Appraisal Reviewer: Dean T. Smith