Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No.	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.
FHWA/TX-94/1390-1		

4. Title and Subtitle	5. Report Date
Physical and Access/Locational Characteristics of Remainders of Partial Takings Significantly Affecting Right-of-Way Costs	October 1994
	6. Performing Organization Code
7. Author(s)	8. Performing Organization Report No.
Jesse L. Buffington, Margaret K. Chui, Jeffery L. Memmott, and Frida Saad	Research Report 1390-1
9. Performing Organization Name and Address	10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)
Texas Transportation Institute The Texas A&M University System College Station, Texas 77843-3135	11. Contract or Grant No. Study No. 0-1390
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address	13. Type of Report and Period Covered
Texas Department of Transportation Research and Technology Transfer Office P.O. Box 5080 Austin, Texas 78763-5080	Interim: September 1993 - August 1994
	14. Sponsoring Agency Code

15. Supplementary Notes

Research Study Title: Determination and Evaluation of Remainder Characteristics Which Significantly Affect Right-of-Way Costs

16. Abstract

Highway right-of-way costs have accelerated in recent years, especially in suburban and urban areas of Texas. Thus, further efforts are being made by Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) officials to find ways to reduce or hold down such costs. One of the efforts helped to enact a new law determining the compensation paid property owners for partial takings of right-of-way for highways. This law, subsequently declared unconstitutional by the Texas Supreme Court, allowed consideration of special or direct benefits arising from the highway improvement in awarding compensation for the taking or assessing damages to the remainder, and it did help to reduce right-of-way costs. The purchase of partial takings can cause some remainders to suffer considerable severance and/or proximity damages. The state only gains title to the partial taking, and the property owner keeps title to the remainder. Although enhancements can offset some of these damages, purchasing agencies are still paying many property owners more than the taking value. Often, small and irregularly shaped remainders are created and damaged to 100% of value (the whole property's value).

This study seeks to determine which remainder characteristics significantly affect right-of-way costs. The more specific objectives of the study are to determine (1) the significant remainder property, access, and location characteristics that affect right-of-way costs and (2) the effects of the 1984-87 right-of-way evaluation law on right-of-way costs. A thorough study of the literature; a mail survey of selected right-of-way fee appraisers, TxDOT appraisers and attorneys on the state attorney general's staff; the preparation and analysis of a sample of old remainder case histories developed by the Texas Transportation Institute and TxDOT during the 1960s; and the collection and analysis of a new sample of remainders created before, during, and after the new law was in effect are all being accomplished under the research plan. The new sample data covers three time periods: 1) January 1, 1974 to October 1, 1984, 2) October 1, 1984, to August 17, 1987, and 3) August 17, 1987, to December 31, 1991. All the work plan has been completed, except for the collection and analysis of the new data base of remainders.

The literature survey has helped identify several important remainder characteristics to be tested. A total of 70 out of 91 persons surveyed responded and gave importance scores to a list of remainder characteristics. At least the top 10 or 12 characteristics are being used in the regression models of the two data samples. Lastly, the regression analysis of the sample of old remainder case histories has identified several important characteristics related to the remainder, i.e., size, value, and use of whole property; remainder shape, value total damages paid; and proportion of taking. Researchers expect the analysis of the new database to confirm these findings and yield other characteristics that significantly affect right-of-way cost. TxDOT can use the results of the study to help control and reduce right-of-way costs by 1) being able to closely monitor the appraisals of remainders of partial takings, 2) working closely with the TxDOT planning and design officials to avoid creating remainder properties that contribute significantly to right-of-way costs, and supporting recommended changes in state right-of-way acquisition laws that would significantly reduce right-of-way costs.

17. Key Words	18. Distribution Statement
right-of-way, remainders, partial takings, physical, access/ locational characteristics, acquisition costs, uneconomic/remnant regression model, sample studies, case studies	No restrictions. This document is available to the public through NTIS: National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 22161

19. Security Classif.(of this report)	20. Security Classif.(of this page)	21. No. of Pages	22. Price
Unclassified	Unclassified	84	

Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72) Reproduction of completed page authorized

PHYSICAL AND ACCESS/LOCATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF REMAINDERS OF PARTIAL TAKINGS SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECTING RIGHT-OF-WAY COSTS

by

J.L. Buffington
J.L. Memmott
M.K. Chui
and
Frida Saad

Research Report 1390-1
Research Study Number 0-1390
Research Study Title: Determination and Evaluation of Remainder Characteristics Which Significantly Affect Right-of-Way Costs

Sponsored by the
Texas Department of Transportation
In Cooperation with the
Federal Highway Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation

October 1994

TEXAS TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTE
Texas A&M University System
College Station, Texas 77843-3135

IMPLEMENTATION STATEMENT

The findings of this study can be used to improve some right-of-way acquisition practices and to recommend legislation giving TxDOT authority to acquire "uneconomic remainders."

The findings indicate that closer attention should be paid to right-of-way acquisitions that would create small, odd-shaped remainders of low value. This could be implemented immediately by including more remainder information in the preliminary planning process prior to right-of-way acquisition. Potential uneconomic remainders could be identified before the acquisition is undertaken.

The findings also support initiation of legislation authorizing TxDOT to purchase remainders that are identified as uneconomic. The determination of an uneconomic remainder could be made on the basis of the estimated department cost of a whole taking versus a partial taking plus damages.

DISCLAIMER

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and accuracy of the data presented within. The contents do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Texas Department of Transportation. This report does not constitute a standard, specification or regulation. It is not intended for construction, bidding or permit purposes. The report was prepared by Jesse L. Buffington, Research Economist and Study Supervisor, Jeffery M. Memmott, Research Economist, Margaret K. Chui, Associate Research Economist and Frida Saad, Research Associate.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors want to thank Mr. Jon Underwood, Director, Research and Technology Transfer Office, and staff members Lana Ashley and Klaus Alkier for assistance in handling TxDOT administrative matters pertaining to the study. Special thanks are given to the TxDOT technical panel members, Jerry Loven, Project Director, Jackie Barnett, James Blackburn, John Dawson, Richard Hubbard and Vicki Sullivan for providing oversight and direction to the study. The research team is especially appreciative of Mr. Gary Bernethy, Director of Right-of-way Division, Howard Knippa, Chief of Staff Services for Right-of-way Division and Nancy Johnson, Staff Services Assistant for the Right-of-way Division. Not all of the data could have been collected without the valuable assistance from right-of-way personnel in the TxDOT districts involved in the study.

Other members of the Texas Transportation Institute Transportation gave valuable assistance to the study. Dr. W.F. McFarland, Research Economist and Head of the Transportation Economics Program, and Mr. Dock Burke, Head of the Economics and Planning Division gave administrative support. Mrs. Cheryl Kruse, Secretary for the Transportation Economics Program took care much of the paperwork for the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE **Page**

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE **Page**

SUMMARY

This is a summary of findings on research completed thus far on Research Study 0-1390 which is determining which remainder characteristics significantly affect right-of-way costs. The findings are based on an extensive literature review, a survey of right-of-way experts in and out of the state government, and a selected sample of old remainder case histories performed in the state during the 1960s by the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) and the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT). The primary objective of the study is to determine the significant characteristics of remainders of partial takings that affect right-of-way costs. A second objective is to determine the effect of the 1984-87 right-of-way valuation law, known as House Bill No. 101, and other legislation that might be needed to address significant characteristics of remainders.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This report presents a brief review of the historical background of right-of-way acquisition problems and federal and state laws and regulations enacted to solve these problems. It reviews some of the legal and economic aspects of purchasing right-of-way remainders of partial takings. The findings from the literature review are as follows.

- Several prior studies identified a number of right-of-way remainder characteristics that are important contributor to right-of-way costs. Some of these are physical characteristics and others are locational/access characteristics. Many of these characteristics were included in the list of characteristics given individual importance scores by a large number of highway right-of-way experts over the state. Most of these characteristics will be evaluated with one or two of the state-wide right-of-way remainder databases assembled by this study.
- A couple of studies present findings on surveys of different types of right-of-way acquisition laws in effect in other states. Among the laws reviewed are those dealing with right-of-way access, excess condemnation, and the extent of

the use of special benefits to remainders in reducing damages to remainders and taking costs. Excess condemnation for purposes of purchasing remnant (uneconomic) remainders is authorized by federal law and several states have passed laws allowing excess condemnation to purchase such remainders. A total of 32 states allow special benefits to be used to offset damages only, and 13 others allow them to offset both damages and the value of the taking.

REMAINDER CHARACTERISTICS AFFECTING RIGHT-OF-WAY COSTS

As mentioned above, the literature survey identified a large number of remainder characteristics that may significantly affect right-of-way costs. These underwent subjective evaluation by right-of-way experts in the state and an objective evaluation by using a database of old remainder case studies, called Sample I, conducted in the 1960s. Another sample of new remainder case studies, called Sample II, has been selected and the various TxDOT district right-of-way personnel are collecting the appropriate data and returning it to TTI researchers for reduction and analysis. The Sample II database will be used to evaluate a larger number of these remainder characteristics than was possible with the Sample I database.

Opinion Survey Findings

The right-of-way experts were asked to give an importance score of 1 to 10 (1=least and 10=highest score) to a list of remainder characteristics. The scores for each characteristic were averaged for all 64 respondents and then used to rank the characteristics. The results were as follows.

- The top twelve physical characteristics receiving an average importance score of 5.0 or more are: changes in highest and best use of remainder, size of remainder, development capabilities, shape of remainder, width of remainder, grade of abutting highway, length or depth of remainder, highest and best use of original property, compliance with local ordinances, land use of original

property, drainage/topography of remainder, and size of original property.

- The top six locational/access characteristics receiving an average importance score of 5.0 or more are as follows: location of access to abutting highway, amount of access to abutting highway, location of taking, functional class of abutting highway, location and number of driveways to abutting highway, and access to cross street or road.

Several of these characteristics were confirmed (by analyzing the Sample I database) to be statistically significant characteristics affecting right-of-way costs. Those findings are presented next.

Sample I Analysis and Findings

Sample I is a selected sample of 196 old case studies of remainders conducted in the 1960s. These remainder parcels, created during the 1946-64 period, were primarily negotiated parcels located in urban areas and on interstate highways. They represent most areas of the state and show a wide diversity of sizes, shapes and original land uses.

Researchers used the least squares regression method to analyze the different characteristics of the remainders in this database. As stated above, several of the characteristics given high importance scores in the survey experts show up in one or both of the regression equations as statistically significant independent variables affecting right-of-way costs. A total of 33 independent variables are defined and analyzed in the two regression models.

Analysis of Total Taking Cost

The first model estimated the relationship between total taking cost and the 33 variables. A total of six of the independent variables were highly related to total taking costs. These significant variables are as follows: appraised value of entire property, value of the remainder, improvement cost per square foot, ratio of size of the taking to the parcel size, shape (irregular triangle) and land use (commercial) of original property.

The above variables explain 85.6% of the variation in total taking cost, which is high for this type of analysis. All of the signs on the coefficients to these variables are logical.

Analysis of Partial Taking versus Whole Taking Cost

The second regression model identifies the characteristics (variables) that significantly influence the choice between a partial taking and a whole taking. It measures the proportional difference between the cost of a partial taking and the cost of a whole taking for all of the remainders in the sample and determines the influence that each remainder characteristic has on that proportional difference.

Again, many remainder characteristics were used in the regression equation. Those that significantly affected the proportional difference between the partial taking cost and whole taking cost remained in the equation and explained 85% of the variation. The significant variables are as follows: ratio of size of taking to total parcel, size of taking, value of the remainder, cost of improvements and cost of damages, value of improvement on entire parcel, and different land uses (commercial and residential). All of the signs on the coefficients to these variables were logical.

Sample II Database

The Sample II database is composed of 300 more recent remainders of partial takings created during the 1984-91 period. This time period was divided into three periods as follows: Period 1 (spanning from 1974 to August 1984), Period 2 (spanning from August 1984 through 1987), and Period 3 (spanning from 1987 through 1991).

General Characteristics

A sample of 100 remainder parcels was obtained from each of the three periods. Period 2 is the period in which the new acquisition law was in effect.

This sample is a stratified random sample that covers all regions of the state. About

one half of the sample is composed of negotiated purchases, and the other half is composed of condemnation purchases. The majority are of a rural type in agricultural use, and most of them abutting a non-interstate highway.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data is still being collected on the 300 remainder parcels, and this collection will continue through most of October. TxDOT district personnel are filling out the case forms and returning them to TTI for reduction and analysis.

The regression analytical method will also be used on the Sample II database. Many more of the physical, locational, and access characteristics will be defined and analyzed. They will be substituted for some of the value type of variables used in the Sample I analyses.

The findings from the analysis of the Sample II database will be reported first in technical memorandums to TxDOT, then in the final report due on March 1, 1995.

The conclusions and recommendations are presented in the last section of this report. Therefore, they are not repeated here.

INTRODUCTION

STUDY PROBLEM

Many of the planned highway improvements require extensive amounts of right-of-way which add significantly to the total cost of such improvements. Therefore, the state, cities, and counties involved are faced with a sizable bill to purchase the necessary right-of-way. Much of the right-of-way being purchased requires only a partial taking of the abutting property, thus creating an equal number of remainder tracts. Many of these remainders are small and irregular in shape and may suffer considerable severance and/or proximity damages in market place. Others may suffer damages due to changes in the type or amount of access. Frequently, the small and irregularly shaped remainders are damaged to 100% of value, thus amounting to the value of the whole property. However, the state only gains title to the partial taking, and the property owner keeps title to the remainder. Although enhancements can offset some of these damages, purchasing agencies are still paying many property owners more than the value of the taking.

Determining the amount of enhancements and/or damages to a remainder is a real problem to real estate appraisers, leading to a greater number of properties having to be acquired through condemnation proceedings. The TxDOT's right-of-way personnel estimate that right-of-way costs could be reduced approximately five percent or $7 million per year by offsetting some right-of-way payments to landowners with the value of enhancement to their remaining land. This estimate is based on the historical experience of the TxDOT for the 1984-1987 period when consideration of enhanced values was allowed under state law. Due to uncertainties of the future value of the remaining land, the amount of "real" enhancements or damages that may accrue due to right-of-way taking remains in doubt. Prior case studies conducted in the 1950s and 1960s show "real" damages exceeding the paid damages on some remainders studied. The access and property characteristics of right-of-way remainders may contribute differing amounts to damages and/or enhancements. Therefore, remainder properties created in later years,

including those created during the 1984-1987 period, will be researched to determine the amount of "real" damages and/or enhancements that accrues due to the differing remainder characteristics and also determine the effect on right-of-way cost attributable to changing laws. Remainders created during the 1984-1987 period now have a five to eight year after period history in which to change in value. Also, the results need to be compared to the findings of 486 remainder case studies conducted in the 1950s and 1960s. If these old remainders were updated, longer-run effects could be determined.

STUDY OBJECTIVES

The general study objective is to determine which remainder characteristics significantly affect right-of-way costs. The more specific objectives of the study are as follows:

1. Determine the significant remainder property, access and locational characteristics that affect right-of-way costs; and
2. Determine the effects of the 1984-87 right-of-way evaluation law on right-of-way costs.

DATA SOURCES

The data sources for the study are relevant reports cited in the literature; a survey of highway right-of-way appraisers, attorneys (TxDOT's and State Attorney General's staff) and other right-of-way officials; a sample of old case studies of remainders of partial takings created during the 40s, 50s and 60s; and a sample of new case studies of remainders of partial takings created during the 70s, 80s and early 90s in Texas. The base data for each of the case studies making up each sample are from TxDOT files.

PURCHASING RIGHT-OF-WAY REMAINDERS

LEGAL ASPECTS

The establishment of the Interstate Highway System (IHS) set in motion vastly accelerated right-of-way acquisition programs through the cooperation of state highway and/or transportation agencies. Since the IHS is a limited access facility, and placed to a considerable extent on new locations, many right-of-way acquisition problems occurred, particularly those involving partial takings [1,2]. As a result, many new rules, regulations, and laws were put into effect on a federal and state level to guide these expanded right-of-way acquisition programs. Acquisition laws were further interpreted by the courts of each state [3]. In Texas, the Carpenter case was supplemented through the succeeding years by rulings of other cases, such as the Meyers and Vaughn cases [4]. More recently, several court cases have dealt with the consideration of 1) "special enhancements" to the remainder being used to offset damages to the remainder and 2) "right of access" in the determination of the fair market value of a remainder, such as State v. The Enterprise Co., 728 S.W. 2d 812 (Tex. 1986); State v. Schmidt, 805 S.W. 2d 25 (Tex. App.--Austin 1991, n.w.h.); and State v. Munday Enterprises, (3-90-236-CV), 1/15/92, Aust. ST., [5,6,7], respectively.

Presently, TxDOT officials are considering legislation that would allow the acquisition of "uneconomic remainders" of partial takings. Federal law already allows the purchase of such remainders under the provisions of the "Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, P.L. 91-646, 84 Stat. 1894" [8]. However, such authorization conflicted with provisions of the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, P.L. 78-521, December 20, 1944, 58 stat. 838" [8]. This conflict was apparently resolved in "State of New Mexico, ex rel. New Mexico Highway Department v. United States, 665 F.2d 1023 (Ct.Cl. 1981)", [8]. Currently, the Texas Constitution does not allow condemning authorities, such as TxDOT, to acquire excess right-of-way or to use "special benefits" to reduce what is paid for the part taken. A total of 28 states do not

allow "special benefits" to be charged against the value of the part taken [9].

Actually, current federal law requires an offer to acquire "uneconomic remnants of land that may remain after a partial taking" [8]. Therefore, states that are authorized under state law to make excess purchases of right-of-way are required to look for, identify, and provide for the acquisition of land meeting the description of "uneconomic remnant" as defined by the Federal Highway Administration. Its definition is as follows: "a remaining part of land, after a partial acquisition, that is of little or no utility or value to the owner" [8].

COST AND ECONOMIC ASPECTS

Highway right-of-way acquisition research on a national and state level was accelerated in the late 1950s and early 1960s as a result of problems incurred from purchasing right-of-way for the interstate highway system [10,11,12,13,14]. Previous research was conducted on the following right-of-way topics: (1) study of property evaluations for right-of-way acquired in Texas [4], (2) analysis of right-of-way appraisal problems [10,15,16], (3) effects of access on highway right-of-way costs [17], (4) determination of special benefits [17,18], (5) rules of compensability and approaches to compensation for right-of-way takings [19,20], (6) right-of-way remainder and severance damage evaluations [8,11,12,13,14,17,21], and (7) excess condemnation [8, 13, 23]. Most of these and other studies have been outdated by the passage of new laws and new court rulings. However, some of these studies are useful to this study. For example, Franklin and Evans's study determined the effect of access, size of part taken and remainder, land use of original property and the remainder after, and several other variables on right-of-way cost by conducted an empirical analysis on a random sample of 343 right-of-way acquisitions in 11 different counties in Texas [17]. The study identified and analyzed many property and locational/access characteristics of these acquisitions to determine their significance on the total cost of parcel of land, cost of land taken, and damages to the remainder. The authors concluded that the granting of access had the effect of reducing the amount paid for damages on these property acquisitions. Many of these same

variables are used in this study.

A more recent study was conducted to determine the benefits of increased land accessibility due to highway projects and to determine the key factors that affect the appraised values in highway condemnation cases [22,9]. Also, a literature review and survey of current practice in other states was used to identify some of the benefits of increased land accessibility, and a small sample of right-of-way acquisitions was studied in an attempt to determine the key factors affecting the appraised values in condemnation cases. The study concluded that there was too much variety in the small sample of cases studied to clearly identify the key factors affecting the appraised values. Another major deficiency of the study was the lack of an after-acquisition market sales history of the sample of remainders studied. The study concluded that a much larger sample of right-of-way acquisitions should be selected for a follow-up study. The survey of other states determined which states permitted the use of general and/or special benefits to offset damages to the remainder and/or the value of the taking. Only five state would not allow any benefits to offset damages to the remainder. A total of 32 states allowed special and/or general benefits to offset damages to the remainder, but not the value of the taking. The remaining 13 states allow special benefits to offset damages to the remainder and also the value of the taking.

As a result of the right-of-way remainder research performed by Buffington and Adkins [13,14] in the early 1960s, TxDOT set up a data bank of right of way remainders that was researched to determine whether each remainder was, in fact, damaged in value after the taking [22]. This data bank has helped TxDOT's review appraisers to evaluate fee appraisals on remainder parcels created over the state. The case studies developed by Buffington and Adkins indicate that a majority of remainders are enhanced in value over and above their before-taking value [13,14]. However, a significant number are damaged, especially the small and/or irregularly shaped ones. In a 1967 survey of TxDOT's right-of-way personnel, Adkins and Buffington found that the vast majority of the respondents thought that purchasing whole takings is the best way to minimize overcompensation for right-of-way takings [15]. The same survey revealed that a majority of those responding thought that the application of the acquisition rules established by the Carpenter case to

appraise partial takings leads to higher right-of-way costs. The Right-of-way Division of TxDOT conducted a limited aggregative analysis of 300 of the 486 remainder case histories published through April 1970 and concluded that a real estate market exists for all types, sizes, and shapes of remainders, but that size apparently plays the most important role in the value of remainder after acquisition [22].

Highway right-of-way costs have been accelerating in recent years, especially in suburban and urban areas of the state. Therefore, further efforts are being made by TxDOT officials to find ways to reduce or hold down such costs. One of the efforts helped to enact a new law determining the compensation paid property owners for partial takings of right-of-way for highways. Such a law allowed consideration of special or direct benefits arising from the highway improvement in awarding compensation for the taking and/or assessing damages to the remainder. This law was later declared unconstitutional by the Texas Supreme Court in the State v. Munday Enterprises case. However, this law was in effect during the 1984-1987 period and helped to reduce right-of-way costs by an estimated seven million dollars [9]. TxDOT is also considering the possibility of obtaining the legal authority to purchase uneconomic remainders of partial takings. Some states already have this authority [12, 23]. The results of the current study may be helpful to TxDOT in making a decision to ask for passage of an excess condemnation law in Texas.

The above-cited studies give some indication of the problem of having to purchase partial takings, and a study of the literature has been helpful in determining the magnitude of the problem and has furnished some guidance on what remainder characteristics should be evaluated in this study. Also, additional guidance has come from a recently completed study that investigated the value of access rights.

REMAINDER CHARACTERISTICS AFFECTING RIGHT-OF-WAY COSTS

Again, the primary objective of this study is to identify and determine the remainder characteristics that most influence right-of-way costs. The second objective is to determine the effects of the 1984-87 right-of-way evaluation law on right-of-way costs. Two types of data collections were conducted to achieve both objectives. The first type is a subjective measurement based on the results of a survey of government personnel or professionals who have expertise in issues of right-of-way costs. The respondents to the survey gave their opinions on the relevancy of the various remainder characteristics. The second type is an objective measurement based on data from two sets of remainder case studies, a non-random sample of 196 case studies conducted by TxDOT and TTI during the 1960s and a stratified random sample of 300 case studies conducted by TTI (in cooperation with TxDOT) in 1994. Sample I is composed of 196 case studies done by TxDOT and 43 case studies done by TTI. Sample II is the primary database used to determine which of the remainder characteristics identified in the literature search and ranked high by the survey respondents significantly affect right-of-way costs.

Both Sample I and Sample II are composed of case studies representing all regions of the state. Figure 1 shows the state divided into seven regions with at least two TxDOT districts per region. Figures 2 and 3 show the percentage of remainder case studies located in each region. Since Sample II is a stratified sample, it is more evenly distributed over the state than Sample I.

OPINIONS OF EXPERTS SURVEYED

To identify the relevant factors in the determination of remainder awards and damages, a survey form was developed and sent to the above mentioned right-of-way government personnel and professionals. A total of 91 survey instruments were sent to public as well as private personnel, selected for their expertise in highway right-of-way



Figure 1. Map of Texas Divided into Seven Regions with the TxDOT Districts Included in Each Region



Figure 2. Chart Showing the Percentage of Sample I Remainder Parcels in Each Region of the State



Figure 3. Chart Showing the Percentage of Sample II Remainder Parcels in Each Region of the State

and remainder acquisitions and sales (see Appendix A for a copy of the survey instrument). This survey targeted five types of respondents to solicit their opinions on the physical as well as locational/access characteristics of right-of-way remainders which may be factors in determining remainder awards and damages. The types of respondents are: 1) TxDOT right-of-way appraisers; 2) fee appraisers; 3) TxDOT right-of-way attorneys; 4) staff attorneys in the attorney general office; and 5) other TxDOT right-of-way officials.

The TxDOT right-of-way appraisers handle the appraisal issues on behalf of the state, including such issues as assigning parcels to be appraised, advising fee appraisers, evaluating appraisers' qualifications and their final submitted appraisal reports, recommending appraisal values, and furnishing appraisal support for accepting the commissioner's awards and recommended settlements of eminent domain lawsuits. They also serve in an advisory role in engineering matters relating to right-of-way costs. In addition, they maintain a file on comparable sales information on each right-of-way project in the state. The fee appraisers are independent real estate appraisal experts contracted by the state to carry out formal appraisals. They conduct the field work, perform appraisal analyses, and write the appraisal report. The TxDOT right-of-way attorneys are state employees hired by TxDOT to handle all legal matters pertaining to right-of-way cases.

When disputes arise between landowners and TxDOT regarding the value placed on right-of-way being acquired by eminent domain, special commissioners are appointed at the county level to hear each case and arrive at a value. These special commissioners are property owners who do not have any interests in the disputed property but offer their experiences gained from their various occupational backgrounds. If either party is not satisfied with the value placed on the property to be acquired and want a county jury to set the value, the attorney general's office will become involved to represent the state.

The last category of personnel to be surveyed represents people who do not belong to the above four categories but have knowledge in right-of-way acquisition (for example, the district right-of-way supervisors).

SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS

The respondents were asked to first identify themselves with one of the five respondent types listed on the survey form (see copy in Appendix A). Then respondents were instructed to place an importance score, between 1 and 10 (1 being the least important and 10 being the most important) on each of the remainder characteristics listed in both categories of the physical and locational/access characteristics. These characteristics were identified in the literature to be potentially relevant in influencing remainder awards and damages [12,14,15,17,21,22].

SURVEY RESULTS

Out of the 91 survey instruments sent out, 70 of them were returned, and out of the 70 returned, 6 were blank either because of wrong addresses or because the persons had since changed job. The 70 returns represents a 77% return rate, which is an excellent return rate in any mail-out survey.

Tables 1 through 5 present the results of the survey by type of respondent, giving the mean scores, variances for each characteristic and the overall ranking of each characteristic across both categories. When comparing the results by type of respondent, the rankings do not differ much, especially in the top rankings. While the appraisers place more importance in the highest and best use of the remainder, the attorneys and their staff place more importance on the length and shape of the remainder; but the differences in the order of ranking are actually insignificant. When both categories are considered together for an overall respondent type ranking, the first three characteristics capture the highest rankings of the two categories, with the first and the second from the physical category and the third from the location/access category. Therefore, the physical category plays a more dominant role.

Table 6 shows the overall results across all five respondent types. In Category 1, a change in highest and best use of the remainder and the size of the remainder are ranked as the two most important physical characteristics affecting right-of-way costs, while in

Category 2, the locational/access characteristics category, both location and amount of access to the abutting highway are ranked the highest.

Table 1. Survey Results and Ranking of Remainder Characteristics for TxDOT Right-of-way Appraisers

Type of Respondent: TxDOT Right-of-way Appraiser				
No. of Respondents of the Type: 16				
	Mean Score	**Variance**	**Ranking by Category**	**Overall Ranking**
Category I. Physical Characteristics				
Change in highest & best use of remainder	8.8	2.3	1	1
Size of remainder	8.4	1.8	2	2.5
Width of remainder (abutting hwy)	7.6	2.9	3	4
Grade level of abutting hwy	7.5	3.8	4	5
Shape of remainder	7.4	5.0	5	6
Length of remainder (depth from hwy)	7.3	3.8	6	7
Development capabilities	7.2	2.8	7	8.5
Highest and best use of original property	6.9	5.1	8	10
Compliance with local ordinances	6.6	4.2	9	13.5
Drainage/topology of remainder	6.1	4.1	10	15
Land use of original property	5.9	3.5	11	16.5
Size of original property	5.2	6.9	12	19
Category II. Locational/Access Characteristics				
Location of access to abutting hwy	8.4	2.1	1	2.5
Amount of access to abutting hwy	7.2	3.4	2	8.5
Functional hwy class (abutting remainder)	6.7	6.5	3.5	11.5
Location & # driveways to abutting hwy	6.7	3.7	3.5	11.5
Location of taking	6.6	4.6	5	13.5
Access to cross street/road	5.9	3.9	6	16.5
Distance to cross street/road	5.3	4.9	7	18
Distance to major hwy	4.5	2.8	8	20
Distance to major shopping center	4.4	2.6	9	21
Distance to CBD of nearest town	4.0	2.8	10	22

Table 2. Survey Results and Ranking of Remainder Characteristics for Fee Appraisers

Type of Respondent: Fee Appraiser				
No. of Respondents of the Type: 27				
	Mean Score	**Variance**	**Ranking by Category**	**Overall Ranking**
Category I. Physical Characteristics				
Change in highest & best use of remainder	9.5	0.9	1	1
Size of remainder	7.6	5.8	2	2.5
Development capabilities	7.2	5.4	3	4
Compliance with local ordinances	7.1	6.8	4	5.5
Grade level of abutting hwy	7.0	5.4	5	7
Shape of remainder	6.9	3.7	6	8.5
Highest & best use of original property	6.3	10.3	7.5	12.5
Length of remainder (depth from hwy)	6.3	5.9	7.5	12.5
Width of remainder (abutting hwy)	6.0	6.1	9	14
Land use of original property	5.4	7.6	10	16
Drainage/topology of remainder	5.3	7.0	11	17
Size of original property	4.4	9.4	12	19
Category II. Locational/Access Characteristics				
Location of access to abutting hwy	7.6	4.0	1	2.5
Location of taking	7.1	6.3	2	5.5
Amount of access to abutting hwy	6.9	5.2	3	8.5
Location & # driveways to abutting hwy	6.8	2.6	4	10
Functional hwy class (abutting remainder)	6.5	7.3	5	11
Access to cross street/road	5.7	5.2	6	15
Distance to cross street/road	4.6	3.1	7	18
Distance to major shopping center	4.0	3.0	8	20
Distance to CBD of nearest town	3.9	2.9	9.5	21.5
Distance to major hwy	3.9	2.0	9.5	21.5

Table 3. Survey Results and Ranking of Remainder Characteristics for TxDOT Right-of-way Attorneys

Type of Respondent: TxDOT Right-of-way Attorney				
No. of Respondents of the Type: 1				
	Mean Score	**Variance**	**Ranking by Category**	**Overall Ranking**
Category I. Physical Characteristics				
Size of remainder	10.0	0	2	2
Length of remainder (depth from hwy)	10.0	0	2	2
Shape of remainder	10.0	0	2	2
Change in highest & best use of remainder	9.0	0	4	4.5
Width of remainder (abutting hwy)	8.0	0	5.5	7
Development capabilities	8.0	0	5.5	7
Highest and best use of original property	5.0	0	7	10.5
Land use of original property	3.0	0	8.5	14
Compliance with local ordinances	3.0	0	8.5	14
Drainage/topology of remainder	2.0	0	10.5	17.5
Grade level of abutting hwy	2.0	0	10.5	17.5
Size of original property	1.0	0	12	20.5
Category II. Locational/Access Characteristics				
Location of access to abutting hwy	9.0	0	1	4.5
Functional hwy class (abutting remainder)	8.0	0	2	7
Amount of access to abutting hwy	6.0	0	3	9
Location of taking	5.0	0	4	10.5
Location & # driveways to abutting hwy	3.0	0	6	14
Access to cross street/road	3.0	0	6	14
Distance to major hwy	3.0	0	6	14
Distance to cross street/road	1.0	0	9	20.5
Distance to CBD of nearest town	1.0	0	9	20.5
Distance to major shopping center	1.0	0	9	20.5

Table 4. Survey Results and Ranking of Remainder Characteristics for Attorney General Staff Attorneys

Type of Respondent: Attorney General staff attorney				
No. of Respondents of the Type: 7				
	Mean Score	**Variance**	**Ranking by Category**	**Overall Ranking**
Category I. Physical Characteristics				
Land use of original property	8.2	2.5	1	1
Highest and best use of original property	7.9	6.7	2	2
Width of remainder (abutting hwy)	7.8	0.8	3	3
Change in highest & best use of remainder	7.7	4.8	4	4
Size of remainder	7.5	4.9	5	5
Development capabilities	7.3	4.5	6	6
Compliance with local ordinances	6.8	3.0	7	7
Length of remainder (depth from hwy)	6.4	5.1	8	8
Size of original property	6.0	2.6	9	12
Drainage/topology of remainder	5.8	1.5	10	14
Grade level of abutting hwy	5.3	4.5	11	16
Shape of remainder	5.0	5.7	12	18.5
Category II. Locational/Access Characteristics				
Functional hwy class (abutting remainder)	6.3	8.8	1.5	9.5
Location & # driveways to abutting hwy	6.3	0.8	1.5	9.5
Amount of access to abutting hwy	6.1	9.0	3	11
Location of access to abutting hwy	5.9	9.8	4	13
Location of taking	5.7	12.2	5	15
Distance to CBD of nearest town	5.1	7.3	6	17
Distance to cross street/road	5.0	5.4	7	18.5
Access to cross street/road	4.9	5.8	8	20
Distance to major hwy	4.6	6.0	9	21
Distance to major shopping center	3.7	5.3	10	22

Table 5. Survey Results and Ranking of Remainder Characteristics for Other TxDOT Officials

Type of Respondent: Other TxDOT Officials				
No. of Respondents of the Type: 13				
	Mean Score	**Variance**	**Ranking by Category**	**Overall Ranking**
Category I. Physical Characteristics				
Size of remainder	9.2	1.2	1	1
Change in highest & best use of remainder	8.2	3.6	2	2
Width of remainder (abutting hwy)	7.8	3.2	3	3
Shape of remainder	7.5	3.5	4	4
Grade level of abutting hwy	7.4	3.3	5	5.5
Development capabilities	7.1	4.2	6	7
Length of remainder (depth from hwy)	7.0	4.2	7	8
Highest and best use of original property	6.8	5.1	8.5	10
Drainage/topology of remainder	6.8	3.6	8.5	10
Land use of original property	6.6	5.3	10	12
Size of original property	6.0	4.6	11	15
Compliance with local ordinances	5.9	6.4	12	16
Category II. Locational/Access Characteristics				
Location of access to abutting hwy	7.4	6.9	1	5.5
Location of taking	6.8	8.2	2	10
Amount of access to abutting hwy	6.3	6.8	3	13
Functional hwy class (abutting remainder)	6.2	4.6	4	14
Location & # driveways to abutting hwy	5.5	6.6	5	17
Access to cross street/road	5.4	4.9	6	18
Distance to cross street/road	4.3	5.1	7	19
Distance to major hwy	3.6	4.2	8	20
Distance to CBD of nearest town	3.3	3.4	9	21
Distance to major shopping center	3.2	2.2	10	22

Table 6. Overall Survey Combined Results and Rankings of Remainder Characteristics for All Respondents

Type of Respondents: All				
Total Number of Respondents: 64				
	Mean Score	**Variance**	**Ranking by Category**	**Overall Ranking**
Category I. Physical Characteristics				
Change in highest & best use of remainder	8.9	2.6	1	1
Size of remainder	8.2	4.1	2	2
Development capabilities	7.2	4.3	3	4
Shape of remainder	7.0	4.8	4.5	5
Width of remainder (abutting hwy)	7.0	4.9	4.5	6
Grade level of abutting hwy	6.9	5.2	6	7
Length of remainder (depth from hwy)	6.8	5.2	7	8.5
Highest and best use of original property	6.7	7.7	8.5	10
Compliance with local ordinances	6.7	6.0	8.5	10
Land use of original property	6.0	6.3	10	15
Drainage/topology of remainder	5.8	5.4	11	16
Size of original property	5.1	7.6	12	18
Category II. Locational/Access Characteristics				
Location of access to abutting hwy	7.6	5.2	1	3
Amount of access to abutting hwy	6.8	5.6	2	8.5
Location of taking	6.7	7.0	3	10
Functional hwy class (abutting remainder)	6.5	6.7	4	13
Location & # driveways to abutting hwy	6.4	3.9	5	14
Access to cross street/road	5.6	5.0	6	17
Distance to cross street/road	4.7	4.5	7	19
Distance to major hwy	4.1	3.2	8	20
Distance to major shopping center	3.9	3.3	9.5	21.5
Distance to CBD of nearest town	3.9	3.8	9.5	21.5

ANALYSIS OF SAMPLE I - OLD CASE STUDIES

Although the Sample I right-of-way case studies were not selected in a random manner over the state, they are scattered well geographically and should be fairly representative of the population of remainders resulting from right-of-way purchases occurring during the 1946-64 time period. Also, the size of Sample I, at 196 remainder parcels, is large enough to be used to analyze a fairly large number of remainder characteristics in the same regression model.

The general characteristics, analysis, and findings of Sample I are presented below.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE I

Figures 4 and 5 show the percentage of Sample I remainder parcels by location. As can be seen in Figure 4, over 80% of the parcels were located in urban areas; Figure 5 shows that over 90% of parcels were located along interstate highways. Figure 6 shows nearly 70% of the parcels were purchased by negotiation.

Figures 7 through 9 show the percentage of Sample I remainder parcels with different physical characteristics. These graphs show a fairly wide diversity of sizes, shapes, and original land uses of remainder parcels making up Sample I. As shown in Figure 7, nearly 50% of the parcels were under 10,000 square feet or 929 square meters in size. Figure 8 shows nearly 50% of the parcels were of an irregular rectangular shape. Last, Figure 9 shows over 50% of the parcels were originally in residential use.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS OF SAMPLE I

The Sample I database was analyzed statistically by using the least squares regression method. The purpose of the regression analysis is primarily to determine from the data the factors affecting the cost of a partial taking, and secondly to determine those factors affecting the cost of a partial taking versus a whole taking. The cost of a partial



Figure 4. Chart Showing the Percentage of Sample I Remainder Parcels by Rural and Urban Location



Figure 5. Chart Showing the Percentage of Sample I Remainder Parcels by Functional Class of Highway

Sample I Methods of Acquisition



Figure 6. Chart Showing the Percentage of Sample I Remainder Parcels by Method of Acquisition



Figure 7. Chart Showing the Percentage of Sample I Remainder Parcels by Size Range



Figure 8. Chart Showing the Percentage of Sample I Remainder Parcels by Shape

Sample I Original Land Use



Figure 9. Chart Showing the Percentage of Sample I Remainder Parcels by Original Land Use

taking includes the cost paid for the land, any improvements, and damages to the remainder. In some cases enhancements may partially or completely offset the damage costs. The damage costs used in the following analyses are net of any enhancements.

In looking at the data, it is apparent that in many cases the partial taking cost, including damages paid, is close to the appraised value of a whole taking. This result can occur if the property goes into condemnation. At least one of these cases is known to have been a condemnation case. Therefore, the data suggest that TxDOT could reduce right-of-way costs if it were allowed the option to purchase whole takings rather than a partial taking, especially if a small remainder would be created by such purchase. In two cases the partial taking cost is actually higher than the appraised value of a whole taking. Again, this brings up the issue of "uneconomic remainders". An uneconomic remainder could be defined as a condition where it would cost nearly as much, or more, to undertake a partial taking than a whole taking. Under current law TxDOT can only acquire the amount of property necessary for highway use. This results in a large number of partial takings and a number of uneconomic remainders. It could be cost-effective for TxDOT to have authority to acquire the whole parcel if the estimated total expenditure is close to the amount for a partial taking. A rule of thumb could be used (for example, if the anticipated total cost of a partial taking is more than eighty percent of the appraised value of a whole taking), and then the desirability of whole taking could be explored in detail. Potentially, part of the cost of a whole taking could be offset by selling the remainder at the market price. This would have the potential of generating significant savings for right-of-way acquisition and avoiding large damage awards for "uneconomic remainders".

The following sections describe the data used in the regression analyses, an analysis of the factors affecting the total partial taking cost, and factors which would affect the desirability of a partial taking versus a whole taking.

Data Items and Variables

Several factors identified in previous studies were examined, along with some additional variables unique to this study. The variables can be divided into two groups,

continuous and binary. The continuous variables include such things as property size, appraised value, costs, and amount of frontage road access. Binary variables are used to measure the impacts of categories, such as rural/urban, method of acquisition, type of land use, and shape of remainder. The binary variables are assigned a value of "0" or "1", depending on the presence or absence of a particular attribute. In the case of a variable with more than two categories, multiple binary variables are used, one for each attribute. Given the way the binary variables are used in regression analysis, one attribute has to be excluded. There has to be one attribute that always has "0". This attribute becomes the base case to which the other attributes are compared. For example, the acquisition category of unknown is always "0"; the land use category of miscellaneous is always "0"; and the remainder shape size of irregular is always "0".

Data items and variables utilized in the analysis include:

Variable Name	Definition
ACCESS	amount of frontage road access for remainder, ft.
ACQDUM1	method of acquisition binary variable one, =1 if negotiated, =0 otherwise
ACQDUM2	method of acquisition binary variable two, =1 if condemned, =0 otherwise
ACQSIZE	size of taking, sq. ft.
ACQTOT	land cost of taking, $
ACQVAL	land cost per square foot, ACQTOT/ACQSIZE, $/sq. ft.
DUMFCL	functional class binary variable, =1 if interstate, =0 otherwise
DUMLAND1	land use binary variable one, =1 if commercial, =0 otherwise
DUMLAND2	land use binary variable two, =1 if residential, =0 otherwise
DUMLAND3	land use binary variable three, =1 if agricultural, =0 otherwise
DUMLAND4	land use binary variable four, =1 if vacant, =0 otherwise
DUMSHP1	remainder shape binary variable one, =1 if triangle, =0

	otherwise
DUMSHP2	remainder shape binary variable two, =1 if irregular triangle, =0 otherwise
DUMSHP3	remainder shape binary variable three, =1 if rectangle, =0 otherwise
DUMSHP4	remainder shape binary variable four, =1 if irregular rectangle, =0 otherwise
IMPRTOT	improvement cost of taking, $
IMPRVAL	improvement cost per square foot, IMPRTOT/ACQSIZE, $/sq. ft.
DAMTOT	damages paid, $
DAMVAL	damages paid per square foot, DAMTOT/REMSIZE, $/sq. ft.
LOCDUM	location binary variable, =1 if rural, =0 otherwise
ORGCOST	total appraised value of entire property, ORGTOT+ORGIMTOT, $
ORGIMTOT	appraised improvements on entire property, $
ORGIMVAL	value of property improvements per square foot, ORGIMTOT/ORGSIZE, $/sq. ft.
ORGSIZE	size of entire property, sq. ft.
ORGTOT	appraised land value of entire property, $
ORGVAL	property land value per square foot, ORGTOT/ORGSIZE, $/sq. ft.
PROVAL	proportional difference between partial taking and whole taking cost (ORGCOST-TOTCOST)/ORGCOST
REMSIZE	remainder size, sq. ft.
REMTOT	appraised value of remainder, $
REMVAL	value of remainder per square foot, REMTOT/REMSIZE, $/sq. ft.

TAKRATIO	proportion of taking to total property size ACQSIZE/ORGSIZE
TOTCOST	total acquisition cost, ACQTOT+IMPRTOT+DAMTOT

Analysis of Total Taking Cost

Researchers used multiple regression model to estimate the relationship between total taking cost, TOTCOST, and the variables listed above. Using ordinary least-squares, each of the variables was tried separately and in numerous combinations with other variables. One of the problems with this type of analysis is the interdependence of a variable with one or more other variables. This can affect the estimates in the equation as well as the statistical significance of the estimated coefficients. For that reason considerable effort was made to identify the statistically significant variables affecting total taking cost.

The results of the analysis are shown in Table 7. All variables are significant at the one percent level, as can be seen in the far right column, 2-Tail Significance. The R^2 value of 0.86 is high for this type of analysis, indicating the independent variables explain about 86 percent of the variation in the dependent variable. This is quite high given the variation in geographic area and time periods the data covers.

Several points can be made concerning the results presented in Table 7.

- The most significant independent variable is ORGCOST, the total appraised value of the entire property. The coefficient of 0.423 indicates that on average the total taking cost is 42.3% of the total property value, holding other impacts constant.
- The value of the remainder, REMTOT, has a negative impact on the total taking cost. This means that the lower the remainder value, the higher the total taking cost. The coefficient of -0.241 indicates that about a fourth of the remainder value is reflected in lower taking costs, holding other impacts constant.

Table 7. Regression Results for Total Taking Cost

Dependent Variable: TOTCOST

Number of Observations: 196

Independent Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error	T-Statistic	2-Tail Significance
Constant	-4305.4605	1150.4397	-3.7424479	0.000
ORGCOST	0.4226117	0.0158561	26.652971	0.000
REMTOT	-0.2407237	0.0334707	-7.1920658	0.000
TAKRATIO	11615.610	2203.6570	5.2710607	0.000
IMPRVAL	2024.9726	508.59866	3.9814745	0.000
DUMSHP2	9755.0984	2696.0928	3.6182354	0.000
DUMLAND1	6758.6135	1898.6790	3.5596399	0.000

R-Squared	0.858094
Adjusted R-Squared	0.853589
S.E. of regression	7784.337
Sum of squared resid	1.15E+10
F-statistic	190.4772

- The improvement cost per square foot, IMPRVAL, has a positive impact on the total taking costs. This is expected since the total improvement cost is part of the total taking cost. However, it does not dominate the results, and the other component costs, in square feet, ACQVAL and DAMVAL were not significant.
- The ratio of the size of the taking to the total parcel size, TAKRATIO, is also significant and has a positive coefficient. This can be interpreted as indicating that the higher the proportion of the taking, the higher the taking cost (holding other impacts constant). This further implies that, when a taking results in a small remainder, the taking cost, including damages, is higher than it would be otherwise.
- One remainder shape binary variable is significant and has a positive coefficient. This variable is DUMSHP2, the irregular triangle shape. This indicates that an irregular triangle shape adds to the cost of the taking, probably by increasing damages, as compared to the other remainder shapes.
- One land use binary variable is significant, DUMLAND1, commercial use. The coefficient is positive, giving the expected results that existing commercial activity increases the taking cost relative to other land use activities.

Figure 10 is a graph showing the relationship between total cost and the amount of acquired land ratio to total land. As this ratio increases in size, the total cost of right-of-way tends to increase. In other words, as the amount of land taken or acquired increases in relation to the whole property, total right-of-way costs increases. Again, this result indicates that smaller remainders are being created as the ratio increases and the total right-of-way cost also increases.

Similar results were obtained in a regression model that excluded the amount paid for improvements involved in the taking. The R^2 was over 0.90 and many of the same variables were found to be significantly affecting right-of-way costs. A refined version of



Figure 10. Graph Showing the Relationship between Total Right-of-Way Cost and the Ratio of Acquired Land to Total Land

the land only model will be presented in the final report.

Analysis of Partial Taking Cost versus Whole Taking Cost

Another analysis was undertaken to determine what factors were influencing the relative cost of a partial taking versus a whole taking. For that purpose, the proportional difference between the two costs, PROVAL, was used as the dependent variable. As mentioned previously, in two instances the total taking cost for the partial taking is higher than the appraised value of the entire parcel. When that occurs, the variable PROVAL becomes negative. A proportional difference was used rather than the absolute difference to avoid a few expensive takings dominating the analysis. The purpose of the analysis is to identify those factors significantly influencing the choice between a partial taking and a whole taking. These factors could be used as the basis for identifying potential "uneconomic remainders" if laws are changed to allow whole takings in some circumstances.

Table 8 shows the results of the analysis. All variables are significant at the ten percent level. The R^2 value of 0.85 is again high for this type of analysis, indicating the independent variables explain about 85 percent of the variation in the dependent variable. Again, this is quite high given the variation in geographic area and time periods the data covers.

Several points can be made concerning the results presented in Table 8.

- The most significant variable is the ratio of the size of the taking to the total parcel size, TAKRATIO. The large negative coefficient indicates that the higher the proportion taking, the more likely it is that the partial taking costs will be as great as the whole taking cost, holding other impacts constant. This is almost certainly related to the diminished value of a small remainder and the high damages paid in those circumstances.
- The size of the taking, ACQSIZE, is also significant. A positive coefficient indicates that the larger the taking, the more likely that a whole taking would be more expensive than a partial taking, holding other impacts

Table 8. Regression Results for Proportional Difference between Partial and Whole Taking Cost

Dependent Variable: PROVAL Number of Observations: 196				
Independent Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error	T-Statistic	2-Tail Significance
Constant	0.9383569	0.0224768	41.747855	0.000
TAKRATIO	-1.0008474	0.0422934	-23.664392	0.000
ACQSIZE	9.876E-08	4.467E-08	2.2107728	0.027
REMVAL	0.0870448	0.0230960	3.7688321	0.000
IMPRVAL	-0.1548122	0.0125313	-12.354060	0.000
DAMVAL	-0.1610122	0.0367370	-4.3828377	0.000
ORGIMVAL	0.1563486	0.0269249	5.8068320	0.000
DUMLAND1	-0.0836614	0.0348701	-2.3992325	0.016
DUMLAND2	-0.1044484	0.0248847	-4.1972851	0.000
DUMSHP1	0.0699925	0.0367523	1.9044382	0.057
R-Squared	0.854952			
Adjusted R-Squared	0.847934			
S.E. of regression	0.130523			
Sum of squared resid	3.168732			
F-statistic	121.8152			

constant.

- The value of the remainder per square feet, REMVAL, has a positive coefficient and is significant. This indicates that the more valuable the remainder, the more likely that a whole taking would cost more than a partial taking, holding other impacts constant. This further reinforces the proposition that "uneconomic remainders" could be defined in terms of costs of whole takings versus partial takings.
- The cost of the improvement per square feet, IMPRVAL, and the cost of damages per square feet, DAMVAL, are both significant and have negative coefficients. This indicates that the more valuable are improvements and more damages that have to be paid, the more likely it is that a partial taking would be as costly as a whole taking.
- The value of the improvements on the entire parcel per square feet, ORGIMVAL, has a positive coefficient and is significant. This indicates that the more valuable are the improvements to the land, the more likely that a whole taking would cost more than a partial taking, holding other impacts constant.
- One binary remainder shape variable is significant, DUMSHP1, the triangle shape. This indicates that a triangular shaped remainder increases the likelihood that a partial taking will be less expensive than a whole taking compared to other remainder shapes.
- Two land use variables are significant, DUMLAND1, commercial development, and DUMLAND2, residential development. The negative coefficients indicate that a partial taking of commercial land or residential land is likely to be as expensive than a whole taking, compared to other land uses.

Figure 11 is a graph showing the relationship between the PROVAL ratio and taking cost. As the PROVAL ratio gets lower, partial taking costs approach whole taking costs in increasing amounts. Takings with PROVAL ratios of 0.2 or less are likely to



Figure 11. Graph Showing the Relationship between the PROVAL Ratio and Taking Cost

involve small uneconomic remainders.

A preliminary land only regression model obtained similar results to that presented above, which excluded improvements purchased. A refined version of this model will be presented in the final report.

SAMPLE II - NEW CASE STUDIES

This section of the report explains in detail the drawing of the sample of study projects and the subsequent sample of study remainders that make up Sample II. It also describes the general characteristics of Sample II. It does not describe the analysis to be performed on the Sample II database. However, the analytical process used on the Sample I database will be repeated on the Sample II database. Since not all of the Sample II data has come in from the TxDOT districts, the findings from the analysis of Sample II database cannot be presented in this interim report.

PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

A total of 665 highway right-of-way projects were closed out by TxDOT between 1974 and 1990. TxDOT right-of-way division personnel furnished TTI some basic information (such as, project number, TxDOT district number, county number, location or area type [urban versus rural], highway functional class [interstate versus non-interstate], and date closed out) on each of these projects. TTI computerized these data and also classified each project into the one of the three time periods and regions of the state defined in an earlier section of this report. Then the database was sorted and a sample of 75 projects was selected from this list of closed projects. Table 9 shows the number of closed-out projects that fell into the different categories used to define characteristics of the population of closed-out projects. The selection process chosen was designed to obtain a sample that was balanced in representation of each of the basic population characteristics of closed projects in each of the three defined time periods. To keep the size of the sample of projects manageable in size and scope, a decision was made to limit the number of projects per period to 25. Also, in order to have as acceptable a locational representation as possible in the analysis, the 25 projects per period were grouped into the seven defined regions of the state.

Table 9. Number of Projects Selected by Period, Area Type, and Highway Type

Region	Period I 1974 -1984								Period II 1984 - 1987								Period III 1987 - 1990							
	Rural				Urban				Rural				Urban				Rural				Urban			
	Number of Records		Number Selected		Number of Records		Number Selected		Number of Records		Number Selected		Number of Records		Number Selected		Number of Records		Number Selected		Number of Records		Number Selected	
	NIH	IH	NIH	IH	NIH	IH	NIH	IH	NIH	IH	NIH	IH	NIH	IH	NIH	IH	NIH	IH	NIH	IH	NIH	IH	NIH	IH
1	42	14	2	1	7	2	1	0	8	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
2	28	13	1	1	10	1	1	0	5	0	1	0	5	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
3	79	6	3	0	13	1	0	1	11	1	3	1	7	0	1	0	9	0	7	0	2	0	1	0
4	38	1	1	0	3	4	1	0	9	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4	0	1	0	1	0
5	47	4	2	0	5	1	0	0	12	0	3	0	3	0	1	0	5	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
6	101	6	4	1	30	2	2	0	13	1	3	1	4	0	1	0	5	1	4	1	0	0	0	0
7	62	2	3	0	6	6	0	0	15	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	**397**	**46**	**16**	**3**	**74**	**17**	**5**	**1**	**73**	**4**	**17**	**3**	**20**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**30**	**1**	**22**	**1**	**3**	**0**	**2**	**0**
	443		**19**		**91**		**6**		**77**		**20**		**20**		**5**		**31**		**23**		**3**		**2**	
	Total number of records for Period I = 534 Total number of selected records for Period I = 25								Total number of records for Period II = 97 Total number of selected records for Period II = 25								Total number of records for Period III = 34 Total number of selected records for Period III = 25							
	Total number of records for Periods I, II, and III = 665 Total number of selected records for Periods I, II, and III = 75																							

The 25 projects in each period were chosen in such a way that the area types, highway types, and the regions would be proportionally represented in any sample pulled for study. Table 9 shows the number of the 665 projects represented by each highway type, area type, and region for each time period and the resulting number of projects selected.

REMAINDER PARCEL SELECTION PROCESS

TxDOT's right-of-way division personnel were asked to furnish enough detail on each of the 75 projects to draw a representative sample of remainder parcels for study. TTI needed to know the type of taking (whole or partial), property type (land use), grantor type (owner or leaseholder), method of acquisition (negotiation or condemnation), and date of acquisition of each parcel in the sample of projects. After TTI received the right-of-way parcel information requested on each of the 75 study projects, these data were added to the computerized database.

After deleting all parcels irrelevant to the study (such as, whole takings, easements, non-owner grantors, and condemnation methods [not regular negotiation or condemnation settlements]), the resulting data set contained a total of 2,033 partial takings. As shown in Table 10, these remainders of partial takings contained 1,797 rural and 236 urban parcels, 1,795 of non-interstate and 238 for interstate highway parcels, and 1,651 negotiation and 382 condemnation parcels for all three time periods combined. Table 10 also shows the time period breakdown by land use category, with a total of 738 parcels in Period I, 623 in Period II, and 672 in Period III. Table 11 shows a more detailed breakdown of the method of acquisition, location (rural and urban), and original property use of each remainder by time period.

Before selecting the sample of study remainders, the TTI researchers thought it necessary to know the size of each remainder and part taken represented by the 2,033 partial takings. TxDOT's computerized files could not produce this type of information. Therefore, the researchers requested copies of the right-of-way maps on the 75 sample projects. When these maps were received from the relevant districts represented in the

Table 10. Number of Parcels from Selected Projects by Property Type, Area Type, Highway Type, Period, and Acquisition Method

Property Type	Area Type			Highway Type			Period				Acquisition Method					
											Negotiation			Condemnation		
	Rural	Urban	Total	NIH	IH	Total	I	II	III	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Acreage	1092	40	1132	1019	113	1132	394	346	392	1132	933	28	961	159	12	171
Vacant	126	25	151	125	26	151	43	74	34	151	82	17	99	44	8	52
Residential	299	27	326	296	30	326	97	96	133	326	256	18	274	43	9	52
Commercial Residential	15	6	21	17	4	21	10	5	6	21	11	2	13	4	4	8
Commercial Business	260	134	394	332	62	394	190	99	105	394	205	91	296	55	43	98
Industrial	5	4	9	6	3	9	4	3	2	9	5	3	8	0	1	1
Total Non-easement Partial Taking	1797	236	2033	1795	238	2033	738	623	672	2033	1492	159	1651	305	77	382

Table 11. Number of Parcels from Selected Projects by Acquisition Method, Period, and Area Type

Property Type	Negotiation						Condemnation					
	Period I		Period II		Period III		Period I		Period II		Period III	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
Acreage	324	4	284	21	334	3	62	4	44	6	53	2
Vacant	16	17	35	0	22	0	3	7	30	0	11	1
Residential	58	13	81	2	117	3	21	5	11	2	11	2
Commercial Residential	3	0	4	1	4	1	3	4	0	0	1	0
Commercial Business	74	52	58	30	73	9	30	34	6	4	18	5
Industrial	1	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
TOTAL	476	89	464	54	552	16	119	54	92	13	94	10

sample, the remainder and part taken sizes were recorded on the computerized database for most of the projects. There were a few which did not record the remainder size, primarily due to the part taken being appraised using the short form. However, the remainder size arrays for each time period seemed more than adequate for drawing a sample of remainders for study.

In the process of selecting the sample of study remainders by time period, discrepancies were found in the number of remainder parcels falling within a particular period if the parcel acquisition dates were used instead of the closed-out dates used earlier for selection of the 75 projects. Many parcels were acquired long before the project finally was closed out. Since the acquisition dates should be used in selecting the final sample, the parcels purchased before 1974 were removed from the working database. As a result, the size of the database used in selecting the final sample was severely reduced, especially affecting the availability of remainder parcels for Period III.

The selection plan called for the final study sample data set to contain 100 parcels per time period, with an even split between the two acquisition methods, that is, 50 by negotiation and 50 by condemnation. The final selection of the parcels, after meeting the period and method of acquisition requirements, was to be done mainly on a random basis. In the sampling process, attempts were made to retain as closely as possible the same rural/urban split, as well as the IH/Non-IH split represented in the final base data set of remainder parcels. However, the number of urban and condemned parcels was insufficient to make up a reasonable sample. As a result, partial takings from six additional projects, obtained from TxDOT's right of way division, were added to the final database set. Even after this addition, the number of condemned parcels comes out to be only 39, short of the 50 needed. Therefore, it was decided that all 39 parcels would be included in the final sample data set and, instead of relying on the planned total of 50, randomly selecting 61 negotiated parcels to add up to 100 parcels for this period. Table 12 shows the makeup of the final base data set of remainder parcels and the final study sample data set, called Sample II, classified by period, rural/urban, IH/Non-IH, and acquisition method.

Table 12. Final Base and Sample II Data Sets for Each Study Period by Type of Acquisition, Area Location, and Highway Class

Data Set		Negotiation						Condemnation					
		Rural	Urban	Total	NIH	IH	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	NIH	IH	Total
Period I	Final Base	421	55	476	433	43	476	81	19	100	79	21	100
	Sample II	44	6	50	45	5	50	39	11	50	40	10	50
Period II	Final Base	214	33	247	245	2	247	62	10	72	71	1	72
	Sample II	36	14	50	48	2	50	42	8	50	49	1	50
Period III	Final Base	26	64	90	90	0	90	12	27	39	39	0	40
	Sample II	17	44	61	61	0	61	12	27	39	39	0	39
TOTAL	Final Base	661	152	813	768	45	813	155	56	211	189	22	211
	Sample II	97	64	161	154	7	161	93	46	139	128	11	139

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE II

The last section describes in considerable detail the selection process for Sample II, and Table 12 shows the number of sample remainder parcels representing the basic or general characteristics of the population of remainder parcels in each time period. To supplement the above description of the general characteristics of Sample II, several graphs are presented in this report to show the percentage breakdown of the general characteristics of the sample. Figures 12 and 13 show the percentage of Sample II parcels by area location (rural/urban) and highway functional class, respectively. As seen in Figure 12, over 60% of the sample parcels are located in rural areas of the state. In contrast, Sample I is made up of mostly urban parcels. Figure 13 shows over 90% of the Sample II being along non-interstate highways. Again, in contrast, Sample I is made up of over 90% of its parcels that abut interstate highways.

Figure 14 show that over 50% of the Sample II remainder parcels involved takings purchased by negotiation, compared to nearly 70% for Sample I. Last, Figure 15 shows the percentage breakdown of Sample II by land use of the original parcel. Over 65% of the sample parcels are classified as agricultural (acreage) or vacant lots, compared to a little over 30% in Sample I. Therefore, the general characteristics of Sample II are considerably different from those of Sample I, perhaps reflecting different populations of remainder parcels created by right-of-way acquisitions in their respective time periods. The remainder case study form being filled out by TxDOT district personnel is designed to allow many other remainder characteristics to be defined (see a copy in Appendix A).



Figure 12. Chart Showing the Percentage of Sample II Remainder Parcels by Rural and Urban Location



Figure 13. Chart Showing the Percentage of Sample II Remainder Parcels by Functional Class of Highway



Figure 14. Chart Showing the Percentage of Sample II Remainder Parcels by Method of Acquisition

Sample II Original Land Use



Figure 15. Chart Showing the Percentage of Sample II Remainder Parcels by Original Land Use

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS OF SAMPLE II

The overall analysis to be used on the Sample II database will be similar to that used on the Sample I database. However, since more remainder characteristics will be defined in the Sample II database, the analysis will be more complex and extensive.

Since the Sample II database is not yet complete, the analysis has not begun. No findings will be available until late 1994. When they are available, they will be reported quickly by technical memorandum.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions and recommendations presented here are based on all findings of the study, except those from the primary database of new remainders (called Sample II). The findings reported in this interim report are based on an extensive literature review, a survey of right-of-way experts in and out of the state government, and a sample of old remainder case studies performed in the state during the 1960s to determine the significant characteristics of right-of-way remainders that affect right-of-way costs.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings thus far in the study, the conclusions that can be reached are as follows.

- Several physical characteristics of remainders significantly affect right-of-way costs. Those identified thus far are size, shape and land use.
- Several value/cost characteristics significantly affect right-of-way costs. Those identified thus far are appraised value of entire property, value of the remainder, value of improvements of entire property, and cost of improvements taken.
- The findings reported do support possible legislation to give TxDOT the authority and flexibility to purchase excess right-of-way in cases where small odd shaped remainders of low value would be created.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are supported by the findings reported here.

- TxDOT right-of-way acquisition procedures should be modified to pay closer attention to right-of-way acquisitions that would create small, odd-shaped remainders of low value.

- TxDOT should initiate legislation that would give it authority to purchase "uneconomic remainders."

REFERENCES

1. D.R. Levin, "Report of Committee on Land Acquisition and Control of Highway Access and Adjacent Areas", Highway Research Board Bulletin 232, Highway Research Board, Washington, D.C., 1959.

2. B. Frankland, "Community Effects on Remainder Parcel Valuation", Highway Research Record No. 54, Highway Research Board, Washington, D.C., 1964.

3. S. Nissel, "Control of Access and Police Power", Highway Research Board Bulletin 205, Highway Research Board, Washington, D.C., 1958.

4. J.L. Long, A Study of Property Valuation for Highway Right of Way Acquisition in Texas (An unpublished Master's Thesis), Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, August 1966.

5. State v. The Enterprise Co., 728 S.W. 2d 812 (Tex. 1986).

6. State v. Schmidt, 805 S.W. 2d 25 (Tex. App.--Austin 1991, n.w.h.).

7. State v. Munday Enterprises, (3-90-236-CV), 1/15/92, Aust. ST.

8. J.C. Vances, "Acquisition of Uneconomic Remnants Under 23 U.S.C. 109(F)", Selected Studies in Highway Law, Vol 2, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C., June 1988.

9. E.J. Washington and R.W. Stokes, Factors Affecting Appraised Values in Highway Land Acquisition Cases, Research Report 489-2F, Texas Transportation Institute, College Station, Texas, October 1988.

10. W.G. Adkins and J.L. Buffington, Right of Way Acquisition Study (Interim Report), Texas Transportation Institute, College Station, Texas, October 1959.

11. Office of Research, Highways and Land Administration Division, Manual for Highway Severance Damage Studies, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C., September 1961.

12. S. Goldstein, W.H. Stanhagen, J.T. Sweeney, and C.L. Fair, "Land Acquisition 1962", Highway Research Board Bulletin 343, National Academy of Sciences -National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 1962.

13. J.L. Buffington and W.G. Adkins, Case Study of Eighteen Remainder Parcels Along Houston's Gulf Freeway, Texas Transportation Institute, College Station, Texas, March 1961.

14. J.L. Buffington and W.G. Adkins, Case Studies of Twenty-five Remainder Parcels Along Interstate Loop 820, Fort Worth, Texas, Texas Transportation Institute, College Station, Texas, August 1961.

15. W.G. Adkins and J.L. Buffington, An Analysis of Right of Way Appraisal Problems, Texas Transportation Institute, College Station, Texas, October 1967.

16. American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers, Divergences of Right of Way Valuations, Report No. 126, National Cooperative Highway Research Program, Highway Research Board, Washington, D.C., 1971.

17. W.D. Franklin and L.A. Evans, The Effect of Access on Right of Way Costs and the Determination of Special Benefits, Research Report No. 82-1F, Texas Transportation Institute, College Station, Texas, October 1968.

18. J.M. Montano, "Recognition of Benefits to Remainder Property in Highway Valuation Cases", National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 88, Highway Research Board, Washington, D.C., 1970.

19. D.T. Massey, Rules of Compensability and Valuation Evidence for Highway Land Acquisition, Report No. 104, National Cooperative Highway Research Program, Highway Research Board, Washington, D.C., 1970.

20. F.P. Bosselman, M.D. Newsom, and C.L. Weaver, New Approaches to Compensation for Residential Takings, Report 107, National Cooperative Highway Research Program, Highway Research Board, Washington, D.C., 1970.

21. J.D. Jordan, Studies of Right of Way Remainders, Final Report, Departmental Research Report No. 44-2F, May 1963.

22. E.J. Washington, R.W. Stokes and G.C. Udenwa, Measuring the Benefits of Increased Land Accessibility Due to Highway Projects: Literature Review and Survey of Current Practices, Research Report 489-1, Texas Transportation Institute, College Station, Texas, April 1987.

23. R.S. Snyder, "Validity of Excess Taking to Avoid Severance Damages", Highway Research Circular No. 4, Highway Research Board, Washington, D. C., June 1965.

APPENDIX A: SURVEY AND DATA FORMS

RIGHT OF WAY REMAINDER PARCEL DATA FORM

Identification Data

Dist._____ County No._____ Hwy No._____ CSJ. No._____

Proj. No._____ U/R Loc_____ Nearest City_____

Parcel No.___ Land Owner at taking_____

Lot____ Blk._____ Subdivison_____ Survey No._____

Size (S.F./Acres): Whole Prop_____, Taking_____ Rem_____

Remainder Size Demensions: (No. of Linear Ft.) Frontage_____

Depth (Sides): Right_____ Left_____ Back_____

Descriptive Data

Remainder(After) Access to Abutting Highway: (Check X one):

Direct to ML's ____ Service Rd. ____ Side St./Rd. Only _____

No. of Driveways: Abutting Highway: _____ Abutting Side St._____

Grade Level to Highway ML's (Ft.): _____ Below _____ Above

Distance to Cross St./Rd. (Miles 00.0): _____

Distance to Major Intersecting Highway (Miles 00.0): _____

Land Use and Zoning:	Use	Zoning
Whole Property at Taking	_____	_____
Remainder Use Now	_____	_____

Highest and Best Use: Whole Property_____

Remainder Before Taking_____

Remainder After Taking_____

Remainder Use/Development Limitations: (Check X on Applicable ones:

Local Ordinances: Parking ____ Zoning_____ Others (List)_____

Lack of Utilities: Electicity___Water___ Gas___ Sewer lines_____

Drainage: Poor_____ In Flood Plain_____ Others _____

Topography: Too Irregular Surface____ On Steep Slope_____

Conflicting/Unsightly Use of Adjacent or Nearby Property ____

Explain_____

Remainder Distance to CBD of Nearest City or Town (Miles 00.0)____

Remainder Distance to Nearest Major Shopping Center(Miles 00.0)___

Value and Cost Data

Date of Approved Value of Right of Way Parcel: Mo.__ Da.__ Yr.__

Approved Value of Component Parts:	Land	Improvements
Property Taken	_____	_____
Remainder (Before)	_____	_____
Remainder (After)	_____	_____
Whole Property (Before)	_____	_____
Damages(Type)_____	_____	_____
Enhancements	_____	_____

Closing Payment Date on Taking/ Damages(if any): Mo.__ Da.__ Yr.__

Payment for Component Parts:	Land	Improvements
Property Taken	_____	_____
Damages	_____	_____

Payment for Acquisition Costs:	Amount
Appraisal Fees	_____
Title Fees	_____
Court Costs	_____
Relocation Costs	_____
All Other	_____
Total Payments	_____

Ajustments:	Amount
Sale of Improvements	_____
Retention Credit	_____
Gains on Donations	_____

Remainder Sales Data

Subsequent Sales History of Remainder Property:

Sale No.	Date of Sale	Land Sold	Sale Price (S.F./Ac	Land Use
1st Sale	_____	_____	_____	_____
2nd Sale	_____	_____	_____	_____
Last Sale	_____	_____	_____	_____

Improvements Included in Above Sales:

1st Sale_____

2nd Sale_____

Last Sale_____

RIGHT OF WAY REMAINDER SURVEY
Conducted by
Texas Transportation Institute
Texas A&M University System

1. Type of Respondent (Please check the appropriate blank.):
   a. TxDOT Right of Way Appraiser _____
   b. Fee Appraiser _____
   b. TxDOT Right of Way Attorney _____
   c. Attorney General staff attorney _____
   d. Others (including panel members) _____

2. Please give a degree of importance score to each of the following physical, locational and access characteristics of right of remainders in contributing significantly to higher right of way costs: (Note: Please choose a number from 1 to 10 to evaluate each characteristic separately. Giving the characteristic a score of (1) means it contributes very little to right of cost and a score of (10) means it contributes very much to right of cost. **More than one characteristic could have the same degree of importance score because each characteristic is evaluated independently.**)

CHARACTERISTIC OF REMAINDER	DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE SCORE (From 1 to 10)
Physical Characteristics	
Size of original property	
Size of remainder	
Width of remainder (frontage of abutting highway)	
Length of remainder (depth from abutting highway)	
Shape of remainder	
Land Use of original property	
Highest and best use of original property	
Change in highest and best use of remainder from that of original property	
Drainage/topography of remainder	
Grade level of abutting highway	
Development capabilities	
Compliance with local ordinances (zoning, parking, etc.)	
Others (Please list below and rate each one.)_____	
Locational/Access Characteristics	
Functional highway class (abutting remainder)	
Location of taking (front versus back of original tract)	
Location of access to abutting highway (direct versus other street or road)	
Location and number of driveways to abutting highway	
Amount of access to abutting highway (direct versus indirect to main lanes)	
Access to cross street or road (direct or indirect)	
Distance to cross street or road	
Distance to CBD of nearest town	
Distance to major highway (in same city or general area)	
Distance to major shopping center (by way of abutting highway)	
Others (Please list and rate each one.)_____	