


RETURN TO FILE 10
RESEARCH

~~SECRET~~
~~MS-82~~

CASE STUDIES OF TWENTY-FIVE REMAINDER PARCELS ALONG INTERSTATE LOOP 820, FORT WORTH, TEXAS

~~SECRET~~



0078

D-10 Research
720.31 (33)

TEXAS HWY. DEPT.
PROJECT 8-2
PARCEL 4.4



by
Jesse L. Buffington
William G. Adkins

Bulletin No. 17

E 67-61

TEXAS TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTE
(A Part of the A. & M. College of Texas)
College Station, Texas

CASE STUDIES OF TWENTY-FIVE REMAINDER PARCELS ALONG INTERSTATE LOOP 820, FORT WORTH, TEXAS

by
Jesse L. Buffington
William G. Adkins

*A special report to the Texas Highway Department
and to the Bureau of Public Roads,
United States Department of Commerce*

August, 1961

BULLETIN NO. 17

TEXAS TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTE
(A Part of the A. & M. College of Texas)
College Station, Texas

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge the many persons who helped make this study possible. Especially appreciated is the cooperation of several of the members of the Fort Worth Independent Appraisers Association. These conscientious men took a major responsibility in the selection and adjustment of comparables and in other difficult evaluative work.

Mr. George T. Jefferson, Right-of-Way Engineer, and Mr. Herbert Helm, Associate Right-of-Way Appraiser, of Texas Highway Department District 2 were keenly interested in the work and made every effort to facilitate its progress.

Not all of the many contributors can be named here, but other members of the District 2 staff will know that their kindness and cooperation will be remembered. The same is true of the personnel of the Fort Worth Planning and Tax Offices and of the Tarrant County Tax and Clerk's Offices who guided the search for various critical data.

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	5
Purpose of the Study	5
Selection of Study Sites	6
Sources of Data	7
Summary of Findings	8
Summary of Recommendations	8
CASE HISTORIES OF 25 REMAINDER PARCELS	10
Interpretation of the Analysis Sheet	10
Individual Analysis	13
AGGREGATE ANALYSIS	38
Enhancements and Damages	38
Succession of Land Uses	41
Comparison of Remainders Selling and Not Selling	41
Differences in Value	41
Differences in Uses	41
Changes in Uses	42
Other Differences or Similarities	42
RECOMMENDED PROCEDURES FOR FUTURE REMAINDER STUDIES	43
Components of a System of Continuing Review	43
Selection of Projects	43
Project Header Sheet	43
Identification of Remainders	43
The Review for Sales	44
Collection of "Before Acquisition" Data	44
Collection of "After Acquisition" Data	44
Selection of Comparables	44
Recommended Procedures in Analysis	44
Why a System of Continuing Review?	45
APPENDIX A — SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION ON REMAINDERS	46
APPENDIX B — SUGGESTED FORMS FOR REMAINDER STUDIES	57
Project Header Sheet — FORM I	57
Remainder Identification Sheet — FORM II	57
Remainder History Schedule — FORM III	57
The Analysis Sheet	58
The Bureau of Public Roads Form	58
Supplementing the Bureau of Public Roads Form	58

CASE STUDIES OF 25 REMAINDER PARCELS ALONG INTERSTATE LOOP 820, FORT WORTH, TEXAS

Introduction

Right of way acquisition experience suggests very strongly that property owners, judges, juries, appraisers, and perhaps even the legal framework have a common bias that a partial taking of property for right of way results in compensable damages to the remaining parcel. This biased view is a generalization not based upon empirical evidence but rather formulated in the absence of knowledge to the contrary. This belief has been sustained and strengthened by the continuing payments of damages in a very large proportion of partial acquisitions. Every such payment of damages, especially those which are not warranted, and every overpayment of damages sustains the myth as does the continued disregard of enhancements. The failure to offset damages with enhancements, as allowed under law, destroys the effectiveness of this legal tool and makes the public agency's responsibility to determine and to pay adequate but not excessive compensation more difficult and indeed quite frustrating.

These biased attitudes and the added right-of-way expense that they surely cause are ample justification for a broadly-based research effort to develop and explain factual data which reflect the actual damages and enhancements experienced by remainders. Unless such studies are broadly based, unless they yield results representative of all remainders created, they themselves may carry a bias which will imperil their long-time utility. This is to say that if the information developed is refutable, there is an excellent chance that it will be refuted at embarrassing times and places. The utility and value of remainder case histories rest heavily upon their accuracy and reliability.

The uses to which remainder studies may be put are both general and specific. Certainly, the findings will have a ready application in public hearings and in other facets of public relations. But in more specific usefulness, they will help appraisers to make more complete and more accurate appraisals in cases involving partial takings and they likely will sharpen appraisal review. They also should be of aid in negotiation and in preparation for condemnation proceedings. In relation to comparables and perhaps under other circumstances, case histories may gain admission into condemnation court.

It is not denied that damages can and do occur just as enhancements can and do occur. The contention is that too little is known about the balance and incidence of the diverse consequences. Thus the over-all purpose of remainder studies is to improve the predictability or expectancy for individual remainders and thereby to dispel or at least to lessen what can be very bothersome and expensive uncertainty. Very probably, the best comparable for remainders to be created is remainders

that have been the result of right of way acquisition in the past.

To develop the needed information, it is believed that remainder studies should be conducted in all parts of the State. This is suggested because findings in any one part of the state may have severely limited acceptability in some other section. Therefore, it is recommended that each Highway Department district should compile and maintain its own file of remainder studies and that the Highway Department's Right-of-Way Division give serious consideration to assembling a central file of study results. This program should make use of standard forms and a proved methodology.

The development of an analytically sound method for conducting remainder studies and the recommendation of a system whereby files of case histories of remainders may be kept up to date and readily accessible have been the responsibility of the Texas Transportation Institute. In its *Interim Report to the Texas Highway Department, 1959*, the Institute was concerned with a number of right of way problems and considerations, among which were remainder damages and enhancements. This report endorsed remainder case history analyses and presented the Institute's first conception of what these analyses would involve.

Subsequently, a study of Gulf Freeway remainders was made to evolve and demonstrate more detailed analytical procedures. Gulf Freeway remainders were chosen for the initial demonstration study because it was known that they had existed for a long enough period of time, since the late 1940's, to have established definite patterns in use and value. From one standpoint, the Gulf Freeway study was a disappointment; the original appraisal data available for the analyses were incomplete, a fact that impaired the quality of the findings. Despite this limitation, a reasonably sound and workable analytical approach was demonstrated. The results of the work were reported by the Institute under the title, *A Study of Eighteen Remainder Parcels Along Houston's Gulf Freeway*.

The next step in the Institute's work was planned as a pilot study of remainder parcels from State-approved acquisition. (The right-of-way for the Gulf Freeway was acquired by the City of Houston.) Appraisal data from such acquisition were expected to be more complete; these data and the manner in which they were recorded were expected to lend themselves more readily to case history analyses. The study plan was to apply the principles and techniques from the Gulf Freeway research, to improve these tools, and to make a final set of recommendations to the Texas Highway Department. This report presents the results of this endeavor.

The recommended system and its parts are, of course, completely elective. It is hoped, however, that no major consideration has been overlooked and that the sponsoring agency, at its option, will have little difficulty in adapting the elected features to its operations.

It should be pointed out that while the 25 remainder case histories reported here were used to develop a system of analysis, they also have a current value in themselves through the several uses named above. They are recent and they are representative of a large number of remainders. Thus they are more than simply illustrative; they are reliable findings.

Selection of Study Sites

Following the investigation of State-approved right-of-way projects in four of Texas' metropolitan areas, three such projects located in the Fort Worth area were selected for study. The right-of-way involved was for Interstate 820 (Loop 217) and the projects were 9002-8-2, 9002-8-4, and 9002-8-5. These study sites were chosen following the advice of Highway Department District 2 right-of-way personnel.

The portion of Interstate 820 which consists of the study projects is situated southeast of downtown Fort Worth in a suburban area. The facility has fully controlled access with frontage roads, except for a short section. It had been planned several years prior to 1956

when the first right of way acquisition was made. The City of Fort Worth made a few early purchases of right of way during 1956 to prevent the improvement of lots. The State began buying right-of-way as early as April, 1957. But the public hearing was not held on the three projects until September, 1958.

By November, 1960, all of the right of way within the three projects was purchased and final payment made, except for 15 jury cases still pending. At that time the combined total parcel costs plus damages had amounted to \$1,603,961. Of this total, the specified payments for damages to remaining land and improvements were \$96,855.

Construction began in May, 1959, on Project 90 02-8-2 and in September, 1960, on Projects 9002-8-4 and 9002-8-5. Construction ended (the section was opened for traffic) on Project 90 02-8-2 in June, 1961. The projected opening date for the other two projects is June, 1963.

The right-of-way purchased for the new facility went through undeveloped tracts of land varying from less than one acre to seventy acres in size and also through 24 subdivisions, developed over the past 15 years.

Approximately 60 percent of the tracts were improved. About 10 of the subdivisions were improved almost completely with single family residences built after World War II. Some of the others were as little




Figure 1. The sections of Interstate 820 (Loop 217) included in the remainder study are set off by arrows on this map showing a portion of the existing and proposed highway program of Fort Worth and Tarrant County.

as 20 percent improved. A few lots abutting major thoroughfares were improved with commercial buildings. One of the subdivisions was occupied by Negroes and was bounded on the north and south by four subdivisions occupied by Whites. These various subdivisions which existed at the time of the study are listed below by projects:

PROJECT 9002-8-2	PROJECT 9002-8-5
Sherwood Forest*	West Handley
Wilson*	C. D. Swaim
Oakcrest	H. E. Shamburger
PROJECT 9002-8-4	R. K. Faubus and
Village Gardens	Bates
Wilkes Estates	Faubus and Bates
Meadowview*	F. E. & Mamie
Handley Heights South	Wolfe
Carver Heights	W. B. Moncrief
Rosedale Industrial tracts	N. D. Whittington
Lake View	J. W. Brock Estates
Rosedale Park	D. M. Davis
W. L. Sloan	Mineral Wells
A. H. Woolverton	Ederville
Madding	

All of the study area except two subdivisions and a few acreage tracts was within the city limits of the Cities of Fort Worth and Forest Hill. The new facility passes within two miles of the central business district of the City of Forest Hill, primarily a city of residences. It ranges from six and one-half to 10 miles from the central business district to the City of Fort Worth.

There are several major traffic arteries which cross the study area and lead to downtown Fort Worth. Among these are U. S. Highway 287, Bowman Springs Road, U. S. Highway 80 (Lancaster Avenue), and Meadowbrook Drive.

To the east of the study area, Lake Arlington comes within one-fourth mile of the new facility. This lake was newly completed and had just filled with water when the state began ordering appraisals preparatory to right-of-way purchase. Thus whatever the Lake's influence on the area, it was already present before acquisition. No other major factor except continuing urban expansion appeared to be an area influence.

Since acquisition of the right of way for the new facility began, some of the abutting tracts have been subdivided. Forest Estates and Shady Hill Additions are new subdivisions in the City of Forest Hill. Also, in the same area, Sherwood Forest Addition has been enlarged and another subdivision plat has been submitted for approval. Further to the east, in the City of Fort Worth, the plat has been rescinded for Meadowview Addition, which was severed by the new facility.

Sources of Data

The following outline gives the sources of data used and something of the procedures of data collection:

1. Use of Right-of-Way Maps:

In order to identify and locate all remainders, the right-of-way map of Interstate 820 covering the three projects to be studied was used. This map and design maps then were used in preparing illustrative layouts for re-

*Were not developed at the time of right-of-way acquisition.

mainders which sold. (The design maps are not needed for remainder studies if the right-of-way map shows the design of the facility.)

2. Recording Data on Remainder Identification Sheets:

After all acquisitions involving remainders were located on the right-of-way map, the legal location and the area of the whole property, the part acquired, and the remainder were recorded on a Remainder Identification Sheet. (See a copy of this form in Appendix B.) After this step, Identification Sheets were grouped by subdivision or survey and placed in a loose leaf binder.

The Highway Department District's file folder for each parcel was then obtained, and all additional data required from it were recorded on the appropriate Remainder Identification Sheet. It is important at this point that the name of the owner at acquisition should be checked. The name to be used is the one which appears on the title company's closing statement.

3. Recording Market Data on Remainders:

The Tarrant County tax records were considered the best source to check for subsequent remainder sales. Each parcel's legal description was checked through these records; and when a remainder sale was determined, the sale data were recorded on the Remainder Identification Sheet.

4. Recording Data on Remainder History Sheet:

A sale of a remainder was taken as an indication that a case history analysis might be possible. At this point, duplicate copies were made of each of the Remainder Identification Sheets which showed a recording of one or more remainder sales. The original copies were left together in the binder to be used for making a periodic continuing review of the tax records to find additional remainder sales.

A second copy of each Remainder Identification Sheet showing a sale was placed in a separate binder by project and in parcel number order. Then a Project Header Sheet was placed in front of such Remainder Identification Sheets of each project. Data common to all the remainders within each project were recorded on the Project Header Sheets. (A copy of this appears in Appendix B.)

Next a copy of the Remainder History Schedule (See Appendix B) was attached to each Remainder Identification Sheet. All of the "before" data for each parcel were then recorded from the parcel files and from the right-of-way map. After collecting all necessary background information on each remainder which subsequently sold, the collection of the after-acquisition data began. Part of this information was recorded from the design map, furnished by the Texas Highway Department.

The deed records in the County Clerk's Office were used to verify and supplement remainder sale data obtained from tax records. The legal description, with metes and bounds, was recorded for each remainder sale. (These data are especially critical when only part of the remainder has sold.) The date of the instrument and the consideration (cash and indebted) were among the items checked.

The Grantees (or Grantors) were contacted to verify each remainder sale and to provide any other infor-

mation deemed pertinent such as trades or lease data. These respondents also were asked about the disposal of old improvements, the building of new improvements, and the intended use of the remainder.

The City Planning Offices of both Fort Worth and Forest Hill were contacted to obtain "after-acquisition" zoning changes and the date and the name of the applicant in each case. The City tax offices were contacted to acquire building permit data on each remainder. It was critical to know just when certain physical improvements had been made on the remainders in order that proper adjustments could be made of the value of the improvements before and after the dates of sales.

Each remainder was inspected and a record made of its present use. The condition of improvements was observed and their value estimated. Photographs were made of each remainder. The remainder's relationship to the new facility, such as visibility, was determined. Any changes in the neighborhood affecting property values were recorded.

5. Collection and Selection of Comparable Property Data:

Data on comparables originally used in appraisal were recorded, as before-acquisition data, on the Remainder History Sheets. It was reasoned that if any of these comparables had resold during the after-acquisition period and near the date of the remainder's sale, they would be useful as comparables for the later analysis. Therefore each of these comparables was checked through the county tax records in an effort to locate repeat sales. Very few such resales of comparables were found, and none were suitable for use. Since this check yielded no acceptable after-period comparables, a further search had to be made.

The same subdivision or survey in which a remainder was located was checked through the County tax records in an effort to find comparable property sales occurring after acquisition. Data on a number of the sales so found were recorded on the Remainder History Sheets. All such properties were close enough to the new facility for their values to be influenced by the facility in a general way, but none was abutting the facility.

The potential comparable properties were investigated and each was photographed. The criteria used in selecting properties comparable to an original whole property were similarity of land, type and quality of improvements, and nearness to the subject property before acquisition. Most of the comparables were within three blocks of the remainder with which they were used in the analysis. Comparables were selected for each subject property where the time lapse was great enough to warrant their use.

Summary of Findings

By July, 1961, fifty-four remainder parcels had sold subsequent to right of way acquisition. Because some parcels sold together, only 29 distinctive case histories were indicated. However, only 25 of these yielded meaningful case histories. Briefly, the principal findings regarding damages, enhancements, and land use changes are as follows:

1. Six remainders experienced land damages as shown by a comparison of their sales prices with the

sales prices of comparables. One of these later succeeded to a higher land use.

2. Two other remainders, each involving two sales, seemed to have suffered land damages, but this occurrence was refuted by later sales. Both of these latter remainders succeeded to higher uses.

3. One remainder reflected neither damages nor enhancements to land. For five remainders, selling as improved properties, damages were in evidence, but no conclusions were made as to the extent of land damages. All of these remainders were in their original use.

4. Eleven remainders experienced net enhancements to land. Some of these enhancements were significantly large. Five of such remainders had succeeded to higher uses.

5. Payments for damages to either land or improvements or both were paid in 17 of the 25 partial takings studied. Land damages were paid on 15 remainders. In 13 cases, these land damages were appraised. In two instances, payments for the property acquired were considered by the researchers to have included damages to remainders in view of the excessive amounts paid for what seemingly were inferior portions. Damages to improvements also were paid on seven of the above remainders. For two additional remainders, damages to improvements only were paid.

6. Damages were paid in six instances in which no actual damages occurred. Excessive damages were paid in six additional cases. Out of the eight remainders for which no damages were paid, there should have been a damage payment for only you.

7. Seven remainders moved to higher uses; seven changed from residential to vacant, five remained residential, four remained vacant, one changed from use as a church site to vacant, and one changed from commercial and residential use to vacant. Five remainders succeeded to residential use and two changed from vacant to commercial use.

8. Generally speaking, the remainders described in this report are considered representative of all remainders in the study area. A comparative study of the remainders selling and not selling revealed few differences of consequence. On the average, the land value of those which sold was the higher. One difference was that, at acquisition, none of those selling were in purely commercial usage, while those not selling had seven in this use. Both groups experienced about the same degree of land use change. However, 15 percent of the remainders selling succeeded to a higher use compared to six percent for the remainders not selling.

Summary of Recommendations

In general, all of the procedures used in this report are recommended for the Texas Highway Department's remainder studies. In fact, it is considered that as sufficient remainder histories are developed for particular projects, these should be reviewed together and a short aggregative analysis should be prepared to reflect how such remainders were affected as a group (as has been done in this report). Among the many recommendations stated or demonstrated elsewhere in this report, there are several that may be emphasized here.

1. It is recommended that each Highway Department District become engaged at least to some extent

in remainder studies. With guidance from the Department's Right-of-Way Division, this work will quickly be reduced in a large part to routine. It can be performed in conjunction with the assembly and maintenance of files of "comparables."

2. The role of the Right-of-Way Division is conceived to be not only to give guidance and advice on procedural matters but also to serve as a central collection agency. Case histories received from the Districts may be coded and card-punched and then used for aggregative analyses and perhaps even as aids in appraisal reviews at the Division level.

3. It is recommended that a uniform system of analysis be adopted and that it make use of standard forms. Only with such provision can the results developed have maximum utility.

4. It is considered that continuing periodic reviews of all remainders would be the optimum arrangement. However, it is realized that this may not be practicable for all Districts. If something less is desired, it is recommended that omissions be made by right-of-way projects. It is believed that the study of all remainders within a project will yield more reliable results than the study of selected remainders from a number of projects.

5. It should be emphasized that once remainders have been identified and a search for sales has been

made, subsequent reviews of the remainders will be much simpler. It is suggested, however, that after the passage of about five years following right-of-way acquisition, the data developed may have very little utility. Therefore, it is recommended that the Right-of-Way Division establish a "cut-off" time. Studies would be made after such a period only for very special purposes.

6. It is recommended that remainder studies make use of comparables in every case for which doubt might arise regarding value and use trends. For example, a steep uptrend in values would tend to result in measured enhancements, just as a downtrend might suggest remainder damages. The *actual* consequences to remainders may have been opposite, a result obtainable and documentable only through the use of comparables or controls.

7. Finally, it is recommended that to guide and record remainder studies the Right-of-Way Division adopt or develop a standard set of forms acceptable to the various Districts. These may be modifications of the forms developed by the Texas Transportation Institute or of the form recommended by the U. S. Bureau of Public Roads. Standard forms and procedures will permit program evaluation as well as a maximum utility of results. (Additional discussion of the importance of data forms is presented in Appendix B.)

Case Histories of 25 Remainder Parcels

The case histories of 25 remainder parcels along Fort Worth's Interstate 820 are presented for two reasons. The most important of these is to illustrate an analytical process. It is believed that a thorough review of each analysis will do much to help an appraiser or right-of-way agent to perform similar research. The second reason is that the findings themselves should prove to be useful; they are suggestive of what may be expected from future studies. In the Gulf Freeway study the lag between the time of acquisition and the time of the study was an obvious drawback, for time is a difficult factor to analyze. Furthermore, it complicated the location and assembly of data. Fortunately most of these 25 remainders experienced a short time lapse between the date of acquisition and date of the remainder sale.

In most cases, the analyses are based on complete appraisals of the whole property and part acquired. The comparable sales used in the analyses are highly comparable to the subject properties. With these data available, some rather firm conclusions could be drawn on the analysis sheet which is interpreted in the following section. The analysis sheet used in this study is somewhat a simplification of the one used in the Gulf Freeway Study.


Interpretation of the Analysis Sheet

A. Before Acquisition:

1. *The whole property is described briefly, and it is indicated as either a corner or interior property.*
2. *The whole property's appraisal date, area, and components of value are given here. In most cases, these are approved values based on appraised values. If only the land to be acquired was appraised, its value per square foot was used to compute the land value of the whole lot or tract, unless the consultant appraiser disagreed with that value.¹ In such cases, his value estimate was used. If the appraised value of the improvements was not given, the consultant appraiser's estimate was used.*

- #### B. Property Acquired: —
- The title company's closing date on the part acquired, the area and improvements acquired, and the amounts paid for land, improvements, and damages appear under this heading.*

¹A member of the Fort Worth Independent Appraisers Association.



An aerial view of Interstate 820 showing the location of five remainders of right-of-way acquisition which sold.



An aerial view of Interstate 820 showing the location of twenty remainders of right-of-way acquisition which sold.

C. After Acquisition:

1. *The relation of the remainder to the new facility is summarized here.*
2. *Subsequent remainder sale data* are recorded and consist of the area sold, amount paid, and the date of sale (date of instrument). If improvements were sold with the land, they are mentioned here.
3. *The increase or decrease in the value of the remainder*, which is the difference in its value at acquisition (before damages) and its value at time of sale, is recorded as a percentage here.
4. *The change in the value of the comparable property* is recorded as a percentage here. This difference is obtained in a manner to reflect what would have happened to the value of the remainder if it had remained

as an integral part of the original whole property.


5. *Subsequent changes in improvements*, such as moving of old improvements and the construction of new improvements, are reviewed. When available, building permit and rental or lease values are stated.

D. *Conclusions*: Conclusions are made as to whether the remainder is damaged or enhanced and how much. Other short statements of explanation are made here.


A Supplemental Information page for each analysis is contained in Appendix A. The location of the subject property and some of its neighborhood characteristics, the location and explanation of the comparable data used, and the changes in the use and value of the remainder including zoning data, type of damages paid, and other supporting facts are given on this sheet.

REMAINDER 1

(8-2-10)



Remainder 1.



Before acquisition.



After acquisition.

A. Before Acquisition:

1. A 13.5-acre tract with a frame house, single frame detached garage with room, two frame barns, and two small out-buildings.
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 1-25-58

Land 588,670 sq. ft. @ \$.026 per sq. ft.	\$ 15,305
Improvements	13,100
Total value	28,405


B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 5-13-58

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| Land 288,106 sq. ft. @ \$.026 per sq. ft. | \$ 7,440 |
| Improvements | 12,810 |
| Damages | 0 |
| Total property payment | \$20,250 |


C. After Acquisition:

1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes rising from zero to 20 feet above grade passing over Hartman Lane, with no frontage roads.
2. Part A of remainder sold: Date 1-22-59
Land 60,113 sq. ft. and improvements \$ 12,500
Part B of remainder sold: Date 2-2-60
Land 240,451 sq. ft. @ \$.034 per sq. ft. \$ 8,200
3. Increase in value of Part A of remainder
(See conclusions)
Increase in value of Part B of remainder = 31%
4. No Change in value of comparable land = 0%
5. Subsequent improvement: The owner repurchased old improvements and moved them onto Part A of remainder. The new owner of Part B of remainder has improved it with 28 brick residences.

- D. Conclusions: Even though no frontage road is adjacent to either remainder, the sale prices reflect an enhancement in value due to the new facility. Both remainder sales grossed the owner \$20,700, which when combined with the \$20,250 paid him for the part acquired for right of way is a total of \$40,950 received for the whole property. The owner spent about \$4,000 for improving Part A. Thus he obtained a net of about \$36,950 for total property originally appraised at \$28,405.



Remainder 2.



After acquisition.

REMAINDER 2
(8-2-15)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. A 9.7-acre tract improved with two small sheds and an earthen pond.
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 2-10-58

Land 423,577 sq. ft.	@ \$.023 per sq. ft.	\$ 9,724
Improvements		56
Total value		\$ 9,780

B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 6-30-58


Land 39,378 sq. ft.	@ \$.023 per sq. ft.	\$ 904
Improvements		56
Damages		0
Total property payment		\$ 960

C. After Acquisition:

1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes 6 to 10 feet below grade and a one-way frontage at grade.
2. Parts A thru E of remainder sold: Date Between 10-5-59 & 6-20-60

Land 201,735 sq. ft.	@ \$.044 per sq. ft.	\$ 8,900
----------------------	-----------------------	----------
3. Increase in value of Parts A through E of remainder = 92%
4. Increase in value of comparable land = 30%
5. Subsequent improvement: After acquisition, the owner placed two frame residences on a portion of the remainder. After their sale, Parts B and E of remainder were improved with brick homes, each valued at about \$14,000.

- D. Conclusions: The sale prices of Parts A through E indicate an enhancement in value of the remainder due to the new facility. Of all portions of remainder which sold, only the first to sell (Part A) failed to reflect enhancements in value. (See Supplemental Information.) The original owner still owns 182,464 sq. ft. of the remainder. At \$.044 per sq. ft., this is worth an additional \$8,028.



Remainder 3.

REMAINDER 3

(8-2-19)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. A 3-acre tract improved with a frame residence, single frame detached garage and guest room, frame carport, and four frame outbuildings.
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 11-5-57

Land 129,939 sq. ft.	@ \$.037 per sq. ft.	\$ 4,800
Improvements		9,300
		\$ 14,100

B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 1-10-58

Land 82,023 sq. ft.	@ \$.036 per sq. ft.	\$ 2,950
Improvements		7,750
Damages		2,300
		\$ 13,000

C. After Acquisition:


1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes at about 20 feet below grade passing under Anglin Dr., with a one-way frontage road at grade.
2. All of remainder sold: Date 12-16-59

Land 47,916 sq. ft.	@ \$.031 per sq. ft.	\$ 1,500
---------------------	-----------------------	----------
3. Decrease in value of remainder = -15%
4. No change in value of comparable land = 0%
5. Subsequent improvement: Upon last investigation, present owner had laid water and sewer lines on a tract, including remainder, as the first phase of the development of a residential subdivision.


D. Conclusions: There were no improvements on the remainder. The sale price indicates that a damage payment was warranted, but not as large as was paid. This narrow odd-shaped remainder was purchased by the owner of adjacent property.



Before acquisition.



After acquisition.



Remainder 4.

REMAINDER 4

(8-2-24)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. A 9.5-acre tract improved with a frame residence, single frame attached garage, frame chicken house, and a well house.
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 11-14-58

Land 422,314 sq. ft.	@ \$.016 per sq. ft.	\$ 6,750
Improvements		11,350
		\$ 18,100

B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 3-25-59

Land 342,730 sq. ft.	@ \$.020 per sq. ft.	\$ 6,946
Improvements		14,467
Damages		868
		\$ 22,281

C. After Acquisition:


1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes about 10 feet above (rising over railroad) to 20 feet below (passing under Anglin Dr.) grade, with one-way frontage roads at grade.
2. Part A of remainder sold: Date 2-10-60

Land 68,433 sq. ft.	@ \$.037 per sq. ft.	\$ 2,500
---------------------	-----------------------	----------
3. Increase in value of remainder (Part A) = 128%
4. Increase in value of comparable land = 69%
5. Subsequent improvement: No improvements have been made on either remainder.


D. Conclusions: There were no improvements on the remainder after acquisition. The sale price of the north remainder (Part A) indicates that its value was enhanced. The south remainder (11,151 sq. ft.) has not yet sold.



Before acquisition.



After acquisition.



Remainder 5.

REMAINDER 5

(8-2-44)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. A corner lot improved with a frame residence.
2. Whole property and value: Data appraised 12-17-57

Land 12,590 sq. ft.	@ \$.040 per sq. ft.	\$ 500
Improvements		3,300
		\$ 3,800

B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 2-11-58

- | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| Land 9,281 sq. ft. | @ \$.043 per sq. ft. | \$ 400 |
| Improvements | | 3,300 |
| Damages | | 0 |
| | | \$ 3,700 |

C. After Acquisition:


1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes about eight feet above grade rising over Highway 287, with a one-way frontage road at grade.
2. All of remainder sold: Date 3-13-58

Land 3,309 sq. ft.	@ \$.076 per sq. ft.	\$ 250
--------------------	-----------------------	--------
3. Increase in value of remainder = 89%
4. No change in value of comparable land = 0%
5. Subsequent improvement: None


D. Conclusions: There were no improvements on the remainder. On the basis of the price paid for the above remainder, it is reasonable to assume that the remainder's value was enhanced due to the new facility.




Before acquisition.



After acquisition.



Remainder 6.



Before acquisition.




After acquisition.

REMAINDER 6
(8-4-301 & 302)


- A. Before Acquisition:
- Two vacant corner lots with a common boundary at backs.
 - Whole property and value: Date appraised 9-20-57

Land 34,980 sq. ft.	@ \$.100 per sq. ft.	\$ 3,500
Improvements		0
Total value		\$ 3,500
- B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 10-28-57
- | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| Land 17,444 sq. ft. | @ \$.100 per sq. ft. | \$ 1,745 |
| Damages | | 235 |
| Total property payment | | \$ 1,980 |
- C. After Acquisition:
- At remainder, new facility has through lanes which rise about 20 feet above grade passing over Bowman Springs Rd., with a one-way frontage at grade.
 - All of remainder sold: Date 10-3-57

Land 17,536 sq. ft.	@ \$.143 per sq. ft.	\$ 2,500
---------------------	-----------------------	----------
 - Increase in value of remainder = 43%
 - No change in value of comparable = 0%
 - Subsequent improvement: The new owner has constructed a frame stucco building for an eating establishment. When investigated, the building was not in use.
- D. Conclusions: Remainders from the two lots sold as one tract before the closing date of the acquisition. The data indicate that the remainder value was enhanced due to new facility. Therefore, no payment for damages was necessary. It is significant that a change in the remainder's zoning from residential to commercial occurred after the remainder sold.



Remainder 7.




After acquisition.

REMAINDER 7
(8-4-10 & 11)


- A. Before Acquisition:
- Four vacant interior lots (each 63' x 159').
 - Whole property and value: Date appraised 1956

Land 40,068 sq. ft.	@ \$.068 per sq. ft.	\$ 2,725
Improvements		0
Total value		<u>\$ 2,725</u>
- B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 4-6-56
- | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| Land 12,979 sq. ft. | @ \$.068 per sq. ft. | \$ 883 |
| Damages | | 0 |
| Total property payment | | <u>\$ 883</u> |
- C. After Acquisition:
- At remainder, new facility has through lanes rising to about 18 feet above grade passing over Bowman Springs Rd., with a one-way frontage road at grade.
 - All of remainder sold: Date 9-1-60

Land 27,089 sq. ft.	@ \$.092 per sq. ft.	\$ 2,500
---------------------	-----------------------	----------
 - Increase in value of remainder = 36%
 - Decrease in value of comparable land = -15%
 - Subsequent improvements: None
- D. Conclusions: The results show that the remainder was enhanced in value due to new facility. A significant point to mention in this case is that the remainder's zoning was changed from residential to commercial before the remainder sold. Comparables lost value.



Remainder 8.



After acquisition.

REMAINDER 8

(8-4-12)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. Two vacant interior lots (each 63' x 159').
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 1956

Land 20,034 sq. ft.	@ \$.068 per sq. ft.	\$ 1,362
Improvements		0
		\$ 1,362

B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 4-6-56


- | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|--------|
| Land 3,685 sq. ft. | @ \$.068 per sq. ft. | \$ 250 |
| Damages | | 0 |
| | | \$ 250 |

C. After Acquisition:


1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes rising to about 17 feet above grade passing over Bowman Springs Rd., with a one-way frontage road at grade.
2. All of remainder sold: Date 4-26-61

Land 16,349 sq. ft.	@ \$.080 per sq. ft.	\$ 1,300
---------------------	-----------------------	----------
3. Increase in value of remainder = 17%
4. Decrease in value of comparable land = -26%
5. Subsequent improvement: A small three-room frame residence was moved onto remainder during 1958, but was considered of little or no value on commercial lots in 1961.

D. Conclusions: The remainder was enhanced in value due to new facility. The remainder's zoning was changed from residential to commercial before the remainder sold. Comparables lost value.



Remainder 9.



After acquisition.

REMAINDER 9

(8-4-13 & 14)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. Five vacant interior lots (each 63' x 159').
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 1956

Land 50,085 sq. ft.	@ \$.068 per sq. ft.	\$ 3,406
Improvements		0
		\$ 3,406

B. Property Acquired and payment: Date closed 4-6-56


- | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|--------|
| Land 2,013 sq. ft. | @ \$.068 per sq. ft. | \$ 137 |
| Damages | | 0 |
| | | \$ 137 |

C. After Acquisition:

1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes rising to about 16 feet above grade passing over Bowman Springs Rd., with a one-way frontage road at grade.
2. All of remainder sold: Date 10-22-58

Land 48,072 sq. ft.	@ \$.071 per sq. ft.	\$ 3,400
---------------------	-----------------------	----------
3. Increase in value of remainder = 4%
4. Decrease in value of comparable land = -28%
5. Subsequent improvement: Remainder is now improved with a metal warehouse and shop and a brick veneer office building, having five offices. The property is enclosed with a six-foot chain-link fence except at the front of buildings.

- D. Conclusions: The value of the remainder was enhanced due to the new facility. A change in the remainder's zoning from residential to commercial occurred after the remainder sold. Land comparable to the original whole property was trending downward in value.



Remainder 10.

REMAINDER 10

(8-4-303 & 304)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. Two lots, one a corner lot improved with a small frame church building.
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 9-20-57

Land 22,499 sq. ft.	@ \$.080 per sq. ft.	\$ 1,808
Improvements		1,662
Total value		\$ 3,470

B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 11-29-57


Land 6,071 sq. ft.	@ \$.080 per sq. ft.	\$ 486
Improvements		70
Damages		919
Total property payment		\$ 1,475

C. After Acquisition:


1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes rising to about six feet above grade passing over Bowman Springs Rd., with a one-way frontage road at grade.
2. All of remainder sold: Date 1-22-58

Land 16,428 sq. ft.	@ \$.183 per sq. ft.	\$ 3,000
---------------------	-----------------------	----------
3. Increase in value of remainder = 127%
4. No change in value of comparable land = 0%
5. Subsequent improvement: The new owner has removed the old church building and has left remainder vacant.


D. Conclusions: The sale price indicates that an enhancement to remaining land occurred due to new facility, and a payment for land damages was not warranted. The new owner has applied for a zoning change from residential to commercial. The owner received only a token sum for the old church building which he retained. Either its appraised value was high or it sustained sizable damages. (Both of these events are quite possible.)




Before acquisition.




After acquisition.



Remainder 11.



Before acquisition.



After acquisition.

REMAINDER 11

(8-4-23)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. A corner lot with a small residence, attached carport, and a small shed, all frame.
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 7-25-58

Land 10,500 sq. ft.	@ \$.071 per sq. ft.	\$ 750
Improvements		4,450
		\$ 5,200

B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 10-17-58


Land 7,922 sq. ft.	@ \$.071 per sq. ft.	\$ 560
Improvements		4,450
Damages		90
		\$ 5,100

C. After Acquisition:

1. At remainder, new facility's through lanes are near grade and a one-way frontage road is at grade.
2. All of remainder sold: Date 11-19-58

Land 2,578 sq. ft.	@ \$.039 per sq. ft.	\$ 100
--------------------	-----------------------	--------
3. Decrease in value of remainder = -47%
4. No change in value of comparable land = 0%
5. Subsequent improvement: None

- D. Conclusions: The sale price indicates that the remainder was damaged as a result of the right-of-way acquisition for the new facility. In effect, the owner received a damage payment of exactly the amount indicated by the subsequent sale of the remainder.



Remainder 12.

REMAINDER 12
(8-4-31)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. An interior lot improved with a frame residence.
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 1-7-59

Land 11,200 sq. ft.	@ \$.077 per sq. ft.	\$ 862
Improvements		5,800
		\$ 6,662

B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 7-7-59

Land 517 sq. ft.	@ \$.120 per sq. ft.	\$ 60
Improvements		90
Damages		0
		\$ 150


C. After Acquisition:

1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes about three feet below grade, with a one-way frontage at grade.
2. All of remainder sold: Date 9-16-60
Land 10,683 sq. ft. and improvements \$ 4,600
3. *Decrease* in value of remainder
($\$6,512$ to $\$4,600$) = -29%
4. *Decrease* in value of comparable property = -22%
5. Subsequent improvement: A redwood fence was built by the new owner on the west side of lot and adjacent to the new facility.


- D. Conclusions: The remainder decreased more in value than the comparable, indicating damages due to the new facility.




Before acquisition.




After acquisition.



Remainder 13.



Before acquisition.



After acquisition.

REMAINDER 13

(8-4-51)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. A vacant interior lot.
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 7-23-58

Land 22,769 sq. ft.	@ \$.043 per sq. ft.	\$	969
Improvements			0
			\$ 969

B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 10-23-58


Land 21,154 sq. ft.	@ \$.043 per sq. ft.	\$	900
Damages			50
			\$ 950

C. After Acquisition:

1. At remainder, new facility's through lanes are near grade; there is a one-way frontage at grade.
2. All of remainder sold: Date 1-17-59

Land 1,615 sq. ft.	@ \$.031 per sq. ft.	\$	50
--------------------	-----------------------	----	----
3. Decrease in value of remainder = -28%
4. No change in value of comparable land = 0%
5. Subsequent improvement: None

D. Conclusions: The sale price indicates that remainder was damaged due to the new facility, but not as much as the 72 percent damage payment.



Remainder 14.



Before acquisition.



After acquisition.

REMAINDER 14

(8-4-65 thru 79)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. A 62-acre corner tract, being a recorded subdivision not developed, improved with a concrete block residence, double frame detached garage, and frame well house.
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 9-20-58

Land 2,701,055 sq. ft. @ \$.032 per sq. ft.	\$ 86,750
Improvements	12,500
Total value	\$ 99,250

B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 12-10-58


Land 551,108 sq. ft. @ \$.036 per sq. ft.	\$ 19,700
Improvements	12,500
Damages	0
Total property payment	\$ 32,200

C. After Acquisition:


1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes at grade, except near Ramey Ave., where they rise to about 20 feet above grade. One-way frontage roads are at grade.
2. All of remainder sold: Date 4-1-59

Land 2,149,947 sq. ft. @ \$.037 per sq. ft.	\$ 78,969
--	-----------
3. Increase in value of remainder = 15%
4. No change in value of comparable land = 0%
5. Subsequent improvement: None


D. Conclusions: The unimproved remainder sold as acreage (plat rescinded). The sale price indicates there was some enhancement in the remainder value due to the new facility. The new owner has been granted a change in the zoning of a portion of remainder from residential to commercial.



Remainder 15.



Before acquisition.



After acquisition.

REMAINDER 15

(8-4-83)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. A 5-acre corner lot improved with a frame asbestos siding residence, double frame detached garage, and metal shed and barn.
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 9-24-58

Land 217,800 sq. ft.	@ \$.048 per sq. ft.	\$ 10,454
Improvements		9,246
		\$ 19,700

B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 12-11-58


Land 79,095 sq. ft.	@ \$.048 per sq. ft.	\$ 3,800
Improvements		9,200
Damages		0
		\$ 13,000

C. After Acquisition:


1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes rising to about 20 feet above grade at Ramey Ave. and a one-way frontage road at grade.
2. All of remainder sold: Date 9-10-59

Land 138,705 sq. ft.	@ \$.050 per sq. ft.	\$ 7,000
----------------------	-----------------------	----------
3. Increase in value of remainder = 4%
4. Increase in value of comparable land = 4%
5. Subsequent improvement: When investigated, the remainder had been leveled in preparation for improvement with a shopping center.


- D. Conclusions: The results indicate that the remainder's value was neither enhanced nor damaged by the presence of the new facility. However, a change in the remainder's zoning, from residential to commercial, occurred before the remainder sold.



Remainder 16.



Before acquisition.



After acquisition.

REMAINDER 16

(8-5-7)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. One-acre interior tract improved with a frame residence, single frame attached garage, single brick detached garage, stucco commercial building, and a frame shed.
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 12-12-58

Land 51,880 sq. ft.	@ \$.831 per sq. ft.	\$ 43,100
Improvements		2,400
Total value		\$45,500

B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 2-24-59


Land 6,578 sq. ft.	@ \$ 1.34 per sq. ft.	\$ 8,800
Improvements		800
Damages		23,000
Total property payment		\$ 32,600

C. After Acquisition:


1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes about 20 feet below grade passing under Lancaster Ave. and a one-way ramp (with access to remainder denied) at grade.
2. All of remainder sold: Date 4-16-59

Land 45,302 sq. ft.	@ \$.200 per sq. ft.	\$ 9,000
---------------------	-----------------------	----------
3. Decrease in value of remainder = -76%
4. No change in value of comparable land = 0%
5. Subsequent improvement: The improvements left on the remainder were removed by the original owner. When last investigated, dirt was being dumped onto remainder.


- D. Conclusions: The sale price indicates that the value of the remainder was damaged to an even greater extent than the damage payment of 61 percent. According to this analysis, the damage payment should have been \$28,646 instead of \$23,000. The denial of access to the new facility and to Lancaster Avenue apparently was the important factor of damage.



Remainder 17.



Before acquisition.



After acquisition.

REMAINDER 17

(8-5-60)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. A corner lot improved with a stucco and concrete block residence.
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 11-5-57

Land 9,610 sq. ft.	@ \$.146 per sq. ft.	\$ 1,400
Improvements		7,000
		\$ 8,400

B. Property acquired and payment: Date closed 1-14-58


Land 5,750 sq. ft.	@ \$.157 per sq. ft.	\$ 900
Improvements		550
Damages		6,750
		\$ 8,200

C. After Acquisition:

1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes near grade and a one-way frontage road at grade.
2. All of remainder sold: Date 10-23-59

Land 3,860 sq. ft. and improvements	\$ 6,000
-------------------------------------	----------
3. *Decrease* in value of remainder (from \$6,950 to \$6,000) = -14%
4. *No change* in value of comparable property = 0%
5. Subsequent improvement: After remainder sold, an additional room was built onto the north side of residence. Also, a chain-link fence has been built at the acquisition line.

- ### D. Conclusions:
- Damages paid were 97% of the remainder value, value before damages being \$6,950. The sale price of the remainder indicates that the land value of remainder was damaged due to new facility but that the payment of damages on land and improvements should have been much smaller.



Remainder 18.

REMAINDER 18

(8-5-61)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. A lot improved with a frame residence with asbestos siding and single frame attached garage.
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 10-17-58

Land 9,800 sq. ft.	@ \$.163 per sq. ft.	\$ 1,600
Improvements		6,600
		\$ 8,200

B. Property acquired and Payment: Date closed 6-18-59

Land 4,878 sq. ft.	@ \$.176 per sq. ft.	\$ 860
Improvements		60
Damages		3,280
		\$ 4,200

C. After Acquisition:


1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes near grade and a one-way frontage road at grade.
2. All of remainder sold: Date 7-23-59

Land 4,922 sq. ft. and improvements	\$ 5,000
-------------------------------------	----------
3. *Decrease* in value of remainder (from \$7,280 to \$5,000) = -31%
4. *No change* in value of comparable property = 0%
5. Subsequent improvement: None


D. Conclusions: The sale price indicates damages to the remainder. However, the buyer considered the remainder to be a bargain at the price he paid and felt that it had sustained little damage.




Before acquisition.



After acquisition.



Remainder 19.



After acquisition.

REMAINDER 19

(8-5-75)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. An interior lot improved with a frame residence, single frame attached garage, and frame storage house.
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 11-3-58

Land 9,278 sq. ft.	@ \$.129 per sq. ft.	\$ 1,200
Improvements		6,500
		\$ 7,700

B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 3-20-59


Land 43 sq. ft.	@ \$.233 per sq. ft.	\$ 10
Damages		100
		\$ 110

C. After Acquisition: (Note: Sale was after appraisal but before closing date.)


1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes near grade and one-way frontage road at grade.
2. Whole property sold: Date 2-3-59

Land 9,278 sq. ft. and improvements	\$ 6,500
-------------------------------------	----------
3. *Decrease* in value of whole property = -16%
4. *No change* in value of comparable property = 0%
5. Subsequent improvement: None

D. Conclusions: The sale price of the whole property before the completion of acquisition reflects that the value of the remainder was damaged by the new facility. Such damage was considerably more than the damage payment. The purpose of the owner in selling prior to the closing date was not determined.



Remainder 20.



After acquisition.

REMAINDER 20

(8-5-74)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. An interior lot improved with a frame residence and single frame attached garage.
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 11-5-58

Land 9,270 sq. ft.	@ \$.162 per sq. ft.	\$ 1,500
Improvements		7,000
		\$ 8,500

B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 6-19-59


Land 258 sq. ft.	@ \$.162 per sq. ft.	\$ 42
Improvements		0
Damages		458
		\$ 500

C. After Acquisition:


1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes from 10 to 15 feet below grade and a one-way frontage road at grade.
2. All of remainder sold: Date 11-25-60

Land 9,012 sq. ft. and improvements	\$ 7,200
-------------------------------------	----------
3. *Decrease* in value of remainder (from (\$8,458 to \$7,200)) = -15%
4. *Decrease* in value of comparable property = -14%
5. Subsequent improvement: None

D. Conclusions: Even though the remainder's value declined, comparable whole property values declined about as much. The grantor stated that he believed the value of the remainder was little affected by the new freeway.



Remainder 21.



After acquisition.

REMAINDER 21
(8-5-81B)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. A vacant interior lot.	
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 11-12-58	
Land 25,657 sq. ft. @ \$.184 per sq. ft.	\$ 4,721
Improvements	0
Total value	<u>\$ 4,721</u>


B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 1-13-59

Land 9,801 sq. ft. @ \$.184 per sq. ft.	\$ 1,800
Damages	0
Total property payment	<u>\$ 1,800</u>

C. After Acquisition:

1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes as much as five feet below grade cutting through hill and passing under Meadowbrook Dr. and a one-way frontage road at grade.	
2. All of remainder sold: Date 3-1-60	
Land 15,856 sq. ft. @ \$.126 per sq. ft.	\$ 2,000
3. Decrease in value of remainder	= -31%
4. No change in value of comparable land	= 0%
5. Subsequent improvement: None	

D. Conclusions: The sale price indicates that the remainder's value was damaged due to the new facility.



Remainder 22.



After acquisition.

REMAINDER 22

(8-5-85)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. A vacant interior lot.
2. Whole property and value. Date appraised 11-12-58

Land 37,500 sq. ft.	@ \$.087 per sq. ft.	\$ 3,260
Improvements		0
Total value		\$ 3,260

B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 1-20-59


- | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| Land 31,058 sq. ft. | @ \$.087 per sq. ft. | \$ 2,700 |
| Damages | | 500 |
| Total property payment | | \$ 3,200 |

C. After Acquisition:

1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes from 20 to 30 feet below grade cutting through hill and passing under Meadowbrook Dr. and a one-way frontage at grade.
2. All of remainder sold: Date 12-29-59

Land 6,442 sq. ft.	@ \$.078 per sq. ft.	\$ 500
--------------------	-----------------------	--------
3. Decrease in value of remainder = -11%
4. Decrease in value of comparable land = -2%
5. Subsequent improvement: The remainder has been divided into two parts, each attached to an adjacent improved residential lot.


D. Conclusions: The sale price indicates that the value of the remainder was damaged, but not as much as the 89 percent paid in damages. The subsequent sale price of \$.100 per sq. ft. for Part A of the remainder indicates that this part was enhanced. (See supplemental information sheet.)



Remainder 23.



Before acquisition.



After acquisition.

REMAINDER 23

(8-5-87)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. An interior lot improved with a frame asbestos siding residence and a single frame asbestos siding attached garage.
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 9-11-57

Land 10,803 sq. ft.	@ \$.130 per sq.ft.	\$ 1,400
Improvements		6,600
		\$ 8,000

B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 1-15-58

Land 6,795 sq. ft.	@ \$.132 per sq. ft.	\$ 900
Improvements		2,430
Damages		4,070
		\$ 7,400

C. After Acquisition:


1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes about 20 feet below grade passing under Meadowbrook Dr. and a one-way frontage road at grade.
2. All of remainder sold: Date 3-12-58

Land 4,008 sq. ft.	@ \$.250 per sq. ft.	\$ 1,000
--------------------	-----------------------	----------
3. Increase in value of remainder = 92%
4. Decrease in value of comparable land = -7%
5. Subsequent improvement: None

D. Conclusions: The remainder was unimproved. The sale price indicates that the remainder's value was enhanced, although a 58 percent damage was made. It should be mentioned that the sale price was a part of the payment made on another residence. (See supplemental information sheet.)

REMAINDER 24

(8-5-99A, 101F, 102 FGH)



Remainder 24.



Before acquisition.



After acquisition.

A. Before Acquisition:

1. Three vacant interior lots with a small vacant abutting tract.
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 8-14-57

Land 68,910 sq. ft.	@ \$.054 per sq. ft.	\$ 3,747
Improvements		0
Total value		\$ 3,747

B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 9-20-57

- | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| Land 35,563 sq. ft. | @ \$.054 per sq. ft. | \$ 1,930 |
| Damages | | 250 |
| Total property payment | | \$ 2,180 |

C. After Acquisition:


1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes slightly above grade and a one-way frontage road at grade.
2. Part A of remainder sold: Date 2-11-59

Land 24,297 sq. ft.	@ \$.062 per sq. ft.	\$ 1,500
---------------------	-----------------------	----------


 Part B of remainder sold: Date 7-6-59

Land 9,050 sq. ft.	@ \$.044 per sq. ft.	400
Total remainder payment		\$ 1,900
3. Increase in value of Part A of remainder = 13%
- Decrease in value of Part B of remainder = -19%
4. Increase in value of comparable land = 1%
5. Subsequent improvement: None


D. Conclusions: The sale price of Part A indicates that this portion of remainder was enhanced in value. The sale price of Part B reflected damages to that portion. When considered together, the whole remainder was slightly enhanced in value, as it sold at an average price of \$.057 per sq. ft. Therefore, a payment for damages on whole remainder was not necessary.



Remainder 25.



Before acquisition.



After acquisition.

REMAINDER 25
(8-5-101 A & B, 102 A & B)

A. Before Acquisition:

1. Fifteen vacant interior lots, each 75' x 174'.
2. Whole property and value: Date appraised 8-14-57
 Land 196,095 sq. ft. @ \$.051 per sq. ft. \$ 10,000
 Improvements 0
 Total value \$ 10,000

B. Property Acquired and Payment: Date closed 9-20-57

- | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| Land 22,059 sq. ft. | @ \$.055 per sq. ft. | \$ 1,207 |
| Damages | | 530 |
| Total property payment | | \$ 1,737 |

C. After Acquisition:

1. At remainder, new facility has through lanes slightly above grade and a one-way frontage road at grade.
2. All of remainder sold: Date 11-10-59
 Land 174,036 sq. ft. @ \$.052 per sq. ft. \$ 9,000
3. Increase in value of remainder = 2%
4. Increase in value of comparable land = 8%
5. Subsequent improvement: Six new brick residences have been constructed on remainder.

- D. Conclusions: The sale price indicates that the value of remainder was slightly damaged (about six percent) due to new facility. The damage payment was also about six percent. Subsequent improvements support the conclusion that damages were very small (and perhaps were temporary).

Aggregative Analysis

There were 202 partial acquisitions for right of way within the bounds of the three projects investigated. Fifty-four of the remainder parcels had sold at least once by the time of the last review for sales in July, 1961. Because these remainders sold in groups of two or more in a number of instances, only 29 distinctive case histories were indicated. In this report, therefore, a so-called "remainder" may actually be a combination of original remainders. (Such combinations as were made are identified on each analysis sheet by the parcel numbers beneath the remainder number.) Only 25 of the 29 remainders permitted a meaningful analysis of enhancements or damages. Three remainders, while changing ownerships, apparently did not experience sales which could be considered bona fide market transactions. Another remainder sale, which occurred before acquisition was complete, was not analyzed because of an insufficiency of data.

The preceding section of this report has examined the case histories of the remainders individually. This section presents a study of the remainders as a group, that is from an over-all viewpoint. The purpose of such an aggregative analysis is twofold. First, the case history of any particular remainder gains perspective when it is compared with other case histories. Second, it is important that the representativeness of remainders which sold should be considered. Obviously, the more

representative such remainders are of those not studied, the greater will be the validity of generalizations. Representativeness is further considered later in this section.

Enhancements and Damages

Table 1 presents a listing of the remainders studied and the enhancements and damages measured in each case. Also shown is the original land use of each remainder, the time period which had elapsed from acquisition until the remainder sold, and value information on comparables.

As may be counted in Table 1, eleven of the remainders experienced enhancements in land value. Measurements of land damages were obtained for six remainders, and the land value of one remainder was neither enhanced nor damaged. Conclusions as to effects on land value were not made for five of the remainders which sold as improved properties; damages for these whole remainders (land and improvements) were measured, however.

Remainders 22 and 24 are special cases. Each showed evidence of damages and also enhancements. On balance, however, both remainders apparently had enjoyed enhancements exceeding damages. (See the Case Histories.)

TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF ENHANCEMENTS AND DAMAGES EXPERIENCED BY 25
INTERSTATE 820 (Southeast Loop 217) REMAINDERS

Remainder	Land Use Before Acquisition	Months Until Resale	Value of Land Per Square Foot At Time of Sale ²		Percent Change in Value		Inferred Enhancements or Damages
			Remainder	Comparable	Remainder	Comparable	
Part A of 1	Res. on Acreage	8	\$.067	\$.029	156%	0%	E 156%
Part B of 1	Res. on Acreage	21	.034	.029	31	0	E 31
2	Barns on Acreage	24 ¹	.044	.030	92	30	E 62
3	Res. on Acreage	23	.031	.037	-15	0	D 15
Part A of 4	Res. on Acreage	10	.037	.027	128	69	E 59
5	Res. on Lot	1	.076	.040	89	0	E 89
6	Vacant Lots	1	.143	.100	43	0	E 43
7	Vacant Lots	53	.092	.058	36	-15	E 51
8	Vacant Lots	60	.080	.050	17	-26	E 43
9	Vacant Lots	30	.071	.049	4	-28	E 32
10	Church on Lots	2	.183	.080	127	0	E 127
11	Res. on Lot	1	.039	.071	-47	0	D 47
12	Res. on Lot	14	4600	5200	-29	-22	D 7
13	Vacant Lot	3	.031	.043	-28	0	D 28
14	Res. on Lots	3	.037	.032	15	0	E 15
15	Res. on Lot	9	.050	.050	4	4	0
16	Comm. and Res.	2	.200	.331	-76	0	D 76
17	Res. on Lot	21	6000	8460	-14	0	D 14
18	Res. on Lot	1	5000	8200	-31	0	D 31
19	Res. on Lot	0	6500	7700	-16	0	D 16
20	Res. on Lot	13	7200	7250	-15	-14	D 1
21	Vacant Lot	14	.126	.184	-31	0	D 31
22	Vacant Lot	11	.078	.085	-11	-2	D 9
Part A of 22	Vacant Lot	18	.100	.085	15	-2	E 17
23	Res. on Lot	2	.250	.120	92	-7	E 99
Part A of 24	Vacant Lots	17	.062	.055	13	1	E 12
Part B of 24	Vacant Lots	22	.044	.055	-19	1	D 20
25	Vacant Lots	26	.052	.055	2	8	D 6

¹As of last sale.

²Figures not having decimal are whole property values.

It should be explained that the enhancements and damages shown in Table 1 are specific in nature. As usually defined, specific enhancements are benefits which accrue to a particular property over and above those experienced by the general area. Since comparables were selected from the general area in which remainders are located, the difference between the value changes represents a measure of specific effects.

The "indicated" enhancements and damages mentioned in Table 1, although specific in a sense, have not been treated for influences of inflation and other factors which might distort measurements when a considerable period of time is involved. Fortunately, the time period was short for most of the remainders studied here, spanning from zero to five years. (In the Gulf Freeway Remainder Study, the time period ranged up to 12 years.)

Suppose the question is asked: "What happened to the values of remainders at the time of acquisition?" One alternate measure is offered here. Since the value of comparables also has been affected over time by general enhancements (or damages), inflation and other factors, perhaps their value *at the time of sale of the remainder* should be taken as a "base value." Applying this value as a yardstick for one of the Gulf Freeway remainders—used as a demonstration case since 12 years

lapsed before its resale—we find that the remainder value at resale was \$.887 per square foot, this being 42 percent greater than that of the \$.624 per square foot for the comparable. On the other hand, a simple comparison of percentage changes, not treated for inflation and other factors, in this case would yield inferred enhancements of 260 percent. The method assumes that, following the first severance effects, all factors common to the remainder and the comparable property influenced their values by equal percentage amounts.

Note that this system tends to account for inflation and other factors, even though the identity and nature of such factors are not precisely known. The system has the further advantage that it cannot measure damages to be greater than 100 percent. A simple comparison of percentage changes could yield an illogical damage measurement in excess of 100 percent. For example, suppose a remainder increases 80 percent in value and its comparable by 200 percent; damages according to the difference in percentage change would be 120 percent, an impossibility. By the alternate measure, it may be demonstrated that the original damage was 40 percent, a more realistic and supportable figure. The results of applying the alternate method to the Interstate 820 remainders are as follows: (Results of the percentage-comparison method are given in the parentheses when they vary from the alternate measurements.)

TABLE 2
PAYMENTS FOR DAMAGES TO REMAINDERS VERSUS SUBSEQUENT HISTORIES

Remainder	Kind of Damages	Form of Damages	Amount of Damage Payments	Damage Payments as a Percent of Remainder Value	"Real" Enhancements or Damages ¹
3	Land	No Frontage	\$ 1,200	68%	D 15
3	Imp.	Bisection	1,100	71	Removed
4	Land	Reduction in Size ²	868	68	E 35 ³
5	Land	Overpayment	29	22	E 89
6	Land	Reduction in Size	235	13	E 43
10	Land	Reduction in Size	413	31	E 127
10	Imp.	Bisection	506	32	Undetermined
11	Land	Reduction in Size	90	47	D 47
11	Imp.	Loss of use	50	100	Removed
12	Land	Overpayment	20	2	D 124 ⁴
12	Imp.	Overpayment	30	1	
13	Land	Reduction in Size	50	72	D 28
16	Land	Denial of Access	23,000	61	D 76
17	Land	Reduction in Size ⁵	300	53	D 29 ⁴
17	Imp.	Bisection	6,450	100	
18	Land	Reduction in Size ⁶	380	47	D 39 ⁴
18	Imp.	Proximity	2,900	44	
19	Imp.	Proximity	100	2	D 16 ⁴
20	Imp.	Proximity	458	7	D 1 ⁴
22	Land	Reduction in Size	500	89	D 9 ⁷
23	Land	Reduction in Size	300	58	E 108
23	Imp.	Bisection	3,770	90	Removed
24	Land	Reduction in Size	250	14	E 4 ⁸
25	Land	Reduction in Size	530	6	D 6

¹Deflated by using value of comparable at time of sale of remainder as the base value.

²An apparent overpayment of \$1,496 for land equivalent to 118 percent in additional damages.

³Only Part A of remainder determined this value.

⁴Damages to whole property (land and improvements).

⁵An apparent overpayment of \$60 or 11 percent additional damages to land.

⁶An apparent overpayment of \$65 or 8 percent additional damages to land.

⁷Part A of remainder sold later reflecting an enhancement of 18 percent to that portion.

⁸The sale of Part A reflected 12 percent enhancements and the sale of Part B reflected 20 percent damages.

Remainder	Enhancements or Damages	Remainder	Enhancements or Damages
Part A of 1	E 156%	14	E 15
Part B of 1	E 31	15	0
2	E 47 (E 62)	16	D 76
3	D 15	17	D 29 (D 14)
Part A of 4	E 35 (E 59)	18	D 39 (D 31)
5	E 89	19	D 16
6	E 43	20	D 1
7	E 59 (E 51)	21	D 31 (D 32)
8	E 59 (E 43)	22	D 9
9	E 44 (E 32)	Part A of 22	E 18 (E 17)
10	E 127	23	E 108 (E 99)
11	D 47	Part A of 24	E 12
12	D 12 (D 7)	Part B of 24	D 20
13	D 28	25	D 6

These measurements of specific enhancements or damages do not vary greatly from those shown in Table 1 and in parentheses. In cases involving only land value measurements where the comparable values did not change, the same amount of "real" damages or enhancements was reflected. When the comparable values declined and the remainder values increased, the amount of "real" or deflated enhancements was greater. If the remainder values increased more than the comparable values, the amount of real enhancements was less than the inferred enhancements. These remainders did not demonstrate the advantages of the alternate method as well as would remainders located in areas where values had changed spectacularly.

Referring again to Table 1, it may seem that only nine of the twenty-five remainders were unimproved at the time of right-of-way acquisition. Yet measures of land value (without improvements) were obtained for seventeen. This was made possible because improvements were removed from eight of the improved remainders either at acquisition or later by the owners. At the time of sale, the value of improvements on two other remainders was considered to be nil, thus allowing the measurement of land value. In still another case, part of a remainder sold as vacant land. Therefore, only five improved remainders did not allow a measurement of land value alone.

Perhaps it is worthwhile to make a brief comparison of damages paid at acquisition versus the subsequent damages or enhancements that the remainders apparently experienced. Seemingly, payment for some form of damages was made on 17 of the 25 remainders (Table 2). In two of these instances, payments were for damages to improvements only. Land damages were specified and paid for 13 remainders. In two other instances, land damages apparently were made only in the form of overpayments for the land actually to be used in right of way. Also, overpayments apparently were made in three of the cases where other damages were specified and paid. The overpayments were small, except in the case of Remainder 4 for which the overpayment amounted to 118 percent. (The term "overpayments" is not used to connote excessive total payments;

TABLE 3
SUCCESSION OF LAND USES OF
INTERSTATE 820 (SOUTHEAST LOOP 217)
REMAINDERS
Land Use

Remainder	Before Acquisition	At Sale	At Investigation
1	Res. on Acreage	Res. on Acreage ¹	Res. on Lots ²
2	Barns on Acreage	Vacant Acreage	Res. on Acreage ³
3	Res. on Acreage	Vacant Acreage	Vacant Lots
4	Res. on Acreage	Vacant Acreage	Vacant Acreage ⁴
5	Res. on Lot	Vacant Lot	Vacant Lots
6	Vacant Lots	Vacant Lots	Comm. Bldg. ⁵
7	Vacant Lots	Vacant Lots ⁶	Vacant Lots
8	Vacant Lots	Res. on Lots ⁶	Res. on Lots
9	Vacant Lots	Vacant Lots	Comm. Bldg. ⁵
10	Church on Lots	Church on Lots	Vacant Lots ⁷
11	Res. on Lot	Vacant Lot	Vacant Lot
12	Res. on Lot	Res. on Lot	Res. on Lot
13	Vacant Lot	Vacant Lot	Vacant Lot
14	Res. on Lots	Vacant Acreage	Vacant Acreage ⁸
15	Res. on Lot	Vacant Lot	Vacant Lot ⁵
16	Comm. and Res.	Vacant Acreage	Vacant Acreage
17	Res. on Lot	Res. on Lot	Res. on Lot
18	Res. on Lot	Res. on Lot	Res. on Lot
19	Res. on Lot	Res. on Lot	Res. on Lot
20	Res. on Lot	Res. on Lot	Res. on Lot
21	Vacant Lot	Vacant Lot	Vacant Lot
22	Vacant Lot	Vacant Lot	Vacant Lot ⁹
23	Res. on Lot	Vacant Lot	Vacant Lot
24	Vacant Lots	Vacant Lots	Vacant Lots
25	Vacant Lots	Vacant Lots	Res. on Lots

¹Part A sold as acreage with residence, and Part B sold later as vacant acreage.
²Part B was subdivided and improved with residences.
³Several tracts have been sold for residential use.
⁴Part of remainder is being subdivided, the other designated for commercial use.
⁵Zoning changed to commercial after remainder sold.
⁶Zoning changed to commercial before remainder sold.
⁷Owner has applied for change in zoning to commercial.
⁸Portion of remainder was zoned commercial after sale.
⁹Now a part of improved residential properties.

rather it is to indicate that damages likely were suspected but were not designated as damages to remainder.)

The results show that six of the 17 remainders on which damages were paid later showed evidence of having received sizable specific benefits. The damage payments on two of these were above 50 percent of their value before damages. In two cases, the damages paid were the same as evidenced by their value when they subsequently sold. (Remainders 11 and 25.) There were four cases where the indicated damages were greater than the amount of damages paid. (Remainders 12, 16, 19, and Part B of 24.) There was only one case for which damages should have been paid and were not.

Succession of Land Uses

The sale price of land must sooner or later be justified or not justified by subsequent land use and its accompanying income stream. Of the Interstate 820 remainders studied, only one had succeeded to a higher use by the time the property had resold (See Table 3). By the time of the investigation, however, seven remainders had been put into uses superior to those which existed on whole properties prior to acquisition. (Remainders 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 22, and 25.) Three of these (Remainders 6, 8, and 9) had experienced zoning changes from residential to commercial, with Remainders 6 and 9 having been improved with commercial buildings. In addition, the residential zoning on three other remainders (Remainders 7, part of 14, and 15) had been changed to commercial. The residential plat was rescinded on Remainder 14. Also, the owner of Remainder 10 had applied for a zoning change from residential to commercial. Remainder 3 (formerly acreage) had become part of a new residential subdivision, and part of Remainder 4 was planned as a part of a proposed residential subdivision.

All of the above changes occurred within a relatively short period of two years and before the construction of the new facility had been in progress very long. Of the 18 remainders which did not experience such a change in use or zoning, five remained improved with

residences and 13 were vacant at the time of the study. Of the originally vacant remainders, four still were vacant and nine had been improved. Seven of these were improved with residences, another with a residence and a commercial building, and one with a church building.

Comparison of the Remainders Selling and Not Selling

Of the 202 remainder parcels created by right-of-way acquisition, 148 (73 percent) had not sold at the time of investigation. Several comparisons have been made between the two groups of remainders (those selling and not selling) to reveal any major differences which might have existed between them at the time of acquisition and also at the subsequent time of investigation.

Differences in Value—Table 4 has been prepared to show the over-all land value of the two groups of remainders before acquisition and the reduction in their value as indicated by the payment of land damages. To arrive at the original values, the value per square foot of the whole property was used when possible. When this value was not provided, the value per square foot of the part acquired was used.

The computations showed that, before damages, the group of remainders which did not sell had a higher value (\$.051 per square foot) than those which did sell (\$.036 per square foot). This was true for both acreage and subdivided remainders. On the other hand, the remainders which sold were damaged more than those which did not sell. It is interesting to note that more land damages were paid on the small group of remainders which sold than on the much larger group not selling.

Differences in Uses—A comparison of the differences at the time of acquisition between the land uses of the two groups is made in Table 5. The most striking difference between the groups is that none of the remainders which subsequently sold were in purely commercial usage while seven which did not sell were in this

TABLE 4
COMPARISON OF THE VALUES AT ACQUISITION OF REMAINDERS
WHICH SOLD VERSUS THOSE WHICH DID NOT SELL¹

Type of Land	Remainders Which Sold				Remainders Which Did Not Sell			
	No. of Parcels	No. of Sq. Ft.	Total Value	Per Sq. Ft. Value	No. of ² Parcels	No. of Sq. Ft.	Total Value	Per Sq. Ft. Value
Before Acquisition								
Acreage	7	3,617,257	\$122,194	\$.03378	53 ³	18,937,019	\$ 888,975	\$.04694
Subdivided	47	2,747,304	109,581	.03989	94	2,050,521	171,444	.08360
Total land	54	6,364,561	231,775	.03642	147	20,987,540	1,060,419	.05053
Land Damages								
Acreage	3	172,802	25,068	.14507	5	1,327,325	2,964	.00223
Subdivided	18	265,996	3,048	.01146	26	131,326	16,831	.12816
Total Damages	21	438,798	28,116	.06407	31	1,458,651	19,795	.01357
After Acquisition								
Acreage	7	3,617,257	97,126	.02685	53	18,937,019	886,606	.04682
Subdivided	47	2,747,304	106,533	.03877	94	2,050,521	154,613	.07540
Total land	54	6,364,561	203,659	.03200	147	20,987,540	1,041,219	.04961

¹Values based on approved values of original whole property less the part acquired; except when value of whole was not given, the unit value of part acquired was used to compute a value.

²Number of parcels are based upon a count of assigned parcel numbers by THD.

³One parcel was left out of calculations because the size of the remainder, could be determined only by considerable extra effort.

usage. (This may mean that commercial uses were little affected by right-of-way severance). There was one remainder which sold that was in a combined commercial and residential use. Another difference between the groups was the lack of any remainder which sold being designated for purely industrial usage. The other group had two remainders so designated.

In all other land use categories, both groups were presented. The most common usage for each group was vacant residential lots, and next, improved residential lots. Of all improved residential lots, 25 percent were remainders which sold.

Changes in Uses—A check made on the changes in the land use of remainders not selling, between the time of acquisition and the time of investigation, revealed that 32 (being 22 percent) of such remainders had changed to other uses, primarily resulting from the right-of-way acquisitions. All but nine of these changed from improved to vacant properties. Twenty percent of remainders which sold changed in use over the same period. Therefore it is suggested that both groups experienced a very similar change in use. However, it should be noted that 15 percent of the remainders which

sold have succeeded to higher uses, compared with six percent of the remainders not sold. This may suggest some superiority of remainders which sold, but it is also possible that land use change is better performed by persons other than original owners.

Comparisons of the zoning changes of the two groups revealed that 13 percent of the remainders which sold and five percent of the remainders which did not sell experienced such changes. For both groups, most of these changes were from residential to commercial.

Other Differences or Similarities—A count was made of remainder parcels abutting interchanges, and it was found that these accounted for 13 percent of the remainders which sold. Sixteen percent of the remainders not sold were so located.

There were remainders in both groups which were denied direct access to the facility. Also, some remainders of both groups were severed into parts on either side of the new facility.

In conclusion, although some differences as well as similarities between the two groups of remainders were observed, there is no serious doubt that remainders which sold were generally representative of all remainders.

TABLE 5
COMPARISON OF LAND USES AT ACQUISITION OF REMAINDERS
WHICH SOLD VERSUS THOSE WHICH DID NOT SELL¹

Land Use	All Remainders		Remainders Which Sold		Remainders Which Did Not Sell	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
In Subdivisions	140	100	46	33	94	67
Residential	132	100	46	35	86	65
Vacant lots	79	100	33	42	46	58
Improved	53	100	13	25	40	75
Commercial	5	100	0	0	5	100
Vacant	3	100	0	0	3	100
Improved	2	100	0	0	2	100
Comm. and Res. ²	3	100	0	0	3	100
In Acreage	62	100	8	13	54	87
Residential	56	100	7	12	49	88
Vacant	28	100	3	11	25	89
Improved	28	100	4	14	24	86
Commercial ²	2	100	0	0	2	100
Comm. and Res. ²	2	100	1	50	1	50
Industrial ²	2	100	0	0	2	100

¹Zoning and deed restrictions were used to obtain breakdowns between various vacant and improved land. Field observations were made and nonconforming uses were classified according to their actual use.

²Improved.

Recommended Procedures for Future Remainder Studies

The ultimate goal of the remainder studies of the Texas Transportation Institute was to develop procedures for use by Highway Department District personnel in the evaluation of severance damage and enhancements. Correlative to this goal was the evolution of a system whereby the Districts might keep the histories of all remainders current and in accessible form. It is realized that both the analytical procedures and the recommended system of review for remainders must be administratively feasible as well as theoretically sound. Furthermore, the eventual results of the Highway Districts' research efforts necessarily must be of a usable nature, consistent with stated and implied definitions under law, in harmony with the prevailing body of scientific principles, and acceptable and understandable to those to whom the data will be presented.

This section embodies the final recommendations of the researchers. It is based upon the experience gained through the development of the remainder analyses previously presented in this report and in the Gulf Freeway report, upon discussions with many persons of the Right-of-Way Division and of various Districts of the Texas Highway Department, and upon suggestions made by competent appraisers.

Components of a System of Continuing Review

The system outlined below is broad and comprehensive. It is founded on the belief that, ideally, all remainders created by state right-of-way acquisition should be studied and up-to-date files maintained on each until the utility of such information has obviously been lost in time. Actually, many Districts will not be able to use the system in its entirety. It should be noted, in this regard, that less than the full system can be adopted; for example, remainders from only one project may be studied, periodic reviews may be closely or widely spaced, and less than full analyses of individual cases can be made and still yield useful information. The components of the suggested system are as follows:

1. Start the system by reviewing all State-approved projects and determining whether all or a selected number of such projects should be included in the continuing review.
2. Take the selected projects and gather general information pertinent to each and record on a Project Header Sheet.
3. Identify all remainders within each project and record descriptive information about each on a Remainder Identification Sheet.
4. Conduct a continuing or periodic review for sales and land use changes of remainders and record data on the Remainder Identification Sheet.
5. For remainders for which it appears that meaningful analyses can be completed, collect all additional data regarding the remainder before and at the time of acquisition and record such data on a Remainder History Schedule or other adopted form.

6. Collect and record on the adopted form information for the "after acquisition" period.

7. Collect and record on the adopted form information on properties comparable to the original whole property. The nature of this information will depend upon the time periods and data to be used for the subject remainder.

8. For individual remainders, perform the analysis of damages or enhancements. (For presentation the format should be similar to that used for individual remainders in this report.)

9. Adopt a system of uniform coding, the development of which probably should be performed by the Right-of-Way Division. This recommendation presupposes that a central file of remainder histories will be assembled and maintained. Such coding will give maximum utility to such a file.

Selection of Projects—As stated earlier, it is desirable that all remainders created by state right-of-way acquisition should be reviewed. Thus all state-approved projects should be a part of the study. The complete universe should be known; in other words, it should be known how remainders for which histories are compiled compare with all remainders created. If less than all projects are to be studied, they should be selected after careful review and in a manner to attain representation of as many types of remainders as possible.

Project Header Sheet—A header sheet should be used for study. (See Form I in Appendix B for an example.) Such a sheet should reduce the amount of data recording that will be required. The sheet should contain information on a project's location, its main characteristics, the number of remainder parcels, and several of the dates pertinent to the study. The sheet also is quite useful to keep an accounting of the continuing review for remainder sales in a project.

The necessary data for completion of most of this sheet can be found in Highway District records. When completed, the sheet should be filed in front of each project's Remainder Identification Sheets.

Identification of Remainders—One reason for identifying each remainder created by state right-of-way acquisition, as stated in a prior section, is the importance of knowing the complete universe of remainders. Another reason is the helpfulness of this step in a search for remainder sales and other remainder data. A Remainder Identification Sheet (See Appendix B) or some similar form should be used to accomplish identification. Such a form should provide for the recording of several essential facts concerning the remainder. Part of the information needed can be recorded from District files as a routine operation. The right-of-way map can be used to locate all remainders within a project. The file folders for the parcels involving remainders will provide much of the information.

When data from the appraisal files have been recorded, the identification sheets logically should be

placed in a separate file, perhaps a loose-leaf binder, in parcel number order. Such a file will facilitate the periodic check for remainder sales and will serve as a control or work guide along with the Project Header Sheet.

The Review for Sales—The next step should be a search for remainder sales. A record of such sales should be a search for remainder sales. A record of such should be made on the Identification Sheet. An optimum arrangement would provide a continuous, daily perhaps, review for sales. The availability of personnel and the nature of records (sources) to be used will likely determine the best frequency of such a review. In some Districts, sales of remainders may be checked at the same time that the comparable files are brought up to date. Sources of notices of sales may be commercial reporting services, title company records, or county records; the most suitable of these will vary from county to county. Sales which do occur should be verified as to price and its validity as a market value. To do this, the Grantee or Grantor should be contacted and the recorded deed probably should be read.

Real estate sales prices are accepted as conventional yardsticks of market value and as evidence of changes in value. Sale of remainders, however, is not the only device for measuring subsequent values; capitalized ground rent can be used, for example. Spectacular changes in land use also can be convincing evidence of value change. It should be pointed out that the continued failure of remainders to sell is in itself suspicious. Such an occurrence may call for an inspection tour and a check for changes in use; long-term leases may be in use in lieu of outright sales.

Collection of "Before Acquisition" Data—The occurrence of a bona fide sale of a remainder is used as the "signal" that an analysis for enhancement or damages may be possible. For remainders not selling, a bona fide rental or lease agreement is the signal. When it is decided that a case study of a remainder or group of remainders is to be made, the Remainder Identification Sheet should be duplicated and another separate file started. The assembly of additional background data is then started using the Remainder History Schedule. Here again a routine approach can be used. Almost all "before acquisition" data may be obtained from the parcel folders or the right-of-way maps in the Districts, and this can be done immediately after a bona fide sale or lease is discovered or periodically after several remainder sales have accumulated. Initiated history schedules should be attached to their respective identification sheets and then placed behind Form I in the case history file. When each parcel folder is examined, photographs also should be selected for the case history file.

Collection of "After Acquisition" Data—To this point very little original research and analysis are required. Henceforth, procedures are more complicated. Whereas some of the "after acquisition" data can be obtained along with "before" data from the parcel files and right-of-way maps, much of the information requires field inspections and perhaps interviews with previous and current owners and users of the remainders. Of course, part of the "after" data, such as the remainder sale data, has already been collected during earlier steps. Such data as zoning and building permit data should be collected at the city planning, building permit, and tax offices, depending on the city.

At this stage, the case history of each remainder has been developed far enough to serve some fruitful uses. For example, it may be useful as a comparable in the appraisal of remainders being created by right-of-way acquisition. Most of the data already collected and recorded would be necessary in confirming a remainder's comparability to another remainder being appraised. Especially in condemnation cases, such information would eventually be required. However, to stop here and to draw a conclusion as to whether a remainder was damaged or enhanced in value perhaps would be erroneous if more than a few months had lapsed since acquisition. In such cases, data on comparables will be needed.

Selection of Comparables—The determination of enhancements and damages depends heavily upon the selection and study of histories of comparable properties. Ideally, the whole comparables used in the original appraisals would resell and thus constitute controls for the remainders. This is the reason for the "Sales Data of Comparables" section of Form III (Appendix B). Resales of these comparables would provide excellent data, but such sales will seldom occur. Therefore, it will be necessary to select "new" comparables which have sold at about the time of the sale of the remainders. This is a difficult chore because these "new" comparables should be similar to the original whole subject properties.

A further complicating factor is that comparables should be located in close proximity to remainders. Thus, they would reflect any general influence of the highway improvement and also satisfy precisely the requirement of comparability.

District staff appraisers, perhaps with the help of fee appraisers, should select and verify the sale prices of comparables used in each case history. They should inspect each and make the necessary adjustments of the sale prices to arrive at an estimate of what the value of the original whole property would have been (assuming it had not been severed) at the time the remainder sold. No adjustment for the presence of the new facility should be attempted.

Data on the comparables selected should be recorded in the last section of the history schedule (Form III). To supplement this, a photograph should be taken of each comparable.

The same source which was used to locate remainder sales is likely the best source of comparable sales. These comparables should be located on an area property map to assist in inspection and final selection. With the completion of this step, the case history schedule is considered complete enough to begin the analysis discussed in the next section.

Recommended Procedures in Analysis

The steps outlined above provide the information needed for the development of a complete history on every remainder that sells. The isolation and measurement of the effect of the highway improvement calls for a further step, this being a careful combination of the facts which have been gathered. For some remainders this analysis may take a rather abstract form. Reference has been made to the selection of comparables which are similar to original whole properties. This approach

is necessary because fragmented properties truly comparable to remainders are practically non-existent.

The type of analysis recommended is illustrated in the 25 individual studies reported earlier. The elements of this approach and accompanying assumptions are as follows.

1. Determine the appraised value of the original whole property and the assigned values for various parts.

2. Determine the payments for the partial taking, checking to see if payments were properly assigned to the various components of the property.

3. Determine the residual value of the remainder before damages (or enhancements) were allowed.

4. If the remainder was vacant land and was still vacant at the time of its later sale, select comparable sale data which reflect what the value of the *land* in the original whole subject property would have been at the time of the sale of the remainder.

5. Then determine what value the remainder would have had at the time of sale if it had continued as a part of the original whole subject property. This calls for an assignment of values. The rule is that the remainder's value should be in the same ratio to the value of the original whole parcel of land both as of the time of acquisition and as of the time of the remainder's sale.

6. The final comparison is between what the remainder sold for versus what its value would have been if it had remained as a part of the whole subject property (as obtained in Step 5.) The alternate methods for stating damages or enhancements have already been discussed in the section, Aggregative Analysis.

7. Check results against land use and income history of the remainder and reconcile any conflicts in evidence of value.

The above guide assumes that the remainder was vacant land. If improvements are involved, it is possible that their value can be isolated and land values can still be compared. This, however, makes the analysis more abstract; it may be that another type of comparison would be desirable.

If the remainder retains its original improvements, perhaps total value comparisons should be made. The elements and assumptions of this approach are essentially the same as those already discussed.

1. Determine the total appraised value of the original whole property.

2. Determine the nature of payments in the acquisition.

3. Determine the total residual value of the remainder before damages (or enhancements) were allowed.

4. Select comparable data and determine what the total value of original subject property would have been at the time of the sale of the remainder.

5. Then determine what the value of the remainder would have been at the time of its sale if it had continued as a part of the whole property. This requires an assignment of values in the same ratio that the value of the remainder held to the original property at the time of acquisition.

6. Again the final comparison is between what the remainder's selling price versus what its value would have been if it had continued as a part of the original whole property. The answer infers either specific damages or enhancements.

It is quite evident that such an analysis places heavy dependence upon the detail and accuracy of the original appraisal data. Also, two very important assumptions are involved: (1) that the original whole property would have retained its use or range of possible uses over the study period, and (2) that the ratio between the land values of the remainder and of the whole property would have been unchanged. Both assumptions should be verified by checking neighborhood factors and trends.

Although this recommended system of analysis does not cover all situations which may arise, it is likely to be applicable in a very large number of cases.

Why a System of Continuing Review?

It cannot be expected that enhancements or damages to remainders will always be demonstrated immediately. Turnover in real estate usually is extremely slow. And even if a remainder does sell within a short time, there is a probability that the sale price will reflect a temporary value. This is to say that temporary damages may be shown, or if potential enhancements are present, they will likely be understated. Remainders are a newly created land parcel; their long term best use is seldom immediately known. Besides this they nearly always are held by persons who are not experienced in real estate management; such persons may have little experience in waiting for land parcels to "ripen" for a higher and better use; furthermore, they likely will not have the patience and finances to wait through the ripening period. Faced with uncertainty as to value—despite some publicity, road benefits are not generally known—original owners of remainders may seek to rid themselves of the bother of a remainder parcel and accept a highly discounted price for their equity. This is an important reason for a system of continuing review; first findings may be misleading.

APPENDIX A

Supplemental Information on Remainders

REMAINDER 1

(8-2-10)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: In city of Forest Hill fronting on Forest Hill Circle (asphalt), Crawford and Hartman Lanes, both gravelled. In Tract 7E2 in the J. Collett Survey. At acquisition, subject property was in a suburban residential area having tracts of from one to 15 acres; about 25 percent were improved with frame residences in the \$4,000 to \$7,000 range. Hartman Lane is a through street to the Forest Hill business district, about 2.25 miles away.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

Two vacant tracts that sold near subject property were used as comparable properties. A 7-acre tract known as Tract 29J out of Blk. 29, Shelby School Land Survey (Abs. No. 1375) was sold by Ata W. Reuter to J. O. Mitchell on 7-13-59, recorded in Vol. 3345, P. 312 of deed records, for \$7,000, or \$1,000 per acre. Converted into square feet, the area is 304,862 sq. ft. and sold for \$.023 per sq. ft. This tract is just across the road (Forest Hill Circle) from the subject.

A 5.9 acre tract known as Tract 10A1B out of J. Collett Survey (Abst. No. 261) was sold by E. M. Bowman to G. V. Matthews on 6-22-60, recorded in Vol. 3466, P. 225 of deed records, for \$7,000, or \$1184 per acre. Converted into square feet, the area is 257,440 sq. ft. and sold for \$.027 per sq. ft. This tract is about 2400 ft. northeast of subject.

The adjustment of sale prices to reflect a unit value of the original whole property as of the remainder's sale dates gave a land value of \$.026 per sq. ft. Both were adjusted for corner influence, time lapse, size and location. The second also was adjusted for lack of public road frontage.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

Little change which might have influenced land values had occurred in area before remainder sold. Part of the remainder sold before construction had begun on new facility, and part sold during construction. Zoning and highest and best use of subject remained residential.

The original improvements and their approved values were: residence, \$6,700; garage, \$750; two barns, \$2,250; outbuildings, \$1,250; water well and pipes, \$1,950; wood awnings, \$150; fencing, \$490; and landscaping, walks and drive, \$270. The owner retained none of the above improvements. The state sold them to a house mover who sold them back to the original owner for \$3,635, which included a \$1,000 moving charge. The improvements were moved to Part A of the remainder, and the owner performed some renova-

tion bringing his cost to about \$4,000. When Part A sold, the estimated value of improvements was \$8,500, leaving a land value of \$.067 per sq. ft. and an enhancement of 156 percent.

After Part B of remainder sold, it was subdivided into the Forest Estates Addn., and 28 brick homes (priced from \$9,500 to \$11,100) were built.

REMAINDER 2

(8-2-15)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting on Leonard St. and Wanda Lane, both gravel streets, in city of Forest Hill about 2.7 miles from CBD. Known as Tract 8A in the J. Collett Survey. At acquisition, subject property was in a suburban residential area composed of tracts from three to 10 acres in size of which 25 percent were improved with frame residences in the \$4,000 to \$7,000 range.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

Two tracts that sold near subject property were used as comparable properties and are as follows:

A seven-acre tract known as tract 29J out of Blk. 29, Shelby School Land Survey (Abst. No. 1375) was sold by Ata W. Reuter to John O. Mitchell on 7-13-59, recorded in Vol. 3345, P. 312 of deed records, for \$7,000, or \$1,000 per acre. Converted into square feet, the area is 304,862 sq. ft. and sold for \$.023 per sq. ft. This tract is about 3,300 ft. southwest from subject by way of public roads.

A 5.9-acre tract known as Tract 10A1B out of J. Collett Survey (Abst. No. 261) was sold by E. M. Bowman to G. V. Matthews on 6-22-60, recorded in Vol. 3466, P. 225 of deed records, for \$7,000, or \$1184 per acre. Converted into square feet, the area is 257,440 sq. ft. and sold for \$.027 per sq. ft. This tract is about 50 ft. northeast from subject.

After adjustment the sale prices of these properties reflect a unit value of the original whole property as of the remainder sale dates of about \$.030 per sq. ft. The first and second comparable prices were adjusted upward 30 and 12 percent, respectively. The first was given time, size and location adjustments, and the second was given adjustment for size and no frontage on a public road.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

Very few changes that might have influenced land values had occurred within the area before the five portions of the remainder were sold. Construction of the new facility was in progress when the last three portions

of the remainder sold. Zoning and highest and best use of subject have not changed from residential. The original whole property improvements consisted of two small sheds (given no value) and an earthen pond valued at \$56. The tract was partially covered with large trees, ideal for residential purposes.

The five vacant tracts sold out of remainder are as follows:

	Date of Sale	No. of Sq. Ft.	Sale Price	Price/Sq. Ft.
Part A	10- 5-59	73,181	\$1,500	\$.020
Part B	10-13-59	71,003	2,500	.035
Part C	2-25-60	18,557	2,000	.107
Part D	3-25-60	3,710	400	.107
Part E	6-20-60	35,284	2,500	.071

Deed restrictions were recorded in the deeds of Parts A, D, and E requiring a minimum of 1200 sq. ft. in heated area in a residence which must be at least 70 percent brick or stone.

REMAINDER 3

(8-2-19)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: In city of Forest Hill about 2.5 miles from CBD. Known as Tract 8A1 in J. Collett Survey. At acquisition, subject property was located in a suburban residential area composed of tracts mostly three to 10 acres in size of which about 25 percent were improved with a residence equal to or superior to subject's (valued at \$3,550). Typical occupant was in low middle income group. Anglin Dr., on which the subject had frontage, is a through street leading to the business district.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

A vacant tract of land acquired by the same party who purchased the remainder, both tracts abutting his property, was used as a comparable property to the subject. It is described as follows: A 5.9-acre tract known as Tract 10A1B out of J. Collett Survey (Abst. No. 261) was sold by E. M. Bowman to G. V. Matthews on 6-22-60, recorded in Vol. 3466, P. 225 of deed records, for \$7,000, or \$1184 per acre. Converted into square feet, the area is 257,440 sq. ft. and sold for \$.027 per sq. ft. This tract is about 450 ft. north of the subject.

After adjusting the sale price of the above property to reflect a unit land value of the original whole property at the time remainder sold, the researcher estimates that it indicates a land value of about \$.037 per sq. ft. The sale price was adjusted for size, time, and lack of frontage on a public road.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

Little or no changes had occurred in area before remainder sold (during construction of new facility) that might have influenced land values. Zoning and highest and best use of subject remained residential (considering remainder as additional acreage to adjacent tract).

The original whole property improvements and their approved values were as follows: residence, \$3,550;

garage and guest room, \$750; carport, \$185; barn and chicken house, \$1,690; pump house and tool shed, \$200; fencing (part taken), \$475; and landscaping and drive (part taken), \$900. The owner did not retain any of the improvements in taking. Payments in damages to the remainder were as follows: land, \$1,200 (due to acquiring all of its frontage on Anglin Drive); and improvements, \$1,100 (due to bisection).

The remainder was first sold to the adjacent property owner. Then the remainder was sold again with three other tracts, totaling 17.5 acres including remainder on 7-26-60 to a corporation at an indicated price of \$1500 per acre, or \$.034 per sq. ft. Since the sale price included several tracts, it was not considered a clear indication of the value of remainder. The present owner has platted a tract, including the remainder, into a subdivision called Shady Hill Addn. and has started developing it by laying water and sewer lines.

REMAINDER 4

(8-2-24)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Situated on Anglin Dr. and abuts Forest Hill's city limits about 2.2 miles from its CBD. Known as Tract 33A1 in David Strickland Survey. At time of acquisition, subject property was located in suburban residential area composed of tracts mostly from three to 10 acres in size of which about 25 percent were improved with residences in medium price range. Typical occupant in \$4,000 to \$10,000 income group.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

A vacant tract of land near the subject, purchased to be developed as part of a residential subdivision, was used as a comparable property to the subject. It is described as follows: A 5.9-acre tract known as Tract 10A1B out of J. Collett Survey (Abst. 261) was sold by E. M. Bowman to G. V. Matthews on 6-22-60, recorded in Vol. 3466, P. 225 of deed records, for \$7,000, or \$1185 per acre. Converted into square feet, the area is 257,440 sq. ft. and sold for \$.027 per sq. ft. This tract is about 700 ft. west of the subject.

After adjusting the sale price of the above property to reflect a unit land value of the original whole property at the time remainder sold, the researcher estimates that it reflects a land value of about \$.027 per sq. ft. The sale price was adjusted for size, time, topography, and lack of frontage on a public road. But these adjustments offset each other, and no change in the original sale price was made.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

Little or no changes had occurred in the area before the north remainder sold (during construction of new facility), which might have influenced property values. The highest and best use of subject remained residential. However, the new owner has indicated that he plans to use a portion of the remainder and an adjacent property, which he has also purchased, for commercial purposes. He will use the rest of remainder for residential purposes.

a part of which will be in the proposed Forest Wood Addn.

The original whole property improvements and their approved values were as follows: residence, \$9,500; garage, \$900; chicken house, \$75; well house, pump and tank, \$200; well, \$250; fence, \$300; landscaping, \$50; and drive, \$75. The owner did not retain any of the improvements.

Agreement could not be reached between the state and property owner on the value of the part acquired and damages to remainders. The award was decided through condemnation proceedings. The commissioners' award was a lump sum of \$17,500. The jury's award was as follows: total award, \$22,281; value of taking, \$21,413; value of remainders before taking, \$2,512 or \$.032 per sq. ft.; and value of remainders after taking, \$1,644 or \$.021 per sq. ft. Therefore, the payment for land damages to the remainders was a sum of \$868, or \$.011 per sq. ft. The jury did not allocate the damage payment between remainders. For the analysis, the jury's verdict was proportioned between land and improvements acquired on the basis of their original approved values (land, \$5,450; and improvements, \$11,350). The amount of the award payment exceeding these approved values was considered a payment for damages.

REMAINDER 5 (8-2-44)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Situated on Oak Crest Dr. and High Ridge Rd., both gravel streets, about 440 ft. and 480 ft. outside the city limits of Forest Hill and Fort Worth, respectively. Business district of former about 2.6 miles away. Known as Lot 1, Blk. 6, Oak Crest Addn., a subdivision in David Strickland Survey. About 50 percent of lots improved with poorly maintained, inexpensive frame residences; have only septic tank and dry toilets for sewage disposal, and streets are gravelled. Typical occupant in low income class. Subdivision abuts Highway 287.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

Comparable sales were not necessary for this case study. The remainder was purchased 30 days after date of negotiated settlement for part acquired by the state; therefore, there was not a sufficient time lapse to indicate that the subject property's land value would have changed because of the time element. It is supposed that the price paid for the remainder reflects a desire on the Grantee's part to speculate with a small irregular shaped parcel having proximity to new facility.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

No changes had occurred in the area which could have appreciably changed property values, and construction of new facility had not begun when remainder sold. The highest and best use of the whole lot was considered by appraisers to be low cost single family residential.

The original whole property improvements and their approved values were as follows: residence, \$3,075, septic tank system, \$150; landscaping, \$25; driveway,

\$25; and walks, \$25. An overpayment of \$29 was made for what was seemingly an inferior portion of the whole lot. This was considered a damage payment to remaining land.

There are no restrictions which prevent the remainder from being used as a site for sign boards. The review appraiser considered such to be a likely use of remainder.

REMAINDER 6 (8-4-301 & 302)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: In city of Fort Worth about 8.1 miles from CBD by way of Bowman Springs Rd., an asphalt street on which remainder fronts. It also fronts on Brady and Nelms Drs., both gravel streets. Known as Lots 1 and 18, Blk. 2, Village Gardens Addn. Area is about 20 percent improved with low cost residences. Location is about one-fourth mile from Lake Arlington and 1.5 miles from nearest shopping center. Schools for 12 grades are within five miles of subject.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

Since the remainder sold 25 days *before* the state closed the transaction with original owner for part acquired for right of way, it was concluded that no comparable data would be required.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

A payment in the amount of \$235 was made for land damages which resulted from a reduction in size of the remainder.

The new owner of the remainder was granted a building permit on 12-5-57 to construct a residence, because the zoning was "B" two family residential. Later, he applied for and was granted (on 5-15-59) a change in the zoning to "E" commercial. He constructed a frame stucco building to be used for commercial purposes. When investigated it was not being used, but he had up a cafe sign.

The new owner purchased only the remainder before taking. No construction had started on new facility. His remainder is one of several contiguous remainders for which the zoning has been changed from residential to commercial. The area along Bowman Springs Rd. seems to be in transition from residential to commercial.

REMAINDER 7 (8-4-10 & 11)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting on Nelms and Brady Drs., both gravel streets, in city of Fort Worth about 8.1 miles from CBD by way of Bowman Springs Rd. Known as Lots 2, 3, 16 and 17, Blk. 2 of Village Gardens Addn. Area about 20 percent improved with low cost residences. Subject property is about one-fourth mile from Lake Arlington and 1.5 miles from nearest shopping center. Schools for 12 grades are with-

in five miles of subject. Typical occupant is in low income class.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

The following sales were considered as typical vacant lot sales in the area which would indicate what the land value of the original whole subject property would have been at the time remainder lots sold (9-1-60).

Lot	Blk	Subdivision	Date of Sale	Deed Vol., P.	No. of Sq. Ft.	Sale Price	Price/Sq. Ft.
9	3	Village Gardens	1-25-61	3361-238	10,017	\$500	\$.050
3	8	Village Gardens	4-14-60	3434-298	10,017	500	.050
10	5	Village Gardens	8-19-60	3476-408	10,335	600	.058

The last sale was considered more heavily than the others because it sold only 13 days after the remainder. After considering adjustments, it was decided that \$.058 per sq. ft. was the indicated whole lot unit value as of 9-1-60.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

The right of way out of the subject property was acquired by the city of Fort Worth during 1956. The state purchased additional right of way in the same area during 1958.

The whole property value of the original subject tract was computed on the basis of the purchase price of the part acquired by the city. Several whole lots were included in this purchase.

The analysis is based upon the second sale of remainder, which occurred before construction of new facility. The first time it sold, it was included in a sale of some 40 lots, which occurred on 12-22-58.

The remainder was still vacant when last investigated, but the zoning was changed from "B" two-family residential to restricted commercial on 5-15-59.

REMAINDER 8

(8-4-12)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting on Brady and Nelms Drs., both gravel streets, in city of Fort Worth about 8.1 miles from CBD by way of Bowman Springs Rd. Known as Lots 4 and 15, Blk. 2 of Village Gardens Addn. Area is about 20 percent built-up with low cost residences. Subject property is about one-fourth mile from Lake Arlington and 1.5 miles from nearest shopping center. Schools for 12 grades are within five miles of subject. Typical occupant is in low income class.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

The following sales were considered as typical vacant lot sales in area to indicate the land value of a whole lot, such as the original subject property, at the time remainder sold (4-26-61).

Lot	Blk	Subdivision	Date of Sale	Deed Vol., P.	No. of Sq. Ft.	Sale Price	Price/Sq. Ft.
9	3	Village Gardens	1-25-61	3361-238	10,017	\$500	\$.050
3	8	Village Gardens	4-14-60	3434-298	10,017	500	.050
10	5	Village Gardens	8-19-60	3476-408	10,335	600	.058

The first sale was considered more heavily than the others, because it sold nearest to the date the remainder sold. The price of the first comparable was the same as that of the second, which sold about nine months earlier.

After considering adjustments, it was decided that the \$.050 per sq. ft. price reflected by the first two sales was the indicated whole lot comparable value as of 4-26-61.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

The right of way out of the subject property was acquired by the city of Fort Worth during 1956.

The whole property value of subject property was computed on the basis of the purchase price of the part acquired by the city. Several whole lots were included in this purchase price.

The remainder first sold on contract of sale in 1957 for \$1,195, or \$.073 per sq. ft. The owner moved a three-room frame house onto Lot 15, lot to rear, during 1958. He later forfeited his contract, losing property. After construction of new facility had begun, the original owner sold remainder to another party who apparently bought it for commercial purposes. The zoning was changed on 5-15-59 from "B" two-family residential to restricted commercial. The new owner apparently considered the old residence of no value to the property.

REMAINDER 9

(8-4-13 & 14)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting on Nelms and Brady Drs., both gravel streets, in city of Fort Worth about 8.1 miles from CBD by way of Bowman Springs Rd. Known as Lots 5, 6, 7, 13 and 14, Blk. 2 of Village Gardens Addn. Area is about 20 percent improved with low cost residences. Subject property is about one-fourth mile from Lake Arlington and 1.5 miles from nearest shopping center. Schools for 12 grades are available within five miles of subject. Typical occupant is in low income class.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

The following sales were considered to be typical vacant lot sales in the area to indicate the land value of whole lots, such as the original subject property, at the time remainder sold (10-22-58).

Lot	Blk	Subdivision	Date of Sale	Deed Vol., P.	No. of Sq. Ft.	Sale Price	Price/Sq. Ft.
4	4	Village Gardens	4-30-58	3206-31	10,335	\$500	\$.048
3	8	Village Gardens	4-14-60	3434-298	10,017	500	.050
9	3	Village Gardens	1-25-61	3361-238	10,017	500	.050

The first and second sales were considered more heavily than the other, because they occurred within about six months of the remainder sale date. After considering adjustments, it was decided that \$.049 per sq. ft. was the indicated whole lot unit value as of 10-22-58.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

The right of way out of the subject property was acquired by the city of Fort Worth during 1956. The state purchased additional right of way in the same area during 1958.

The whole property value of the original subject tract was computed on the basis of the purchase price of the part acquired by the City. Several whole lots were included in this purchase.

Construction of the new facility began after the remainder sold. The remainder was improved during 1960 with a 2,000 sq. ft. metal warehouse and shop with a concrete floor and a 951 sq. ft. attached brick veneer office building having five offices and two rest rooms. The building permit was issued on 9-28-60 for \$5,000. All of the remainder has been enclosed under a six-ft. chain-link fence, except at front of buildings. The zoning of this remainder was changed on 5-15-59 from "B" two-family residential to restricted commercial.

REMAINDER 10
(8-4-303 & 304)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting on Brady and Wilkes Drs., both gravel streets, in city of Fort Worth about 8.1 miles from CBD by way of Bowman Springs Rd. Known as Lots 1 and 2, Blk. 6, Village Gardens Addn. Area about 25 percent improved with low cost residences. Area is about 1.5 miles from nearest shopping center and within five miles of schools for 12 grades. About one-fourth mile from Lake Arlington.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

Since only 53 days had lapsed between the date of acquisition of the right of way and the date of sale of remainder, no comparable sales were presented. Changes in the land value of properties not abutting new facility were very small during this short period.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

Payments for damages to the remainder were as follows: land, \$413 (due to reduction in size); and improvements, \$506 (due to bisection).

The original whole property had improvements with an approved value (church building) of \$1,662. This was retained by owner and moved onto the remainder. Later he sold the improvement (for \$15 and an outboard motor) and remainder of the two lots, occurring before construction of the new facility. The Grantee reportedly purchased the remainder lots for commercial usage, such as leasing to an oil company that will improve them with a service station. The owner has applied for a zoning change from "B" two-family residential to commercial.

REMAINDER 11
(8-4-23)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting on Wilkes Dr. and Iola St., both gravel streets, in city of Fort Worth about 8.1 miles from CBD by way of Bowman Springs Rd. Known as Lot 11, Blk. 5 of Wilkes Estates Addn. Area is 20 percent improved with low cost residences. The subject property is one-fourth mile from Lake Arlington and 1.5 miles from nearest shopping center. Schools for 12 grades are within five miles of subject. Typical occupant in low income class. All streets are gravelled in the Addition.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

Since only 33 days lapsed between the closing date for the part acquired by state and the sale date of remainder, the assumption is that little or no change in general land values occurred within the area. Therefore, no comparable sale data are reported here.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

The original whole property improvements and their approved values were as follows: residence, \$4,020; carport, \$250; shed, \$50; butane system, \$65; landscaping, \$25; drive, \$25; and walk, \$15. All of these improvements were in the right of way except the shed and it was damaged 100 percent by the appraisers. None of the improvements were retained by the owner. A payment in the amount of \$90 was made for land damages which resulted from a reduction in size of the remainder.

The zoning has not changed and the tract remains vacant. When the sale was made, the deed restricted the use of remainder to single-family residential.

On the other side of Freeway the land use of some of the abutting remainders has changed from residential to commercial. But no other area changes have occurred. The remainder sold before construction had started on the new facility.

REMAINDER 12
(8-4-31)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting on Asbury Ave., a gravel street, in city of Fort Worth about 8.1 miles from CBD by way of Bowman Springs Rd. Known as Lot 14, Blk. 10 of Wilkes Estates Addn. Area about 20 percent improved with low cost residences. About one-fourth mile from Lake Arlington and 1.5 miles from nearest shopping center. Schools for 12 grades are within five miles of subject property. Typical occupant is in low income class.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

The following were considered typical property sales in the area by which to obtain an indicated value of the original whole property at the time the remainder sold (9-16-60).

Lot	Blk	Subdivision	Date of Sale	Deed Vol., P.	No. of Sq. Ft.	Sale Price	Value of Improvements
9	5	Village Gardens	8-19-60	3476-102	12,720	\$5,000	\$4,200
7	9	Wilkes Estates	3-22-61	3541-394	11,200	4,750	4,000
12	3	Wilkes Estates	10-28-60	3498-401	10,500	4,000	3,400

After making adjustments based on the above values, the value of the original whole property should have been about \$5,200 on 9-16-60. Broken down between land and improvements, it would appear the improvements were worth about \$4,500, leaving a lot value of \$700, or \$.063 per sq. ft. The first of the above sales was adjusted for lot size, corner influence, size and quality of improvements. The second was adjusted for size and quality of improvements. The third was adjusted for lot size, and size and quality of improvements.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

The original whole property improvements and their approved values were as follows: residence (none given); butane tank (none given); septic tank (none given); clothes line and poles (none given); chain-link fence and gate, \$60 for part taken; and landscaping (none given). However, the appraisers' cost approach estimate of value for all improvements was \$5,800. The condemnation appraiser appraised the whole property at \$6,650 as of 7-7-59.

The remainder is still improved with the residence, and the zoning has not changed. The new owner built a redwood fence on the west side next to the new facility on which construction had just begun when remainder was acquired.

The original owner would not accept the negotiated offer of \$40 or \$.077 per sq. ft. for the land and \$60 for a portion of fence and the gate. Therefore, it was necessary for the state to acquire it by condemnation proceedings. The commissioners' award was a lump sum of \$150. This amount was acceptable to both parties. It is not known whether damages were actually considered by the commissioners. But the researchers considered the amount of the award payment which was above the original approved values to be a payment for damages to the remaining land and improvements.

REMAINDER 13

(8-4-51)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting on Oakdale Dr., a gravel street, in city of Fort Worth about 8.1 miles from CBD by way of Bowman Springs Rd. Known as Lot 5, Blk. 16 of Wilkes Estates Addn. Area is about 20 percent improved with low cost residences. The streets are poorly gravelled. Typical occupant is in low income class. Nearest shopping center is 1.5 miles and schools for all 12 grades are within five miles. Lake Arlington is about one-fourth mile from subject.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

Since only about 75 days had lapsed between the date the state acquired right of way and the date remainder sold, it was concluded that no significant changes in lot values in area had occurred. Also all valid comparable sales of vacant lots in area occurred almost a year later, making them less reliable than the value placed on lot at time of acquisition.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

A payment in the amount of \$50 was made for land damages which resulted from a reduction in size of the remainder.

The lot was vacant at the time of acquisition and has remained so to date of the investigation. The remainder was sold by contract on 1-17-59 to the abutting property owner. (The deed was recorded on 12-29-59.) It is not known what use the owner plans for this fragment of a residential lot. There has been no application for a change in the present zoning which is "B" two-

family. Construction of the new facility had not begun when the remainder sold.

REMAINDER 14

(8-4-65 thru 79)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting on Ramey Ave. and Cravens Rd., both asphalt streets, in city of Fort Worth about 8.4 miles from CBD. Known as Lots 1 through 30, Duke's Meadowview Addn. in Ulrich Wuthrick Survey. Areas near this addition are well developed with residences occupied by Negroes. There are schools for 12 grades in area. Present trend is toward residential development. Shopping facilities are nearby.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

Since only four months and 22 days had lapsed between the date of right-of-way acquisition and the date of the remainder sale, little or no change had occurred in land values of property not abutting new facility. The following two sales in the area support this conclusion:

A 1.49-acre vacant tract out of NW corner of Lots 1 and 2, Blk. 4, Handley Hts. South Addition sold on 5-19-59, recorded in Vol. 3327, P. 65, of deed records, for \$2,100, or \$.032 per sq. ft. The tract has frontage on Cravens Rd. across from subject.

The east 200 ft. of Lot 5, Blk 2, Handley Hts. South Addn. sold on 6-15-59, recorded in Vol. 3355, P. 89 of deed records, for \$4,500. The tract was improved with a small frame residence estimated to be worth about \$2,500, leaving a land value of \$2,000, or \$.032 per sq. ft. The tract has frontage on Elizabeth Rd. 600 ft. from Cravens Rd. near subject.

The sale prices of the above two properties were not adjusted. Therefore, the indicated original whole property unit land value as of the date remainder sold was \$.032 per sq. ft., the same as originally valued.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

The approved values of the original whole property improvements were: residence, \$8,300; garage, \$970; well house, \$200; well and casing, \$1,500; pump and pipe, \$700; over-head storage tank and tower, \$300; butane system, \$100; septic tanks, \$150; and landscaping, fence and walk (part taken), \$280. None of these improvements were retained by the owner.

The west 15 lots were not appraised originally, but the appraiser, who previously appraised the other part of the property, placed a value on them based on values of lots which were appraised.

After the right of way was acquired, the owner applied for permission to rescind the plat known as Duke's Meadowview Addn., and the city commission approved it on 2-11-59 shortly before he sold the remainders. Construction of the new facility had not begun when the remainder sold. The new owner applied for and was granted a change in the zoning of the north 1,000 ft. of the west remainder, effective 2-10-61, from "B" two-family residential to restricted commercial, ex-

cept for the north 150 ft. abutting Ramey Ave. and the west 150 ft., which is to remain residential.

Several zoning changes from residential to commercial have occurred in the general area since the right of way was acquired.

The present owner has not developed any of the three remainders created, one of which is very small (see map).

REMAINDER 15

(8-4-83)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting on Cravens Rd. (asphalt) and Willis Rd., a gravel street, across the street from Fort Worth city limits about 8.4 miles from CBD. Known as Lot 1, Blk. 1, Handley Hts. South Addn., a subdivision with lots about five acres in size. This subdivision is improved with old substandard residences. There are several subdivisions to north that are completely built up and occupied by Negroes. Schools for 12 grades are nearby. Shopping area is about one mile north. Lake Arlington is close by to the east.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

Since only 10 months had passed between the date of right-of-way acquisition and the date of remainder sale, little or no change had occurred in land values of properties not abutting new facility. The following sales support this conclusion:

A 1.49-acre vacant tract out of NW corner of Lots 1, and 2, Blk. 4, Handley Hts. South Addn. sold on 5-19-59, recorded in Vol. 3327, P. 65 of deed records, for \$2,100, or \$.032 per sq. ft. The tract has frontage on Cravens Rd. about 2,550 ft. south of subject.

The east 200 ft. of Lot 5, Blk. 2, Handley Hts. South Addn. sold on 6-15-59, recorded in Vol. 3355, P. 89 of deed records for \$4,500. The tract was improved with a small frame residence estimated to be worth about \$2,500 leaving a land value of \$2,000, or \$.032 per sq. ft. The tract has frontage on Elizabeth Rd. 600 ft. from Cravens Rd. and is about 900 ft. south of subject.

After adjusting the two sale prices for time, location, tract size and topography, a value of \$.50 per sq. ft. for comparable land was decided.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

The approved values of the original whole property improvements were as follows: residence, \$8,265; garage, \$270; metal shed and barn, \$70; well house, \$75; butane tanks, \$180; fence and posts (part acquired), \$100; well and pump, \$175; and landscaping and drive, \$65. None of these improvements were retained by the owner.

Construction of the new facility had not begun when the remainder sold. The purchasers of the remainder (abutting property owners of the remainder to north) applied for and were granted a zoning change on 7-17-59 from "B" two-family residential to "E" commercial. This was two months before a deed was recorded show-

ing they had acquired the subject remainder. Later they applied for and received a change in the zoning of their other remainder from residential to "E" commercial. Other zoning changes have occurred in area.

The two remainders now have corners at Ramey Ave. and Willis Rd. A sign has been posted indicating that a new shopping center will be constructed on the two remainders.

REMAINDER 16

(8-5-7)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting on Lancaster Ave. (paved) and Old Handley Rd., an asphalt street, in the city of Fort Worth about 6.4 miles from CBD. Known as tract 22, in the S. G. Jennings Survey (Abst. 843). Most of the improvements in the block are of commercial type. There are some residences, small shops, cafes, and the like, but they are definitely of mediocre construction. The adjacent areas are improved with frame residences in subdivisions. Lancaster Ave. is a major thoroughfare leading into town.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

Since only 51 days had lapsed between the date of right-of-way acquisition and the date of remainder sale, little or no changes in the value of land not abutting the new facility had occurred. Therefore, it was decided that comparable sale data were not needed in this case. There has not been any noticeable change in neighborhood characteristics since the date of acquisition.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

The approved values of all original whole property improvements which were acquired by the state are as follows: stucco building, \$200; abandoned brick garage, \$250; two fish tanks, \$100; drive and walks, \$100; fencing, \$100; and landscaping, \$50. A frame residence, frame attached garage, frame shed, and a barbecue pit were not in the right of way and were not given specific approved values, but these were valued by the appraisers at \$2,400. A payment in the amount of \$23,000 was made for land damages which resulted from denial of access to the remainder directly from the new facility and Lancaster Ave.

The owner did not retain any of the improvements in the right of way. He also disposed of the remaining improvements before selling remainder. Construction of the new facility had not begun when the remainder sold. A sign has been posted allowing the dumping of dirt onto remainder, and some dumping of dirt has occurred.

Access to the one-way ramp and Lancaster Avenue has been denied to the remainder. Thus, the only access to a public road is by way of Old Handley Road which passes to rear of remainder and comes to deadend at the new freeway. On the east, it goes into Lancaster Avenue. At acquisition, the whole property was zoned, with the north 100 ft. commercial and the balance of tract industrial. The city zoning records showed no change in zoning and have tract zoned "E" commercial.

REMAINDER 17

(8-5-60)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting on Cravens Rd. and Greenlee St., both asphalt streets, in city of Fort Worth about 6.4 miles from CBD. Known as Lot 1, Blk. 1, of Corrected Second Revision of Faubus and Bates Addn. Area about 90 percent improved with good quality residences in \$6,000 to \$10,000 class. A few higher priced homes are scattered in area. Property is convenient to schools and shopping area. A city park is nearby. Subject is one long city block from Meadowbrook Dr., a major thoroughfare. Most of streets in neighborhood are in good condition.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

The following area sales were considered by the review appraiser as comparable to the original whole property and would give an indicated value of the whole property at the time its remainder sold (10-23-59).

Lot	Subdivision	Date of Sale	Deed Vol., P.	Area in Sq. Ft.	Sale Price	Value of Improvements	Land Value Per sq. ft.
11	W. B. Moncrief	2-20-59	3296-336	9,270	\$7,000	\$5,800	\$.129
23	W. B. Moncrief	7-29-59	3351-353	9,270	8,500	7,300	.129
25	W. B. Moncrief	9-2-59	3375-347	9,270	7,500	6,300	.129

The above properties are located only about one-half block north, the first being on the same street with subject. All the improvements in this area are highly comparable. The sale prices of the above properties were adjusted for time, location, tract size, quality of improvements, and topography.

According to the above adjusted values, the total indicated value of the original whole property as of 10-23-59 would have been \$8,460, this being a \$60 increase in value from time of acquisition; thus the change in value of comparables was nil.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

The approved values of the original whole property improvements in the right of way are as follows: residence, \$275; concrete patio, \$45; fence, \$200; and landscaping, \$30. The approved value of the residence was \$6,742. Due to a mistake in determining the exact location of the right-of-way line, the residence was considered a bisection and was appraised as such. When it was discovered that the right-of-way line actually missed the residence, the right-of-way section asked the fee appraisers about changing their appraisals and was informed that the proximity damages would just about offset the damages allowed for bisection. Therefore, no changes were made, and the damage payment in the amount of \$6,450 was made on basis of a bisection. A payment in the amount of \$300 was made for land damages which resulted from a reduction in the size of the remainder. In addition, an overpayment of \$60 for the part acquired was considered as a payment for land damages.

The zoning and use of property have not changed since acquisition, but the purchaser apparently acquired the remainder for rent property. Before acquisition, most of the property was owner-occupied.

The new owner has added another room onto the north side of the residence and built a chain-link fence in the back along the right-of-way line. Construction of the new facility had not begun when the remainder sold.

REMAINDER 18

(8-5-61)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting on Cravens Rd., an asphalt street, in city of Fort Worth about 6.4 miles from CBD. Known as Lot 2, Blk. 1 of Corrected Second Revision of Faubus and Bates Addn. Area about 90 percent improved with good quality residences in \$6,000 to \$10,000 class. A few higher priced homes are scattered in area. A city park is nearby. Subject is one long city block from Meadowbrook Dr., a major thoroughfare. Most of the streets in the area are in good condition.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

The following area sales were considered as comparable to the original whole property and give an indication of what the value of whole property would have been at the time its remainder sold (7-23-59).

Lot	Subdivision	Date of Sale	Deed Vol., P.	Area in Sq. Ft.	Sale Price	Value of Improvements	Land Value Per Sq. Ft.
11	W. B. Moncrief	2-20-59	3296-336	9,270	\$7,000	\$5,800	\$.129
23	W. B. Moncrief	7-29-59	3351-353	9,270	8,500	7,300	.129
25	W. B. Moncrief	9-2-59	3375-347	9,270	7,500	6,300	.129

The above properties are located about one-half block north, the first being on the same street as subject. All the improvements in this area are highly comparable. The above sale prices were adjusted for time, location, tract size, quality of improvement, and topography. This analysis showed practically no change in the values of comparables.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

Only the approved whole value of the subject improvements was given, being \$6,600, except for a \$60 value for the fence which was acquired. The improvements and their appraised values were: residence, \$5549; garage, \$497; concrete walk and drive, \$178; trees and landscaping, \$80; and fence, \$150. Payments for damages to the remainder were as follows: land, \$380 (due to a reduction in size); and improvements, \$2,900 (due to proximity). In addition an overpayment of \$65 for the part acquired was considered a payment for land damages.

Construction of the new facility had not begun when the remainder sold. The party who purchased the remainder was renting the whole property at acquisition for \$900 per year. This party considered the purchase price of \$5,000 for the remainder to be a real bargain and did not feel that the present property was excessively damaged. He estimated its value at investigation to be at least \$7,500 and this was also the opinion of the review appraiser.

The zoning and use of the remainder have not changed.

REMAINDER 19

(8-5-75)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting Cravens Rd., an asphalt street, in city of Fort Worth about 6.4 miles from CBD. Known as Lot 14, W. B. Moncrief Addn. Area about 90 percent improved with good quality frame residences in \$6,000 to \$10,000 class. A few scattered homes are priced even higher. Area has schools, shopping facilities, and a city park nearby. Subject is about one-half block from Meadowbrook Dr., a major thoroughfare. Most of the streets in the area are in good condition.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

Since the whole property sold soon after the appraisal date and before the acquisition date, the values of whole property not abutting the new facility were considered to have remained the same. This was the opinion of the review appraiser.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

The only approved value given for this property was the value of the part acquired and the amount of damages. One of the appraisers gave the whole lot value as \$1,200. The review appraiser set a value of \$6,500 on the improvements before taking. An original appraiser stated in his parcel 74 appraisal that improvement values in the block were between \$6,500 and \$7,000. A payment in the amount of \$100 was made for damages to the improvements which resulted from close proximity to the new facility.

One of the original developers within the area purchased the whole property one and one-half months before the state purchased the right of way. She also received that payment. At least one other remainder has been purchased by this individual, perhaps as a speculation.

The zoning and land use have remained the same since acquisition.

REMAINDER 20

(8-5-74)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting on Purselly St., a gravel street, in city of Fort Worth about 6.4 miles from CBD. Known as Lot 21 of W. B. Moncrief Addn. Area about 90 percent improved with good quality frame residences in the \$6,000 to \$10,000 class. A few scattered homes are priced even higher. Area has schools, shopping facilities, and a city park nearby. Subject is one-half block from Meadowbrook Dr., a major thoroughfare. Most of the streets are in good condition.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

The following sale was considered by the review appraiser to be comparable to the original whole property and would give an indicated value of whole property at the time its remainder sold (11-25-60).

Lot 25 in W. B. Moncrief Addn. sold to L. D. Berna, Jr. on 9-2-59, recorded in Vol. 3375, P. 347 of deed records, for \$7,500. This property is four lots north of subject on same street.

After adjusting for time, size and quality of improvements, the indicated value which the subject would have had at time remainder sold was considered to be about \$7,250. Other sales within the area support this value. It is suspected that the original appraised value was too high. This does not dispute the analysis since such appraised value was taken as the value of comparables at the time of acquisition.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

No improvements were acquired by the state, and thus no approved values were given. One of the appraisers estimated that all of the improvements were worth about \$7,000, which is the value used in the analysis. The review appraiser felt that this value was too high and should have been nearer \$6,000. A payment in the amount of \$458 was made for damages to the remaining improvements which resulted in close proximity to the new facility.

The grantor stated that he considered the value of the remainder unaffected by the new facility and that he was happy to sell the property for the approximate amount that he paid for it in 1955 in addition to receiving payment for the land acquired and damages to the remainder. Construction of the new facility had just begun when the remainder was sold.

The remainder use and zoning have remained the same, but there may be a transition to rent property occurring.

REMAINDER 21

(8-5-81B)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting on Woodbine St., an asphalt street, in city of Fort Worth about 6.4 miles from CBD. Known as Lot 6-B, Blk. 3, F. E. and Mamie Wolfe Addn. Area about 90 percent improved with good quality frame and brick residences in the \$6,000 to \$10,000 class. A few homes are priced higher. Schools and shopping facilities are nearby. Also, a city park is in area. Meadowbrook Dr., a major thoroughfare, is a little more than a block to north. Most of the streets in the area are in good condition.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

The following sales were considered by the review appraiser in arriving at a value of the original whole lot at time its remainder sold (3-1-60):

Lot Blk.	Subdivision	Date of Sale	Deed Vol., P.	Area in Sq. Ft.	Sale Price	Value Per Sq. Ft.
13	1 Meadowbrook Est.	6-24-59	3340-68	9,524	\$2,000	\$.210
4	10 Meadowbrook Est.	3-1-59	3315-392	9,224	2,500	.271
2	18 Meadowbrook Est.	7-22-59	3357-188	11,050	2,150	.195

After adjusting the above sale prices for location, tract size, and topography, the indicated whole lot value as of date of remainder sale was \$.184 per sq. ft., or the same value as at acquisition.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

Since acquisition, the zoning and land use of remainder have not changed. Little or no other change has occurred in the immediate area to affect land values. Construction of the new facility had just begun when the remainder sold.

REMAINDER 22

(8-5-85)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting on Meadowbrook Dr., an asphalt street, in city of Fort Worth about 6.5 miles from CBD. Known as Lot 6, N. D. Whittington Addn. Area about 80 percent improved with brick and frame residences in good condition. There is some nonconforming construction existing, and the area is static. Schools and shopping facilities are close by. Also, a city park is in the area. Typical occupant in middle income class. The lots in block are oversized for area. Meadowbrook Dr. is a major thoroughfare. Most of the streets in the area are in good condition.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

The following sales were used by the review appraiser to give an indication of the value of the original whole lot at the time its remainder sold (12-29-59).

Lot Blk.	Subdivision	Date of Sale	Deed Vol., P.	Area in Sq. Ft.	Sale Price	Value Per Sq. Ft.
13 1	Meadowbrook Est.	6-24-59	3340-68	9,524	\$2,000	\$.210
24 1	Meadowbrook Est.	7-2-59	3357-144	10,200	2,500	.245
4 10	Meadowbrook Est.	3-1-59	3315-392	9,224	2,500	.271
2 18	Meadowbrook Est.	7-22-59	3357-188	11,050	2,150	.195

After making adjustments for time, location, lot size, and topography, the indicated whole lot value as of 12-29-59 was \$.085 per sq. ft. and also assumed to be about that value when part A of remainder resold on 8-4-60.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

Since there were no improvements on the lot at acquisition, no approved values are given, except that a payment of land damages (due to reduction in size) in the amount of \$500 was approved.

Construction of the new facility had not begun when the remainder sold. The whole remainder was first sold to the abutting property owner on the south. He purchased it to provide ingress and egress from the frontage road to the rear of his lot. Later, he sold Part A, the north 2004 sq. ft., to the abutting property owner on the east, who also owns a remainder. This owner has moved a residence onto his remainder and purchased Part A of this remainder to provide him more frontage on facility.

Since the first sale involved the whole remainder, the analysis was based on that sale value. But it should be mentioned that the second sale, Part A of remainder, sold for \$200, or \$.100 per sq. ft., which was \$.022 per sq. ft. more than the purchase price for the whole remainder. This represents a 15 percent increase in value

from acquisition, whereas the first sale price represents an 11 percent decrease in value.

Since acquisition, no zoning and land use changes have occurred, except that the remainder has been purchased by the abutting property owners to be a part of improved residential lots.

REMAINDER 23

(8-5-87)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting on Meadowbrook Dr., an asphalt street, in city of Fort Worth about 6.5 miles from CBD. Known as Lot 8, N. D. Whittington Addn. Area is about 80 percent improved with brick and frame residences in good condition. Schools and shopping facilities are convenient. A city park is nearby. Typical occupant in middle income class. Meadowbrook Dr. is a major thoroughfare. There is some nonconforming construction in area, and the area is static.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

Since only two months had lapsed between the date of acquisition and date of remainder sale, it is assumed that little change had occurred in the values of whole properties not abutting new facility. The following sale supports this assumption:

Lot 2 of the Cravens Addn. sold on 10-10-58, recorded in Vol. 3255, P. 358, for \$8,500. The improvements were valued at \$7,000 leaving a lot value of \$1,500 or \$.107 per sq. ft. This property is one block east on Meadowbrook Dr. The lot size is 14,040 sq. ft., slightly larger than subject. The improvements were highly comparable to subject.

After adjusting for time, location, tract size, and quality of improvements, the indicated whole property value at time remainder sold was \$8,300. The estimated breakdown between land and improvements was: land, \$1,300, or \$.120 per sq. ft., and improvements \$7,000. This reflects a one-cent decline in land value.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

The approved values of the original improvements acquired by the state are as follows: bisected residence, \$2,000; bisected garage, \$10; septic tank, drive and landscaping, \$345; and fence, \$75. Payments of damages were: Land (due to reduction in size), \$300; and improvements (bisection), \$3,770.

Construction of the new facility had not begun when the remainder sold. The remainder sold as part of the consideration for another home. The original owners considered the remainder as worth \$1,000 of the purchase price of the new home. The new owners considered the actual cash value of remainder at the time of trade, as being not more than \$500. However, they valued remainder at \$1,000 in May, 1961. Neither value would reflect damages.

Since acquisition, the remainder has not been improved nor has the zoning been changed.

REMAINDER 24

(8-5-99A, 101F, 102 FGH)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting on Ellis Rd. (not developed at acquisition) with access to Handley Rd., an asphalt street, in city of Fort Worth about 6.7 miles from CBD. Known as Lots 13, 14, and 15, Blk. 1, and Lot 13, Blk. 2, of D. M. Davis Addn. Also, a 25 ft. x 399 ft. tract out of the J. E. Brandon Survey which abutts two of the above lots. Area less than 50 percent improved with frame and brick residences, many of them new. Schools and shopping facilities are nearby. Meadowbrook Dr. is a major thoroughfare.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

The following sales were used to give an indication of what the original whole lot value of the subject would have been at the time its remainder sold:

Lot Blk.	Subdivision	Date of Sale	Deed Vol., P.	Area in Sq. Ft.	Sale Price	Value Per Sq. Ft.
8 10	Meadowbrook Est.	6-8-59	3373-53	8,262	\$1,950	\$.236
11 10	Meadowbrook Est.	6-10-60	3453-65	8,260	2,000	.242
15 10	Meadowbrook Est.	11-13-59	3390-435	8,260	2,100	.254

The above lots are two blocks east, one of them fronting on a developed portion of Ellis Rd. Brick homes were built on these lots after they were sold. These homes are very similar to those being built in the adjacent addition.

After the above lot prices were adjusted for time, location, tract size, and topography, the indicated whole lot value was \$.055 per sq. ft. This value applies to the sale dates of both Parts A and B of remainder.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

A payment of \$250 was made for land damages to the remainder due to reduction in size and the loss of some street frontage.

No improvements were on the subject at time of acquisition. The remainder's zoning and land use have not changed as yet.

Part B of remainder (9,050 sq. ft.) sold on 7-6-59, to the same party who purchased Part A, for \$400, or \$.044 per sq. ft. It was a narrow strip which the original owner did not subdivide with the rest of his tract. The state acquired the right of way from this strip on 5-13-59, almost two years after acquisitions were made from Part A. The whole strip was valued at \$.054 per sq. ft. at the time of acquisition. Thus, the purchase price of remainder of strip declined in value \$.010 per sq. ft., indicating that the strip when considered alone was damaged due to the facility. Both parts of the remainder sold before construction had begun on the new facility.

Many new brick homes are being constructed in the area near remainder.

The new owner is trying to get this portion of the D. M. Davis Addn. plat rescinded in an effort to regain ownership of the dedicated cul-de-sac. He reportedly intends to develop the remainder into some type of commercial usage.

REMAINDER 25

(8-5-101 A & B, 102 A & B)

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Location of Property: Fronting on Ellis Rd. (not developed at acquisition) with access to Handley Rd., an asphalt street, in city of Fort Worth about 6.7 miles from CBD. Known as Lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and part of 8 and 9, Blk. 1 and Lots 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and part of 8 and 9, Blk. 2, D. M. Davis Addn. Area is less than 50 percent improved with predominantly brick residences, mostly new. Schools and shopping facilities are convenient. City park is nearby. Meadowbrook Dr. is a major thoroughfare. The typical occupant is in middle income class.

2. Comparable Sale Data:

The following sales were considered by the review appraiser to give an indication of the original whole lot value of subject at the time its remainder sold (11-10-59).

Blk.	Subdivision	Date of Sale	Deed Vol., P.	Area in Sq. Ft.	Sale Price	Value Per Sq. Ft.
8 10	Meadowbrook Est.	6-6-59	3373-53	8,262	\$1,950	\$.236
11 10	Meadowbrook Est.	6-10-60	3453-65	8,260	2,000	.242
15 10	Meadowbrook Est.	11-11-59	3390-45	8,260	2,100	.254

The above lots are about one block east, one of which fronts on Ellis Rd. These lots were later improved with brick homes similar to those which have been constructed on this remainder. After the above lot prices were adjusted for time, location, and tract size, the indicated whole lot value at the remainder sale date was considered to be \$.055 per sq. ft. This value would be higher if lots were serviced with utilities.

The review appraiser indicated that the area would have developed about the way it has regardless of the construction of the new facility.

3. Changes in Land Use and Value of Remainder After Acquisition:

The whole property was vacant at the time of acquisition. Only four of the 15 lots were appraised originally. The review appraiser agreed that the per lot value placed upon the four would be applicable to the other 11 lots. Thus, a whole property value was computed on that basis. A payment of \$530 was made for land damages to remainder due to reduction in size and the loss of some street frontage.

Construction of the new facility had not begun when the remainder sold. The new owner applied for and was granted a slight revision in the original subdivision plat. He combined the remainders of lots 8 and 9 in Blk. 1 (south side of Ellis Rd.) and designated them as Lot 8R. He did the same to the remainders of Lots 8 and 9 in Blk. 2 (north side of Ellis Rd.), designating them as Lot 8R.

The review appraiser indicated that the remainder had 13 sites suitable for residential use. No zoning change had been applied for when investigated. At time of investigation, six of the remainder lots had been improved with brick homes which sold in the \$13,500 to \$15,000 range. Ellis Rd. had been improved.

APPENDIX B

Suggested Forms for Guiding Remainder Studies and Reporting Results

Data forms have a number of related purposes. The manner in which forms are designed is critical to the efficient completion and accuracy of case studies. Their content and their format should be decided with the nature of their anticipated use as the major consideration.

What purposes do data forms serve? Obviously they are used to assemble and centralize data on a particular subject in an orderly fashion. The purpose thus served is to *record data* according to an established study plan. At this stage they are guides for the researcher; they put before him the relevant facts which he then combines into a meaningful analysis, a case history in the case of remainder parcels.

Another purpose for which data forms may be used is to *report findings*. For remainder studies especially it may be desirable to obtain uniformity in the presentation of findings. Usually, a large number of answers is required. Also, case studies often are grouped, and it may be desirable that their results may later lend themselves to comparison or aggregative analysis. Without uniformity, readability may be limited and direct comparisons may become quite difficult.

Still another purpose data forms may serve is documentation. Sources of information must be given to permit verification. Also, if follow-up studies are anticipated, documentation reduces duplication and waste in future efforts.

When a continuing review of all remainders in a project is planned, still another purpose is to be filled by data forms. They aid in making such a review orderly and give a continuing indication of its stages and progress.

If coding for card-punching and machine-tabulation is to be done, data forms must be compatible with this procedure. The collection of results into a central file which is to be used either as a source of specific kinds of histories or for aggregative analysis probably will necessitate the coding of data to assure maximum utility of the file and its contents. Without early preparation and provision of forms, coding may become unduly laborious.

These considerations of the various uses of data forms are felt to be a necessary preface to the presentation of several suggested forms. The main body of this report has dealt with some of these individual forms in detail. Additional comments seem appropriate here, however. Copies of the forms used by the Texas Transportation Institute are presented at the end of this appendix.

Project Header Sheet

The "project header sheet" is suggested when a system of files is desired which assembles together case

history data for all remainders within a project. This form's purpose is to allow quick identification of the project including its general characteristics. At the same time, a great deal of copying for individual remainders of data pertinent to all is saved. The "project header sheet" also can be useful to keep a record of periodic reviews for remainder sales.

Remainder Identification Sheet

It is recommended that such a form be completed for every remainder parcel created by right-of-way acquisition. Whether investigation is to be selective and sporadic or complete and periodic, an identification sheet for each remainder is an important step. It initiates a separate file from which additional study, however conceived, can be launched. Incidentally, "remainder identification sheets" may well be considered as a part of the file on comparables.

The identification sheets for each project should be preceded by a project header sheet.

Remainder History Schedule

As is the case with forms previously discussed, any number of acceptable formats could be developed for recording a remainder's case history. The order of items and the terminology is important, but the most critical feature is the content. The more complete the data schedule, the better the analysis it will yield and support. The great danger seems to be oversimplification; especially until case analysis is attempted, one is likely to cut data requirements "to the essentials," assuming that these are positively known.

The simplest type of remainder study would involve only the selling price of the remainder. This would be compared with the remainder's appraised value before damages. Comparables would not be used. What are essential data for so simple a study? Is the answer meaningful if it is not known whether improvements were added or removed prior to the sale? Are not at least a few characteristics of the remainder (and perhaps the original whole property) important to the case study? Fortunately, little extra effort is needed to obtain a rather full description instead of a minimum one. Thus the information provided for in a history schedule can be comprehensive with little fear of inefficiency.

The decision concerning the use of comparables or control data is an important one. Without such data, inferred enhancements and damages may bear a close resemblance to propaganda. If this is the purpose of the studies, comparables may not be needed. If the complete facts are desired, remainder sales prices should not be used alone, except in those cases (as previously cited in body of the report) for which time lapse is obviously not a critical factor.

Whether or not comparables are used, there yet is certain information needed to assure a useful remainder study. The "remainder history schedule" that follows contains many types of information. Experience of investigations may reveal some items to be nonessential; other more important data may need to be added.

The Analysis Sheet

The "analysis sheet" used in this report is considered to be a reporting device. Its purpose is to present to readers what has been found. Ordinarily the findings cannot be presented meaningfully by one or two numbers. A brief summary of the nature of the original property and the nature of the taking and of the remainder as well as the market consequences to the remainder seemed to be minimum requirements. Many words can be saved through the use of a map and photographs. Some documentation of results, such as sources of information, may be needed; in this report a supplemental sheet was used to present additional explanation and documentation.

The Bureau of Public Roads Form

The United States Bureau of Public Roads has developed a form to guide remainder studies. This

form, "Case Study of Severance Damages," has been adapted to a coding system in anticipation of central files of data cards and of machine tabulation. The form deserves careful consideration.

The Bureau of Public Roads form has several desirable features, among which is its use of check items. It will serve well for the assembly of results in a central place from scattered points and investigators. However, it seems that some supplementary forms may be required in preparation for the completion of the Bureau of Public Roads standard form, if a continuing review of remainders is adopted as the course of action.

Supplementing the Bureau of Public Roads Form

To incorporate the Bureau of Public Roads form into an overall study plan of continuing review, the investigator can make good use of a "project header sheet" and a "remainder identification sheet" or reasonable substitutes, by whatever name they are called. If comparables are to be utilized, he will need some device to record and report the additional data and analyses.

The Bureau of Public Roads form may be adopted to guide a major part of a remainder study with these or such other supplementation as may be desired. Certainly it should serve well as a device for reporting case histories to some central file.

FORM I

PROJECT HEADER SHEET
FOR
REMAINDER STUDIES

HIGHWAY DEPT. DISTRICT NO. _____ ROW PROJECT NO. _____

LOCATION: STATE _____ COUNTY _____ NEAREST METROPOLITAN AREA _____

NEAREST URBAN PLACE _____ AND DISTANCE TO _____

NAME AND NUMBER OF HIGHWAY _____

DESCRIPTION OF HIGHWAY _____

DATE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS CONCERNING HIGHWAY _____

DATE ROW ACQUISITION WAS STARTED (date ROW map approved) _____

NUMBER OF REMAINDERS CREATED _____

DATE HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION BEGAN (date of contract) _____

DATE CONSTRUCTION WAS COMPLETED (open for traffic) _____

DATES OF INVESTIGATION FOR REMAINDER SALES:	DATE COMPLETED	NO. OF SALES
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

FORM II

REMAINDER IDENTIFICATION SHEET

HIGHWAY DEPT. DIST. NO. _____ PROJECT NO. _____ PARCEL NO. _____

SUBDIVISION _____ LOT _____ BLK _____

OR

SURVEY _____ ABSTRACT NO. _____ PLAT BOOK BLOCK NO. _____
(City, County, or Others)

DATE OF FINAL APPRAISED VALUE _____ DATE OF CLOSING _____

OWNER AT ACQUISITION _____ OBTAINED BY NEGOTIATION: YES _____ NO _____

PROPERTY USE AT ACQUISITION _____ ZONING _____ RESTRICTIONS _____

HIGHEST AND BEST USE OF REMAINDER AFTER ACQUISITION _____

FINAL RECOMMENDED VALUES:

		LAND	IMPROVEMENT
Whole property	_____ sq.ft./acres	\$ _____	\$ _____
Part acquired	_____ sq.ft./acres	\$ _____	\$ _____
Damages and reason	_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
Enhancements and reason	_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
Remainder after acquisition	_____ sq.ft./acres	\$ _____	\$ _____

COURT AWARD:

	PART ACQUIRED		REMAINDER	DAMAGES
	LAND	IMPROVEMENTS	LAND	IMPROVEMENTS
Commissioners	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
Jury verdict	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____

PROPORTIONED BY DISTRICT ON BASIS OF INDIVIDUAL RECOMMENDED VALUES: YES _____ NO _____

SALE DATA ON REMAINDER:

DATE	GRANTEE	VOL.	PAGE	CONSIDERATION	REVENUE STAMPS
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

ZONING AT SALE _____ SPECIFIC USE _____
(At Sale)

FORM III

REMAINDER HISTORY SCHEDULE

A. WHOLE PROPERTY — BEFORE ACQUISITION

1. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS:

- a. Dimensions of land _____
- b. Shape of lot or tract _____
- c. Grade with roads or streets _____
- d. Drainage _____
- e. Visibility _____

2. LOCATION AND TYPE OF ROAD SERVICE:

- a. Name and type of major street _____
- b. Access on major street (one-way or two-way, etc.) _____
- c. Name and type of other abutting street _____
- d. Access on other road _____
- e. Distance to major shopping center _____
- f. Time _____
- g. Distance to CBD _____
- h. Time _____

3. NEIGHBORHOOD AND FACILITIES:

- a. Nature of utilities and other facilities _____
- b. Percent build-up of neighborhood _____
- c. Age, type and condition of surrounding improvements _____
- d. Nuisances, hazards or other threats to neighborhood _____
- e. Condition of streets _____
- f. Shopping facilities _____
- g. Schools _____
- h. Income class of typical residents _____
- i. Typical frontage _____
- j. depth _____ of lots
- k. Other _____

4. DESCRIPTION AND VALUE OF IMPROVEMENTS ON WHOLE PROPERTY:

a. Type of Building and Construction	b. No. of Sq. Ft.	c. Approved Value	d. If Retained, Cost to State	e. If in Taking Part or All
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

5. IF INCOME PROPERTY, TERMS OF LEASE:

- a. Rental rate \$ _____ per year
- b. Estimated net income by income approach \$ _____
(Use value of appraiser whose estimate is nearest to total approved value)
- c. Capitalized at _____% interest plus _____% for recapture of capital
- d. Estimated value by income approach \$ _____

B. REMAINDER — AFTER ACQUISITION

1. DESIGN OF NEW FACILITY AT REMAINDER _____

2. ACCESS RIGHTS:

- a. Were access rights purchased? Yes _____ No _____
- b. Was access impaired? Explain _____
- c. Is there direct access on frontage road? Yes _____ No _____

3. IF REMAINDER IS ON FRONTAGE ROAD:

- a. Is frontage road one-way _____ or two-way _____?
- b. Distance to nearest "on" ramp _____ feet
- c. Distance to nearest "off" ramp _____ feet

4. DISTANCE TO NEAREST INTERCHANGE _____ feet

5. DISTANCE TO CBD: a. Miles _____ b. Time _____

6. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF LAND:

- a. Dimensions of land _____
- b. Shapes of remainder _____
- c. Grades with roads or streets _____
- d. Drainage _____
- e. Visibility _____

7. IMPROVEMENTS REMOVED: YES _____ NO _____ NOT APPLICABLE _____

Explain: _____

C. REMAINDER — AT TIME OF SALE

1. REMAINDER SALE DATA:

a. Date of Sale	b. Area in Sq. Ft. or Acres	c. Verified Price	d. Est. Value Improvements	e. Unit Land Value
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Land description if only part sold: _____

2. SOURCE OF INFORMATION SUBSEQUENT SALE _____

3. IF OLD IMPROVEMENTS WERE MOVED TO REMAINDER: _____

- a. Cost to move \$ _____
- b. Cost to repair \$ _____

4. BUILDING PERMIT DATA ON REMAINDER:

a. Date	b. Amount	c. No. of Sq. Ft.	d. Building and Types of Construction
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

5. COST OF NEW IMPROVEMENTS PLACED ON REMAINDER:

a. Year Built	b. Total Cost	c. Source of Information
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

6. CHANGES IN NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS SINCE ACQUISITION:

Social, Economic, Physical _____

7. IF REMAINDER WAS INCOME PROPERTY:

- a. Rental rate \$ _____ per year
- b. Estimated net income \$ _____ per year
- c. Estimated capitalized value \$ _____

8. REMARKS (BY ITEM NO.) _____

D. SALES DATA OF COMPARABLES

1. COMPARABLES USED IN APPRAISAL OF WHOLE PROPERTY AT TIME OF ACQUISITION:

(Use values of appraiser whose estimate is nearest to total approved value.)

	Street Address and Distance to Subject	Date Of Sale	Deed Vol. Page	Area in Sq.Ft./Ac	Sale Price	Value of Impr'mts	Total Value
a.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
b.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
c.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
d.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
e.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
f.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

- g. Type of adjustment made on each comparable (By letter): (1) Time _____
 (2) Location _____ (3) Tract size _____ (4) Quality of improvements _____
 (5) Topography _____ (6) Others _____
- h. Total indicated value of whole property \$ _____

2. COMPARABLES TO ORIGINAL WHOLE PROPERTY USED AT TIME OF REMAINDER SALE:

(If possible, use Item D 1 comparable property resales.)

	Street Address and Distance to Subject	Date of Sale	Deed Vol. Page	Area in Sq.Ft/Ac	Sale Price	Value of Impr'mts	Total Value
a.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
b.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
c.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
d.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
e.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
f.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
g.	Type of adjustments made on each comparable (By letter): (1) Time _____						
	(2) Location _____ (3) Tract size _____ (4) Quality of improvements _____						
	(5) Topography _____ (6) Others _____						

3. ESTIMATED VALUE OF ORIGINAL WHOLE PROPERTY AT TIME OF REMAINDER SALE:

(Use last or most reliable sale)

- a. Land @ _____ per sq. ft/ac = \$ _____
- b. Improvements _____
- c. Total indicated value of whole property: _____

4. DESCRIBE SOURCES OF SALE DATA VERIFICATION _____

E. REMARKS:
