

CAC Independent Research Report

Regarding TIP Amendment: FPN: 445056-1

RESEARCHER: AMY ESPINOSA, AT-LARGE REPRESENTING WOMEN

GOAL

To conduct factual and unbiased research to better understand the perspective of the demographic I represent with regard to the loss of their homes under eminent domain to expand the I-4 interchange northbound to I-275 (TIP Amendment: FPN: 445056-1).

RESEARCH HIGHLIGHTS

1. Spoke to two home owners and one tenant to better understand their perspective on the proposed acquisition.
 - Clearly communicated I was a concerned citizen doing independent research to bring their point of view back to the CAC.
 - Stated that I was not affiliated with FDOT or the MPO nor did I have any legal background or knowledge on the topic of eminent domain.
2. [Read the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 \(Chapter 61\)](#), [Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan \(April 2020\)](#) and reviewed the [TIS Master Plan \(1989\)](#) relating to the area of interest (2B).
3. Called FDOT representative Joseph Murphy, District Right of Way Administrator, Acquisition to better understand if there are provisions given to offset the property taxes when a new home is purchased by the home owner.
 - Joe offered to give a presentation on right of way acquisitions to our committee.
4. Called Hillsborough County Property Appraiser to better understand if any provisions are given to home owners impacted by eminent domain acquisitions.
 - [Florida homeowners have Portability](#), also known as the “Transfer of Homestead Assessment Difference”. It is the ability to transfer the dollar benefit of the Homestead CAP from one Homestead to another.
5. Spoke with 3 professionals in the real estate industry to better understand the approximate home values based on today’s market.
 - Two Realtors who have been in the business for more than 15 years; one of which has also been in commercial real estate for more than 30 years.
 - One Appraiser who’s company works specifically to appraise homes that will be taken under eminent domain.

PROPERTY INFO & RESIDENT PERSPECTIVES*

*AVM (Automated Value Model) is an approximate range given by licensed Realtors based on the market as of May 2021. FDOT has confirmed that appraisals have not been completed nor have they made an offer to homeowners at this time.

[2502 N 12th St](#) (Tenant)

Built in 1923 on a 5200 sqft lot (52 x 100)

[2020 Taxes](#) were 1,418.03
Square footage is 1,668

Assessed Value: 118,313
Zillow Estimate: 211,922
AVM Range: \$122,000 - 272,000

[1013 14th Ave](#) (Owner)

Retired. No mortgage. Well informed. Does not appear to be bothered by the loss of the home but is adamant about getting a fair price.

Built in 1908 on a 4,845 sqft lot (50 x 96.9)

[2020 Taxes](#) were 164.74
Square footage is 1,332

Assessed Value: 119,422
Zillow Estimate: 219,275
AVM Range: \$156,000 – 230,000

[1011 14th Ave](#) (Owner)

Retired. No mortgage. Well informed and has stated this is not the first time the home has been threatened. Does not seem to be bothered by the loss of the home but is adamant about getting a fair price.

'I don't want to get in the way of progress. I was a truck driver and I see the backups daily in my backyard.'

Built in 1949 on a 5000 sqft. Lot (50 x 100)

2020 Taxes were 539.00
Square footage is 853

Assessed Value: 95,195
Zillow Estimate: 185,220
AVM Range: \$127,000 – 195,000

[1005 14th Ave](#) (Tenant)

Built in on a 8,800 sqft lot (88 x 100)

2020 Taxes were 1,423.81
Square footage is 1,147

Assessed Value: 147,348
Zillow Estimate: 211,807
AVM Range: \$147,000 – 184,000

[914 14th Ave](#) (Tenant)

Built in on a 18,000 sqft lot (90 x 200)

2020 Taxes were 2,129.20
Square footage is 2,634

Assessed Value: \$236,367
Zillow Estimate: 342,994
AVM Range: \$235,000 – 318,000

[702 E Columbus Dr](#) (Tenant)

Did not seem to be aware that the home could be taken under eminent domain. Left a copy of the Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan (April 2020).

Built in 1915 on a 5,170 sqft lot (55 x 94)

2020 Taxes were 1,701.48.
Square footage is 1,613

Assessed Value: \$122,598
Zillow Estimate: 272,802
AVM Range: \$161,000 – 305,000

ADDENDUM

Due to personal circumstance I, Amy Espinosa, was unable to attend the June 2nd CAC Meeting to take questions or present the research contained herein.

This addendum has been added in response to questions sent via email from Rick Fernandez, Hispanic at-large member of the CAC. His questions and my responses are below with each name preceding the respective question/response pairing.

Additional Context:

This research was completed within a short timeline (little more than a week). It is in no way in-depth research and was merely prompted by my own internal quest to better understand the perspective of the residents I represent to bring that perspective back to the committee in a factual and unbiased way. For this reason my focus was solely on speaking to the people who may lose their homes.

Rick Fenandez (RF):

As I understand Amy's report, she spoke with one "tenant" and two home owners connected seven parcels we have been discussing. First: is that correct on head count? Were there any other collateral contacts? Any follow up conversations?

Amy Espinosa (AE):

Yes that is correct: one tenant and two owners. With respect to collateral contacts and/or followup conversations, due to the time I had, I did not interview any nearby residents whose properties are located outside of the 'acquisition zone'.

I conducted this research in a manner that would respect the of privacy of those involved. I only approached people who were outside and those that did not have gated entryways. Of the six homes identified within the report, two homes had gates with no one visibly in view to approach and one residence had no response to my door knocking. No contact was made with residents of 3 tenant occupied properties and I left no contact information. Two attempts were made.

To those I did speak with, I offered my contact info in the event they wanted to follow up at a later date. Neither home owner was interested and the tenant offered to pass my contact info along to the owner. Although the people I spoke to were very polite and helpful, they did not seem to be interested in continuing the conversation at a later time and explained they said what they wanted to say. For this reason, I did not contact them again.

RF:

Of those contacted, whether generally "informed" on the issues or not, have any of them been contacted by FDOT or notified in any other way about the ROW acquisitions being envisioned NOW. This area has been under FDOT cloud for years. The fact that someone is generally aware their home is in the zone for some future taking is not the same as being aware of FDOT's plans today.

AE:

The two owners did appear to have knowledge of the current TIP proposal and recent contact with FDOT. One even stated that they had already seen homes that were available.

- When I spoke with the FDOT representative, Joseph, he was not aware any homes had been seen and indicated that was further along in the process. For this reason, the statement from the resident was left out of my report as I could not determine if it actually occurred.

The tenant I spoke to did not appear to be as informed as the two home owners and I did not confirm whether FDOT had already reached out to them. To be fair, I did not speak with this resident nearly as long as the other two. They were polite but did not seem to have the interest to discuss the matter with me. Instead, they offered to pass along the message to the home owner. Silently acknowledging their discomfort, I thanked them for their time and offered to leave a copy of the Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan (April 2020) along with my contact information on their porch. They accepted. I never received any communication from the actual homeowner regarding this matter.

RF:

Although beyond the scope of Amy's efforts, I have one other question: We have been discussing FDOT's acquisition of 7 parcels for \$2.5M. How many other properties (and at what price point) have previously been taken/purchased within the footprint being impacted by FDOT's proposed lane modification from WB I4 to NB I275? This isn't JUST about 7 parcels ... more properties are involved and (I suspect) people too ... Thoughts??

AE:

You are correct this was beyond the scope of my research. If a list cannot be provided for some reason, per your request, additional properties can be found by searching on the Hillsborough County Property Appraiser's website by address (in the event you do not already know this).

Below are links to the FDOT properties I am aware of in the vicinity of this amendment. All are vacant.

- [1009 14th Ave](#)
- [1015 14th Ave](#)
- [1017 14th Ave](#)
- [916 14th Ave](#)
- [918 14th Ave](#)
- [920 14th Ave](#)