

March 14, 2014

#### TO THE INTERESTED PARTIES

(See Attached Transmittal List)

Re: HEX 2014-003 - Proposed Local Improvement District No. 8660 - Formation

Enclosed please find the Hearing Examiner's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommendation to the Tacoma City Council entered in the matter on March 14, 2014, as the result of a public hearing held on March 10, 2014.

Sincerely,

Louisa Legg

Legal Assistant

Enclosure (1) – Findings/Conclusions/Recommendation

Attachment (1) - Transmittal List

CERTIFICATION

On this day, I forwarded a true and accurate copy of the docume o which this certificate is affixed via United States Postal Service postage prepair on via delivery through City of Tacoma Mail Services to the parties or attorneys of record herein. I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that

the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED

# <u>Proposed L.I.D. No. 8660 – Formation</u> <u>Hearing Examiner Recommendation Transmittal List</u>

#### Via Inter-office Mail:

Ralph Rodriguez, L.I.D. Administrator, City of Tacoma, Dept. of Public Works
Ricardo Noguera, Director, Community and Economic Development, City of Tacoma
Carey Jenkins, Housing Division Manager, Community and Economic Development, City of Tacoma
Liz Wheeler, Customer Service Rep. Tech., Finance Dept., Treasurer's Office, City of Tacoma
Gary Gates, Operations Manager, Tacoma Public Utilities, Water Division
Ryan Flynn, P. E., Sr. Principal Engineer, Tacoma Public Utilities, Water Distribution Engineeringn
Teresa Dressler, P.E., Environmental Services, Science and Engineering Division, City of Tacoma
Chris Larson, P.E., Public Works Engineering, City of Tacoma
Tacoma City Clerk's Office
Pierce County Auditor's Office

#### Via First Class Mail:

Bruce E. Allen, 5047 North Bristol Street, Tacoma, WA 98407-2125

Donald B. Bickford, 5044 North Bristol Street, Tacoma, WA 98407-2126

Elvine E. Carman, 5021 North Bristol Street, Tacoma, WA 98407-2125

Mary E. "Liz" Chaffee, 3005 North Mason Avenue, Tacoma, WA 98407-5409

Douglas and Susan Critchlow, 5002 North Bristol Street, Tacoma, WA 98407

Robert J. & Sharon Dahmen, 5001 North Bristol Street, Tacoma, WA 98407-2125

Fred Hall, 4017 North 14th Street, Tacoma, WA 98406

Michael P. R. and Alessandra Heiserman, 5020 North Bristol Street, Tacoma, WA 98407-2126

Nanci L. Holman-Smith, 5026 North Bristol Street, Tacoma, WA 98407-2126

James P. and Becky J. Hunt, 5017 North Bristol Street, Tacoma, WA 98407-2125

Judith A. Jones, 5016 North Bristol Street, Tacoma, WA 98407-2126

Thomas L. Jordin, 5025 North Bristol Street, Tacoma, WA 98407-2125

John G. Orr, 4105 N 30<sup>th</sup> Street, Tacoma, WA 98407-5313

Linda M. Robson, 5022 North Bristol Street, Tacoma, WA 98407-2126

Marcia N. Stulgis, 4124 North 31st Street, Tacoma, WA 98407-5405

Lamar and Jean A. Teat, 5043 North Bristol Street, Tacoma, WA 98407-2125

AND RECOMMENDATION

City of Tacoma Office of the Hearing Examiner Tacoma Municipal Building 747 Market Street, Room 720 Tacoma, WA 98402-3768 (253)591-5195 FAX (253)591-2003



-1-

21

20

19

Segment 2: Construction of permanent alley pavement, with a structural section and storm drainage, on the alley between North 30<sup>th</sup> Street and North 31st Street from Monroe Street to Mason Avenue.

Such improvements would include all other work necessary to complete the same in accordance with the plans and specifications to be prepared by the Tacoma City Engineer. Resolution No. 38848 (proposed Local Improvement District [L.I.D.] No. 8660) is incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth. Ex. 6.

- 2. Resolution No. 38848 set the date of March 10, 2014, for the Hearing Examiner to conduct a public hearing to consider construction of the identified improvements and to consider formation of L.I.D. No. 8660 in order to provide long-term financing for the improvements. Notice of Public Hearing for proposed L.I.D. No. 8660 was published in the Tacoma Daily Index on February 20 and 21, 2014. Ex. 1; Ex. 7; Rodriguez Testimony. Notice of Public Hearing letters were mailed to property owners of record on February 21, 2014. Ex. 1: Ex. 8: Rodriguez Testimony. An Affidavit of Publication has been filed with the City Clerk, as well as plans and estimates required by said resolution.
- 3. Pursuant to applicable law and the direction of the Tacoma City Council, the Hearing Examiner convened a public hearing on March 10, 2014, to consider the formation of L.I.D. No. 8660. The hearing was conducted in the First Floor Council Chambers, Tacoma Municipal Building, 747 Market Street, and was open to the public.
- 4. The Department of Public Works (DPW), L.I.D. Section prepared a staff report regarding the project which was entered into the record as Exhibit 1. The DPW's report

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND RECOMMENDATION - 2 -



indicates the estimated project cost of proposed L.I.D. No. 8660 totals \$555,320.10 distributed between the segments as follows:

\$204,151.00

Segment 1:	Total Assessed to Property Owners Surface Water Construction Fund Estimated Segment Cost	\$215,169.10 \$136,000.00 <b>\$351,169.10</b>
Segment 2:	Total Assessed to Property Owners Surface Water Construction Fund	\$155,151.00 \$ 49,000.00

**Estimated Segment Cost** 

5. The total amount being assessed to property owners within the proposed district is \$370,320.10. The City of Tacoma's Environmental Services Science & Engineering Surface Water Construction Fund will contribute \$185,000.00 towards the total estimated project cost. The proposed L.I.D. has a 20-year assessment roll and the estimated cost per Assessable Unit of Frontage (A.U.F.) for **Segment 1** is \$190.00 and for **Segment 2** is \$128.00. Ex. 1.

#### Segment 1

- 6. Mr. Rodriguez indicated that a zone and termini formula was used to estimate the preliminary assessments for each property within Segment 1 of the proposed L.I.D. (RCW 35.44.030 and .040). *Rodriguez Testimony*.
- Bristol Street between North 50<sup>th</sup> Street and North 51<sup>st</sup> Street is currently an oil 7. mat surface. The roadway is being impacted by a sanitary sewer and water project in the area being conducted by the City of Tacoma's Environmental Services Department (Environmental Services). In the ordinary course of business, at the conclusion of their work, Environmental

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND RECOMMENDATION



Services would replace the street with a surface similar to the existing roadway. Some of the neighbors in the area hoped to upgrade the roadway to a full street section with concrete curbs and gutters. A neighborhood advisory survey for such an improvement was circulated in 2013 and signed by the owners of 54.45 percent of the property within the proposed improvement district. *Ex. 3; Ex. 5; Rodriguez Testimony*.

8. Prior to the hearing, Segment 1 property owners Nanci Holman (Smith) (*Ex. 12*) and Susan Critchlow (*Ex. 13*) filed written protests against formation of the district. A number of additional property owners within the district appeared at the hearing and lodged their protest against formation of Segment 1, including Linda M. Robson, Elvine E. Carman, Michael Heiserman, Donald B. Bickford, Robert J. Dahmen, and Judith A. Jones. *Exs. 20-25*, *respectively*. At the conclusion of the hearing, the protest rate had increased to 53.12 percent. *Ex. 26*. Based upon that remonstrance rate, the DPW is recommending against formation of Segment 1 of proposed L.I.D. No. 8660. *Id*.

### Segment 2

9. The Segment 2 improvements would encompass construction of alley pavement with a structural section and storm drainage on the alley between North 30<sup>th</sup> Street and North 31<sup>st</sup> Street from Monroe Street to Mason Avenue. The existing alley is a 12-foot oil mat surface in very poor repair. It would be replaced with a paved surface 16 feet in width. Mr. Rodriguez testified that the zone and termini method was used to estimate the preliminary

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND RECOMMENDATION City of Tacoma
Office of the Hearing Examiner
Tacoma Municipal Building
747 Market Street, Room 720
Tacoma, WA 98402-3768
(253)591-5195 FAX (253)591-2003



- 4 -

assessments for each property within Segment 2 of the proposed L.I.D. (RCW 35.44.030 and .040). *Rodriguez Testimony*.

- 10. A neighborhood advisory survey was circulated in or around 2012 and signed by the owners of 50.78 percent of the property within the improvement district. *Ex. 4; Ex. 5*. Prior to the hearing, the DPW received inquiry from property owner Marcia Stulgis who was seeking information about the L.I. D. Assistance Program. She did not register a protest to the project. *Ex. 15; Rodriguez Testimony*. Property owner Mary Liz Chaffee appeared at the hearing with questions about the project, but she did not protest formation of the district. *Chaffee Testimony*. At the conclusion of the hearing, the remonstrance rate for Segment 2 of proposed L.I.D. No. 8660 was zero percent.
- 11. The verbatim digital transcript in the referred-to matter is in the custody of the Examiner's Office, the file is in the custody of the City Clerk, and both are available for review by the Council and any party in interest.
- 12. Any Conclusion of Law hereinafter stated which may be deemed to be a Finding of Fact herein is hereby adopted as such.
  - 13. From these Findings of Fact the Examiner makes the following:

# **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

1. The Hearing Examiner has jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to *Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC)* 1.23.050.A.2.

- 5 -

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND RECOMMENDATION

City of Tacoma
Office of the Hearing Examiner
Tacoma Municipal Building
747 Market Street, Room 720
Tacoma, WA 98402-3768
(253)591-5195 FAX (253)591-2003



- 2. The purposes of the initial hearing in regard to formation of an L.I.D. are to determine if the formation of the district should proceed and if the limits of the district are proper. *Chandler v. City of Puyallup*, 70 Wash. 632, 633, 127 P.293 (1912). Accordingly, the only issues properly presented during the formation stage of the L.I.D. process are:
  - (a) The jurisdiction or authority of the city to proceed with creating the district.
  - (b) The proper boundaries of the district.

Underground Equality v. Seattle, 6 Wn. App. 338, 342, 492 P.2d 1071 (1972).

- 3. No party to these proceedings has challenged the City's authority to create L.I.D. No. 8660 under the terms of RCW, Chapter 35.43.<sup>1</sup>
- 4. The City's authority to create an L.I.D. initiated by resolution, as is the case here, is limited if owners of property shouldering a sufficient proportion of the project costs protest formation of the district:

**35.43.180 Restraint by protest.** The jurisdiction of the legislative authority of a city or town to proceed with any local

- 6 -

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND RECOMMENDATION

RCW 35.43.040 provides, in pertinent part, that:

Whenever the public interest or convenience may require, the legislative authority of any city or town may order the whole or any part of any local improvement including but not restricted to those, or any combination thereof, listed below to be constructed, reconstructed, repaired, or renewed and landscaping including but not restricted to the planting, setting out, cultivating, maintaining and renewing of shade or ornamental trees and shrubbery thereon; may order any and all work to be done necessary for completion thereof; and may levy and collect special assessments on property specially benefited thereby to pay the whole or any part of the expense thereof, viz:

<sup>(1)</sup> Alleys, avenues, boulevards, lanes, park drives, parkways, parking facilities, public places, public squares, public streets, their grading, regrading, planking, replanking, paving, repaving, macadamizing, remacadamizing, graveling, regraveling, piling, repiling, capping, recapping, or other improvement; if the management and control of park drives, parkways, and boulevards is vested in a board of park commissioners, the plans and specifications for their improvement must be approved by the board of park commissioners before their adoption; . . .

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

improvement initiated by resolution shall be divested by a protest filed with the city or town council within thirty days from the date of passage of the ordinance ordering the improvement, signed by the owners of the property within the proposed local improvement district or utility local improvement district subject to sixty percent or more of the total cost of the improvement including federally-owned or other non-assessable property as shown and determined by the preliminary estimates and assessment roll of the proposed improvement district or, if all or part of the local improvement district or utility local improvement district lies outside of the city or town, such jurisdiction shall be divested by a protest filed in the same manner and signed by the owners of property which is within the proposed local improvement district or utility local improvement district but outside the boundaries of the city or town, and which is subject to sixty percent or more of that part of the total cost of the improvement allocable to property within the proposed local improvement district or utility local improvement district but outside the boundaries of the city or town, including federallyowned or other non-assessable property: ... (Emphasis added.)

RCW 35.43.180.

5. The City of Tacoma, however, has further limited its authority to proceed with formation of an L.I.D. in the face of protest by adopting Resolution No. 37956, which expresses the Council's policy to refrain from forming an L.I.D. if property owners representing 50 percent or more of the total assessments protest formation of the district. This policy contains an exception allowing formation if the City Council has previously determined the L.I.D. to be in the best interest of the City.

21 FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW,

AND RECOMMENDATION

City of Tacoma
Office of the Hearing Examiner
Tacoma Municipal Building
747 Market Street, Room 720
Tacoma, WA 98402-3768
(253)591-5195 FAX (253)591-2003



- 7 -

6. Since the rate of protest against formation of Segment 1 of proposed L.I.D. No.
8660 rose above 50 percent <sup>2</sup> , the City's policies do not support formation of Segment 1 of the
proposed district. Segment 2 of proposed L.I.D. No. 8660 has not been protested by any of the
property owners within its boundaries, therefore, the City has the authority by statute and its
own L.I.D. policies to proceed with the formation of the Segment 2 of proposed L.I.D. No.
8660.

7. Robert Dahmen, a property owner in Segment 1, presented evidence that his property already has curb, gutter and sidewalk improvements and that it would not benefit from the proposed L.I.D. *Ex. 18*. It is not necessary to reach a conclusion regarding the benefit, if any, to Mr. Dahmen's property because Segment 1 of the proposed L.I.D. does not meet the protest rate criterion for formation. In all other respects, the proposed L.I.D. boundaries appear to embrace as nearly as practicable all property that will be specially benefited by proposed L.I.D. No. 8660. The boundaries of Segments 1 and 2 of the proposed L.I.D. include only those properties that will have access to the alley/street improvements. The benefits of the project are special to those properties and, accordingly, they have been properly included within the boundaries of proposed L.I.D. No. 8660.

8. Based on the foregoing, the Hearing Examiner concludes that Segment 1 of proposed L.I.D. No. 8660 does not meet the City's policies governing improvement district

-8-

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND RECOMMENDATION City of Tacoma
Office of the Hearing Examiner
Tacoma Municipal Building
747 Market Street, Room 720
Tacoma, WA 98402-3768
(253)591-5195 FAX (253)591-2003

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> By the conclusion of the hearing, protest rates for the project were: (1) Segment 1 - 53.12 percent; (2) Segment 2 - zero percent (Ex. 26).

1	formation and should not be formed. Segment 2 of proposed L.I.D. No. 8660 meets the		
2	requirements of state law and the City's policies governing improvement district formation and		
3	should be formed.		
4	9. Any Finding of Fact hereinbefore stated which may be deemed to be a Conclusion		
5	of Law herein is hereby adopted as such.		
6	Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the Hearing		
7	Examiner enters the following recommendation:		
8	RECOMMENDATION:		
9	Based on applicable Tacoma City Council policies and state law with respect to		
10	formation of local improvement districts, the Hearing Examiner recommends the City Council		
11	refrain from forming Segment 1 of proposed Local Improvement District No. 8660. Based		
12	upon the same authorities, the Hearing Examiner further recommends the City Council should		
13	form Segment 2 of proposed Local Improvement District No. 8660		
14	<b>DATED</b> this 14 <sup>th</sup> day of March, 2014.		
15			
16	Twee T. Macleod		
17	PHYLLIS K. MACLEOD, Hearing Examiner		
18			
19			
20			
21	FINDINGS OF FACT,  CONCLUSIONS OF LAW,  AND RECOMMENDATION  City of Tacoma Office of the Hearing Examiner Tacoma Municipal Building 747 Market Street, Room 720		

**ORIGINAL** 

747 Market Street, Room 720 Tacoma, WA 98402-3768 (253)591-5195 FAX (253)591-2003

#### 2

# 9/400

## 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

# 11

12

13

14

#### 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

# NOTICE

# RECONSIDERATION/APPEAL OF EXAMINER'S RECOMMENDATION

#### **RECONSIDERATION:**

Any aggrieved person or entity having standing under the ordinance governing the matter, or as otherwise provided by law, may file a motion with the Office of the Hearing Examiner requesting reconsideration of a decision or recommendation entered by the Hearing Examiner. A motion for reconsideration must be in writing and must set forth the alleged errors of procedure, fact, or law and must be filed in the Office of the Hearing Examiner within 14 calendar days of the issuance of the Hearing Examiner's decision/recommendation, not counting the day of issuance of the decision/recommendation. If the last day for filing the motion for reconsideration falls on a weekend day or a holiday, the last day for filing shall be the next working day. The requirements set forth herein regarding the time limits for filing of motions for reconsideration and contents of such motions are jurisdictional. Accordingly, motions for reconsideration that are not timely filed with the Office of the Hearing Examiner or do not set forth the alleged errors shall be dismissed by the Hearing Examiner. It shall be within the sole discretion of the Examiner to determine whether an opportunity shall be given to other parties for response to a motion for reconsideration. The Hearing Examiner, after a review of the matter, shall take such further action as he/she deems appropriate, which may include the issuance of a revised decision/recommendation. (*Tacoma Municipal Code* 1.23.140)

# APPEALS TO CITY COUNCIL OF EXAMINER'S RECOMMENDATION:

Within 14 days of the issuance of the Hearing Examiner's final recommendation, any aggrieved person or entity having standing under the ordinance governing such application and feeling that the recommendation of the Hearing Examiner is based on errors of procedure, fact or law shall have the right to appeal the recommendation of the Hearing Examiner by filing written notice of appeal and filing fee with the City Clerk, stating the reasons the Hearing Examiner's recommendation was in error.

# APPEALS SHALL BE REVIEWED AND ACTED UPON BY THE CITY COUNCIL IN ACCORDANCE WITH TMC 1.70.

## **GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR APPEAL:**

The Official Code of the City of Tacoma contains certain procedures for appeal, and while not listing all of these procedures here, you should be aware of the following items which are essential to your appeal. Any answers to questions on the proper procedure for appeal may be found in the City Code sections heretofore cited:

- 1. The written request for review shall also state where the Examiner's findings or conclusions were in error.
- 2. Any person who desires a copy of the electronic recording must pay the cost of reproducing the tapes. If a person desires a written transcript, he or she shall arrange for transcription and pay the cost thereof.

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND RECOMMENDATION

- 10 -

