

March 10, 2015

TO ALL: See Transmittal List

Re: File No. HEX2014-023 - Local Improvement District No. 6979 Assessment Roll

As a courtesy, please find enclosed a copy of the Hearing Examiner's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommendation to the Tacoma City Council entered on March 9, 2015.

Sincerely,

Louisa Legg

Legal Assistant

Enclosure (1)

#### **Transmittal List:**

Fred Walden, PO Box 44856, Tacoma, WA 98448-0856

Axcent (Accent) Servicing LLC, 7505 SE 28<sup>th</sup> St. Apt. 1, Mercer Island, WA 98040-2701

Evelyn J. Peterson TTEE, 4317 NE 66<sup>th</sup> Ave #19, Vancouver, WA 98661-3082

Estate of William G. Bradford c/o Betty J. Welling, Executrix, PO Box 64902,

University Place, WA 98464-0902

Ekawat Sunti, 1425 Sanford Drive, Fort Collins, CO 80526-4251

cc: Tacoma City Clerk's Office (cover letter only)

#### CERTIFICATION

On this day, I forwarded a true and accurate copy of the documents to which this certificate is affixed via United States Postal Service postage prepaid or 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 March 10, 2015, at Tacoma, W.

# **ORIGINAL**



March 9, 2015

Mr. Matthew Austin 6901 S. Madison Street #C Tacoma, WA 98409

Ms. Johanna Herrera 6739 S. Madison Street Tacoma, WA 98409 Mr. Ralph Rodriguez, L.I.D. Administrator City of Tacoma, Dept. of Public Works 747 Market Street, Room 520 Tacoma WA 98402 (Inter-office Mail Delivery)

Re: File No. HEX2014-023 - Local Improvement District No. 6979 Assessment Roll

To the Parties,

In regard to the above referenced matter please find enclosed a copy of the Hearing Examiner's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommendation to the Tacoma City Council entered on March 9, 2015.

Sincerely,

Louisa Legg

Legal Assistant

Enclosure (1)

cc: Tacoma City Clerk's Office

Liz Wheeler, Customer Svc. Rep. Tech, Tacoma City Treasurer's Office

Mr. Steven Harrison, 5905 114th Place SE, Bellevue WA 98006

#### CERTIFICATION

On this day, I forwarded a true and accurate copy of the documents to which this certificate is affixed via United States Postal Service postage prepaid or 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 March 9 2015, at Tacoma, V

CRIGINAL

#### OFFICE OF THE HEARING EXAMINER

#### CITY OF TACOMA

2

1

3

In the Matter of:

NO. 6979

LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW,

AND RECOMMENDATION (ASSESSMENT ROLL)

FILE NO.: HEX 2014-023

A PUBLIC HEARING in the above-captioned matter was held on July 31, 2014, before PHYLLIS K. MACLEOD, the Hearing Examiner for the City of Tacoma. The City of Tacoma appeared through Ralph Rodriguez, Local Improvement District (L.I.D.) Administrator for the City's Department of Public Works. Property owners Matthew Austin and Johanna Herrera appeared and testified. Steven A. Harrison of Harrison Appraisal appeared and testified regarding the 2-4 Unit Residential Appraisal Report he prepared. At the City's request, the evidentiary record was held open for the City to obtain and present a special benefit study providing further information on the value of properties before and after the L.I.D. projects for street lighting (L.I.D. No. 6979) and paving (L.I.D. No. 8648). The Special Benefit Study was submitted on November 17, 2014. The property owners who participated in the assessment hearing were then given the opportunity to respond to the study. A response was received from Matthew Austin on December 16, 2014. The Hearing Examiner asked the City to provide further material responding to the submittal from the property owners. The City filed its response on January 27, 2015. Mr. Austin requested an opportunity to respond

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND **RECOMMENDATION -**L.I.D. NO.6979 (ASSESSMENT ROLL)

ORIGINAL

to the January 27, 2015 submittal, which was granted. His response was received February 10, 2015. A final exhibit was requested from the City and when it was received on February 27, 2015, the evidentiary record was closed.

The Hearing Examiner, having considered all the evidence presented, having reviewed the records and files in the case, and being otherwise fully advised, makes the following:

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

- 1. On November 13, 2007, the Tacoma City Council adopted Ordinance No. 27654, which provided for the formation of Local Improvement District (L.I.D.) No. 6979. Ordinance No. 27654 called for the installation of six street lights along S. 69<sup>th</sup> Street, from S. Durango Street to S. Madison Street; and along Proctor Street, from S. 69<sup>th</sup> Street north approximately 225 feet, together with all other work necessary to complete the project in accordance with maps, plans, and specifications prepared and on file in the Office of the Director of Public Works. Ordinance No. 27654 is incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth. *Ex.4*.
- 2. The Assessment Roll for Local Improvement District No. 6979 was filed in the Office of the City Clerk on December 4, 2013, and the same shows the amount assessed against each lot and parcel of land in payment of the cost and expense of the improvements previously referred to, and said roll has been opened for inspection by all parties interested therein. *Rodriguez Testimony*.
- 3. The Notice of Assessment Roll Hearing was published in the Tacoma Daily Index, as required by law, on July 10, 2014 and July 14, 2014. An Affidavit of Publication has been filed with the City Clerk. *Ex. 2*; *Rodriguez Testimony*. All procedures as provided for by

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND RECOMMENDATION – L.I.D. NO.6979 (ASSESSMENT ROLL)

July 15, 2014. Ex. 3; Rodriguez Testimony.

- 4. Pursuant to applicable laws and the direction of the Tacoma City Council, the Hearing Examiner conducted a public hearing on the Assessment Roll on July 31, 2014.
- 5. Ralph Rodriguez, L.I.D. Administrator for the City's Department of Public Works, testified that the street light improvements have been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications for such work. The final rate per Assessable Unit of Frontage (AUF) is \$95.86, compared to the estimated rate of \$56.00 per AUF. Mr. Rodriguez explained that the increase between the estimated cost per AUF and the final cost per AUF was due to numerous factors including a change in the style of pole that was requested by property owners, increased design costs, and increased staff costs. The final project cost is \$106,566.40 compared to the estimated project cost of \$62,500.00. The final total assessed to property owners is \$106,566.40. This is a 10-year Assessment Roll. *Ex. 1; Rodriguez Testimony*.
- 6. A zone and termini formula was used to determine the L.I.D. assessments, as provided at RCW 35.44.030 and .040. Only abutting properties were included in the assessment district. *Rodriguez Testimony*.
- 7. Property owners Matthew Austin and Johanna Herrera testified at the hearing challenging the assessments applied to their properties. Mr. Austin is the owner of a triplex located at the southeast corner of the intersection of S. Madison Street and S. 69<sup>th</sup> Street in Tacoma, Washington. The driveway access to his triplex is off of S. Madison Street.

  Ms. Herrera owns a single-family residence at the northeast corner of S. Madison Street and S. 69<sup>th</sup> Street. She purchased the property in the first part of 2014. The Herrera and Austin

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND RECOMMENDATION – L.I.D. NO.6979 (ASSESSMENT ROLL)

properties sit directly across S. 69<sup>th</sup> Street from each other. *Austin Testimony; Herrera Testimony*.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- 8. The evidence showed that the street lights in the L.I.D. project were installed along S. 69th Street beginning at a point well to the east of the Austin and Herrera properties. The closest street light installed as part of the project is some 79 feet east of the Austin property line. Exs. 7, 12, 22; Austin Testimony. An existing street light mounted on a utility pole serves the Austin and Herrera properties, and it was not altered or updated as part of the street lighting L.I.D. No actual illumination from the new street lights will extend to the Austin and Herrera properties. Mr. Austin and Ms. Herrera testified that the street light project did nothing to benefit their properties. Austin Testimony; Herrera Testimony. Appraiser Steven Harrison gave the opinion that the L.I.D. improvements did nothing to increase the value of the Austin property. By analogy, the same conclusion can be applied to the similarly situated Herrera property. Harrison Testimony. The City acknowledged that the only benefit to the Austin and Herrera lots would be the increase in general neighborhood value generated by extending street lighting to the undeveloped properties east of their parcels. Rodriguez Testimony. The Special Benefit Study (Ex. 28) prepared for the City by Valbridge Property Advisors/Allen Brackett Shedd did not discuss the benefit to the Austin and Herrera properties, if any, attributable specifically to the street light installation.
- 9. The weight of the evidence at hearing failed to substantiate an increase in fair cash market value of the Austin and Herrera properties resulting from the street lighting installed under L.I.D. No. 6979. By contrast, Mr. Rodriguez's unchallenged testimony demonstrated the project's benefits to properties that lacked street lighting prior to the L.I.D.

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND RECOMMENDATION – L.I.D. NO.6979 (ASSESSMENT ROLL)

1	installed under L.I.D. No. 6979. By contrast, Mr. Rodriguez's unchallenged testimony
2	demonstrated the project's benefits to properties that lacked street lighting prior to the L.I.D.
3	The evidence supported a finding that the value of the unlighted and undeveloped properties in
4	the L.I.D. was increased in an amount equal to or greater than the applicable assessments. No
5	property owner in the undeveloped portion of the L.I.D. challenged the final assessment roll
6	figures. Rodriguez Testimony.
7	10. The verbatim digital recording in this matter is in the custody of the Hearing
8	Examiner's Office, and the file is in the custody of the City Clerk; both are available for review
9	by the Council and any party in interest.
10	11. Any Conclusion of Law hereinafter stated which may be deemed to be properly
11	considered a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.
12	From these Findings of Fact the Hearing Examiner makes the following:
13	<u>CONCLUSIONS OF LAW</u> :
14	1. The DPW has complied with all applicable laws with respect to approval and
15	confirmation of the Assessment Roll for L.I.D. No. 6979.
16	2. An improvement constructed under an L.I.D. is presumed to benefit properties
17	within the L.I.D. on an equitable basis, and the assessments are presumed to have been made
18	fairly and legally. See Abbenhaus v. Yakima, 89 Wn.2d 855, 860-61, 576 P.2d 888 (1978); see
19	also Bellevue Plaza v. Bellevue, 121 Wn.2d 397, 402-403, 851 P.2d 662 (1993); Hansen v.
20	L.I.D., 54 Wn. App. 257-62, 773 P.2d 436 (1989). Consistent with the foregoing case law,
21	Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC) 1.23.070.B, has established the City's standard of review for
22	final assessment rolls:

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

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND

L.I.D. NO.6979 (ASSESSMENT ROLL)

**RECOMMENDATION -**

District assessment shall have the burden of establishing, by a preponderance of expert appraisal evidence, that the method of assessment was founded on a 'fundamentally wrong basis' and does not properly reflect the special benefits resulting from the improvements constructed.

TMC 1.23.070.B.

- demonstrated that the Herrera and Austin properties were not benefitted by the installation of street lights on S. 69<sup>th</sup> Street or S. Proctor Street. The lights do not abut their properties and do not provide any illumination to their parcels. Austin/Herrera provided appraisal testimony indicating the L.I.D. improvements failed to benefit their properties. The City was unable to respond with testimony quantifying a benefit to the Austin and Herrera properties conferred by the street lights installed for nearby property. The appraisal testimony presented by the City did not attribute any specific value to the street lighting element of the improvements made in the area. In the absence of any evidence of benefit to the Austin and Herrera parcels, the assessment of their properties is based on a fundamental error. A property cannot be assessed for improvements that do not benefit the parcel. *In re Schmitz*, 44 Wn.2d 430, 434, 268 P.2d 436 (1953).
- 4. Based upon the evidence in the case, the Final Assessment Roll should be modified to exclude the Herrera and Austin properties from the assessment for L.I.D. No. 6979 because their parcels received no benefit from the street light project. After that modification and any necessary recalculation, the Assessment Roll will conform to applicable legal requirements. There is no evidence that the methodology used to substantiate the assessments on the remaining properties was incorrect. Accordingly, the City Council should adopt an

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND RECOMMENDATION – L.I.D. NO.6979 (ASSESSMENT ROLL)

1	ordinance assessing the property owners other than Austin and Herrera for benefits conferred
2	under L.I.D. No. 6979, previously created by the City Council and the Assessment Roll for
3	L.I.D. No. 6979 should be confirmed and approved, as modified.
4	5. Any Finding of Fact hereinbefore stated which may be deemed to be properly
5	considered a Conclusion of Law is hereby adopted as such.
6	From the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law the Hearing Examiner
7	enters this:
8	RECOMMENDATION:
9	The Hearing Examiner recommends that the Assessment Roll for L.I.D. No. 6979 be
10	recalculated and modified to exclude properties owned by Johanna Herrera and Matthew
11	Austin. The Hearing Examiner further recommends that the modified Assessment Roll for
12	L.I.D. 6979 be confirmed and approved.
13	<b>DATED</b> this 9 <sup>th</sup> day of March, 2015.
14	Turent Macleod
15	PHYLLIS K. MACLEOD, Hearing Examiner
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

#### RECONSIDERATION/APPEAL OF EXAMINER'S RECOMMENDATION

#### **RECONSIDERATION:**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

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 verbatim recording. 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 --L.I.D. NO.6979 (ASSESSMENT ROLL)