



**OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND
DEVELOPMENT**

**ORS 195.300 to ORS 195.336 (MEASURE 49) SUPPLEMENTAL REVIEW
OF MEASURE 37 CLAIM
Preliminary Evaluation**

December 16, 2008

STATE ELECTION NUMBER: E129334

CLAIMANTS: Fannie E. Regnier
Almond D. Regnier
3845 NW Boise Drive
Madras, OR 97741

**MEASURE 37 PROPERTY
IDENTIFICATION:** Township 10S, Range 13E, Section 23
Tax lots 300 and 800
Jefferson County

AGENT CONTACT INFORMATION: Bob Harris
P O Box 698
Madras, OR 97741

I. ELECTION

The claimants, Fannie Regnier and Almond Regnier, filed a claim under ORS 197.352 (2005) (Measure 37) on May 16, 2006 for property located at 3845 Northwest Boise Drive, near Madras, in Jefferson County. ORS 195.300 to ORS 195.336 (Measure 49) entitles claimants who filed Measure 37 claims to elect supplemental review of their claims. The claimants have elected supplemental review of their Measure 37 claim under Section 6 of Measure 49, which allows the Department of Land Conservation and Development (the department) to authorize up to three home site approvals to qualified claimants.

II. SUMMARY OF PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

Based on the department's preliminary analysis, it appears that claimant Fannie Regnier is qualified for up to three home site approvals on the Measure 37 claim property. The claimant's property, including both the Measure 37 claim property and all contiguous property in the same ownership, currently appears to consist of two lots or parcels, which are developed with one dwelling. After taking into account the number of lots, parcels and dwellings currently located on the Measure 37 claim property and the contiguous property under the same ownership, it appears that the home site approvals will allow claimant Fannie Regnier to establish one additional lot or

parcel and two additional dwellings on tax lot 300 and the northern portion of tax lot 800 of the Measure 37 claim property.

Based on the department's preliminary analysis, it appears that claimant Almond Regnier is not eligible for any relief under Measure 49 because he is not an owner of the Measure 37 claim property.

III. THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF HOME SITE APPROVALS FOR WHICH THE CLAIMANTS MAY QUALIFY

Under Section 6 of Measure 49, the number of home site approvals authorized by the department cannot exceed the lesser of the following: three; the number stated by the claimant in the election materials; or the number described in a Measure 37 waiver issued by the state, or if no waiver was issued, the number of home sites described in the Measure 37 claim filed with the state. The claimants have requested three home site approvals in the election material. The Measure 37 waiver issued for this claim describes one hundred eighty home sites. Therefore, the claimants may qualify for a maximum of three home site approvals under Section 6.

IV. PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF QUALIFICATION FOR HOME SITE APPROVAL

1. Preliminary Analysis

To qualify for a home site approval under Section 6 of Measure 49, a claimant must have filed a Measure 37 claim for the property with either the state or the county in which the property is located on or before June 28, 2007, and must have filed a Measure 37 claim with both the state and the county before Measure 49 became effective on December 6, 2007. If the state Measure 37 claim was filed after December 4, 2006, the claim must also have been filed in compliance with the provisions of OAR 660-041-0020 then in effect.

The claimants, Fannie Regnier and Almond Regnier, filed a Measure 37 claim, M129334, with the state on May 16, 2006. The claimants filed a Measure 37 claim, 06-M37-18, with Jefferson County on May 16, 2006. The state claim was filed prior to December 4, 2006.

It appears that the claimants timely filed a Measure 37 claim with both the state and Jefferson County.

In addition to filing a claim with both the state and the county in which the property is located, to qualify for a home site approval under Section 6 of Measure 49 the claimants must establish each of the following:

(a) The Claimant is an Owner of the Property

Measure 49 defines "Owner" as: "(a) The owner of fee title to the property as shown in the deed records of the county where the property is located; (b) The purchaser under a land sale contract, if there is a recorded land sale contract in force for the property; or (c) if the property is owned

by the trustee of a revocable trust, the settlor of a revocable trust, except that when the trust becomes irrevocable only the trustee is the owner.”

According to the deed submitted by the claimants, Fannie Regnier is the settlor of a revocable trust into which she conveyed the Measure 37 claim property and, therefore, is an owner of the property under Measure 49.

According to the information submitted by the claimants, Almond Regnier has not established his ownership of the property for the purposes of Measure 49. Almond Regnier is not a settlor of the revocable trust and, therefore, is not an owner of the claim property for purposes of Measure 49. .

(b) All Owners of the Property Have Consented in Writing to the Claim

It appears that claimant Fannie Regnier is the sole owner of the property. Therefore, no additional consent is required.

(c) The Measure 37 Claim Property Is Located Entirely Outside Any Urban Growth Boundary and Entirely Outside the Boundaries of Any City

The Measure 37 claim property is located in Jefferson County, outside the urban growth boundary and outside the city limits of the nearest city, Madras.

(d) One or More Land Use Regulations Prohibit Establishing the Lot, Parcel or Dwelling

As stated in Section III above, claimant Fannie Regnier may qualify for up to three home site approvals.

The property is currently zoned Exclusive Farm Use (EFU A-1) by Jefferson County, in accordance with ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because the property is “agricultural land” as defined by Goal 3. Goal 3 requires agricultural land to be zoned exclusive farm use. Applicable provisions of ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, generally prohibit the establishment of a lot or parcel less than 80 acres in size in an EFU zone, and regulate the establishment of dwellings on new or existing lots or parcels.

The claimants’ property consists of 181.55 acres. Therefore, state land use regulations prohibit the claimants from establishing on the Measure 37 claim property the three home sites the claimants may qualify for under Section 6 of Measure 49.

(e) The Establishment of the Lot, Parcel or Dwelling Is Not Prohibited by a Land Use Regulation Described in ORS 195.305(3)

ORS 195.305(3) exempts from claims under Measure 49 land use regulations:

- (a) Restricting or prohibiting activities commonly and historically recognized as public nuisances under common law;
- (b) Restricting or prohibiting activities for the protection of public health and safety;
- (c) To the extent the land use regulation is required to comply with federal law; or
- (d) Restricting or prohibiting the use of a property for the purpose of selling pornography or performing nude dancing.

Based on the documentation submitted by the claimants, it does not appear that the establishment of the three home sites for which the claimants may qualify on the property would be prohibited by land use regulations described in ORS 195.305(3).

(f) On the Claimant’s Acquisition Date, the Claimant Lawfully Was Permitted to Establish at Least the Number of Lots, Parcels or Dwellings on the Property That Are Authorized Under Section 6 of Measure 49.

A claimant’s acquisition date is “the date the claimant became the owner of the property as shown in the deed records of the county in which the property is located. If there is more than one claimant for the same property under the same claim and the claimants have different acquisition dates, the acquisition date is the earliest of those dates.”

Jefferson County deed records indicate that claimant Fannie Regnier acquired the property on July 21, 1972. As indicated in Section IV(1)(a) of this report, claimant Almond Regnier is not an owner of the Measure 37 claim property for purposes of Measure 49.

On July 21, 1972, tax lot 300 and the northern approximately 40-acre portion of tax lot 800 were not subject to any local or state laws that would have prohibited claimant Fannie Regnier from establishing at least three lots or parcels and at least three dwellings. Therefore, the claimant lawfully could have established the three home sites the claimant may qualify for under Section 6 of Measure 49 on this portion of the Measure 37 property.

On July 21, 1972, the southern approximately 30-acre portion of tax lot 800 situated in the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 23 was subject to Jefferson County’s I-2 Heavy Industrial District zone. Jefferson County’s I-2 Heavy Industrial zone prohibited residential uses. Therefore, claimant Fannie Regnier lawfully could not have established any home sites on this portion of the Measure 37 property on her date of acquisition

2. Preliminary Conclusion

Based on the preliminary analysis, it appears that claimant Fannie Regnier qualifies for up to three home site approvals under Section 6 of Measure 49 on tax lot 300 and the northern approximately 40-acre portion of tax lot 800.

Based on the preliminary analysis, it appears that claimant Fannie Regnier does not qualify for any home site approvals under Section 6 of Measure 49 on the southern approximately 30-acre portion of tax lot 800.

Based on the preliminary analysis, claimant Almond Regnier does not qualify for Measure 49 home site approvals because he is not an owner of the Measure 37 claim property for purposes of Measure 49.

V. NUMBER OF LOTS, PARCELS OR DWELLINGS ON OR CONTAINED WITHIN THE PROPERTY

The number of lots, parcels or dwellings that a claimant is authorized to establish pursuant to a home site authorization is reduced by the number of lots, parcels or dwellings currently in existence on the Measure 37 claim property and any contiguous property under the same ownership. However, if a claimant otherwise qualifies for relief under Section 6 of Measure 49, the claimant will be able to establish at least one additional lot, parcel or dwelling, regardless of the number of lots, parcels or dwellings currently in existence.

Based on the documentation provided by the claimants and Jefferson County, the Measure 37 claim property appears to currently include on tax lot 300 and the northern approximately 40-acre portion of tax lot 800 of the Measure 37 claim property two lots or parcels and one dwelling. There is no contiguous property under the same ownership. Therefore, the three home site approvals claimant Fannie Regnier appears to qualify for under Section 6 of Measure 49 will allow her to establish up to one additional lot or parcel and two additional dwellings Each dwelling must be on a separate lot or parcel, and must be contained within the Measure 37 claim property.

VI. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF PROPOSED LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS ON THE NUMBER AND SCOPE OF HOME SITE APPROVALS

The department has identified the following limitations and conditions that may affect the number or scope of the home site approvals that claimant Fannie Regnier would otherwise be entitled to under Section 6 of Measure 49. This list may not be comprehensive and does not preclude the possibility that other considerations, not yet identified by the department, may affect the establishment of a land division or dwelling authorized by a home site approval.

1. The establishment of a land division or dwelling based on a Measure 49 home site authorization must comply with all applicable standards governing the siting or development of the land division or dwelling. However, those standards must not be applied in a manner that prohibits the establishment of the land division or dwelling, unless the standards are reasonably necessary to avoid or abate a nuisance, to protect public health or safety, or to carry out federal law.
2. A home site authorization will not authorize the establishment of a land division or dwelling in violation of a land use regulation described in ORS 195.305(3) or in violation of any other law that is not a land use regulation as defined by ORS 195.300(14).
3. A claimant is not eligible for more than 20 home site approvals under Sections 5 to 11 of Measure 49 regardless of how many properties a claimant owns or how many claims a claimant filed.

4. The number of lots, parcels or dwellings a claimant may be eligible to establish under a Measure 49 home site authorization is reduced by the number of lots, parcels and dwellings currently in existence on the Measure 37 claim property and contiguous property in the same ownership, regardless of whether evidence of their existence has been provided to the department. If lots, parcels or dwellings currently exist on the Measure 37 claim property or on contiguous property under the same ownership and the lots, parcels or dwellings have not been disclosed to the department, then the number of additional lots, parcels or dwellings a claimant may establish pursuant to the home site authorization must be reduced according to the methodology stated in Section 6(2)(b) and 6(3) of Measure 49.
5. Temporary dwellings are not considered in determining the number of existing dwellings currently on the property. Claimant Fannie Regnier may choose to convert any temporary dwelling currently located on the property on which she is eligible for Measure 49 relief to an authorized home site pursuant to a Measure 49 home site approval. Otherwise, any temporary dwelling is subject to the terms of the local permit requirements under which it was approved, and is subject to removal at the end of the term for which it is allowed.
6. A home site approval only authorizes the establishment of a new lot, parcel or dwelling on property on which claimant Fannie Regnier is eligible for Measure 49 relief. No additional development is authorized on contiguous property for which no Measure 37 claim was filed or on Measure 37 claim property on which a claimant is not eligible for Measure 49 relief. A lot or parcel established pursuant to a home site approval must either be the site of a dwelling that is currently in existence or be the future site of a dwelling that may be established pursuant to the home site approval.
7. Claimant Fannie Regnier may use a home site approval that does not authorize a new lot parcel or dwelling to convert a lot, parcel or dwelling currently located on the property on which she is eligible for Measure 49 relief to an authorized home site. If the number of lots parcels or dwellings existing on the property on which claimant Fannie Regnier is eligible for Measure 49 relief exceeds the number of home site approvals she qualifies for under a home site authorization, claimant Fannie Regnier may select which existing lots, parcels or dwellings to convert to authorized home sites; or may reconfigure existing lots parcels or dwellings so that the number is equivalent to the number of home site approvals.
8. A home site approval does not authorize the establishment of a new dwelling on a lot or parcel that already contains one or more dwellings. Claimant Fannie Regnier may be required to alter the configuration of the lots or parcels currently in existence on the Measure 37 claim property and contiguous property so that each additional dwelling established on the property on which she is eligible for Measure 49 relief, pursuant to a home site approval, is sited on a separate lot or parcel.
9. Once the department issues a final home site authorization, a home site approval granted under that authorization will run with the property and will transfer with the property. A home site approval will not expire, except that if a claimant who received a home site authorization later conveys the property to a party other than the claimant's spouse or the

trustee of a revocable trust in which the claimant is the settlor, the subsequent owner of the property must establish the authorized lots, parcels and dwellings within 10 years of the conveyance. A lot or parcel lawfully created based on the home site authorization will remain a discrete lot or parcel, unless the lot or parcel lines are vacated or the lot or parcel is further divided, as provided by law. A dwelling lawfully created based on a home site approval is a permitted use.

10. Because the property is located in an exclusive farm use zone, the home site authorization will not authorize new lots or parcels that exceed five acres. However, existing lots or parcels may exceed five acres. Before beginning construction in one of these zones, the owner must comply with the requirements of ORS 215.293. Further, the home site authorization will not authorize new lots or parcels that exceed two acres if the new lots or parcels are located on high-value farmland, on high-value forestland or on land within a ground water restricted area. However, existing lots or parcels may exceed two acres.
11. Because the property is located in an exclusive farm use zone, Measure 49 requires new home sites to be clustered so as to maximize suitability of the remnant lot or parcel for farm or forest use. Further, if an owner of the property is authorized by other home site approvals to subdivide, partition, or establish dwellings on other Measure 37 claim properties, Measure 49 authorizes the owner to cluster some or all of the authorized lots, parcels or dwellings that would otherwise be located on land in an exclusive farm use zone, a forest zone or a mixed farm and forest zone on a single Measure 37 claim property that is zoned residential use or is located in an exclusive farm use zone, a forest zone or a mixed farm and forest zone but is less suitable for farm or forest use than the other Measure 37 claim properties.

VII. NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT

A claimant or a claimant's authorized agent, a county and any third party may submit written comments, evidence and information in response to the preliminary evaluation. The comments, evidence and information must be filed with the department no more than twenty-eight (28) calendar days after the date this evaluation is mailed to the claimants and the claimants' agent and notice of this evaluation is mailed to third parties.

The department will mail a copy of all materials timely filed by a county or a third party with the department to the claimants and the claimants' agent. A claimant or a claimant's authorized agent may then file written comments, evidence or information in response to the materials filed by the third party or county. That response must be filed no more than twenty-one (21) calendar days after the date the department mails the materials to the claimants and the claimants' authorized agent.

All comments, evidence and information in response to the preliminary evaluation and all responses to materials filed by a third party or a county shall be delivered to Supplemental Measure 49 Claim Review, 635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150, Salem, Oregon 97301-2540 and will be deemed timely filed either (1) if actually delivered to the department before the close of business on the final eligible calendar day, or (2) if mailed on or before the final eligible calendar day.

Note: Please reference the claim number and claimant name and clearly mark your comments as "Preliminary Evaluation Comments." Comments must be submitted in original written form only. Comments submitted electronically or by facsimile will not be accepted.