BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES,
THE DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF
THE STATE OF OREGON

IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF Steven R. Buermann, CLAIMANTS	))))	FINAL ORDER CLAIM NO. M122268

Claimants: Steven R. Buermann (the Claimants)

Property: Township 10N, Range 09W, Section 00, Tax lot 501, Lincoln County (the Property)

Claim: The demand for compensation and any supporting information received from the Claimants by the State of Oregon (the Claim).

Claimants submitted the Claim to the State of Oregon under ORS 197.352. Under OAR 125-145-0010 *et seq.*, the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) referred the Claim to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) as the regulating entity. This order is based on the record herein, including the Findings and Conclusions set forth in the Final Staff Report and Recommendation of DLCD (the DLCD Report) attached to and by this reference incorporated into this order.

ORDER

The Claim is approved as to laws administered by DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) for the reasons set forth in the DLCD Report, and subject to the following terms:

1. In lieu of compensation under ORS 197.352, the State of Oregon will not apply the following laws to Steven Buermann's division of the 21.01-acre property into one 15.12-acre parcel and one 5.9-acre parcel or to his development of a dwelling on the 5.9-acre parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, enacted or adopted after March 27, 1979. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired the property on March 27, 1979.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on March 27, 1979. On that date, the property was subject to compliance with Goal 4.

3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that the subject property may not be used without a permit, license or other form of authorization or consent, the order will not authorize the use of the property

unless the claimant first obtains that permit, license or other form of authorization or consent. Such requirements may include, but are not limited to: a building permit, a land use decision, a "permit" as defined in ORS 215.402 or 227.160, other permits or authorizations from local, state or federal agencies and restrictions on the use of the subject property imposed by private parties.

4. Any use of the subject property by the claimant under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in (1) above; (b) any laws enacted or enforced by a public entity other than the Commission or the department; and (c) those laws not subject to ORS 197.352 including, without limitation, those laws exempted under ORS 197.352(3).

5. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing terms and conditions, in order for the claimant to use the subject property, it may be necessary for him to obtain a decision under ORS 197.352 from a city and/or county and/or metropolitan service district that enforces land use regulations applicable to the property. Nothing in this order relieves the claimant from the necessity of obtaining a decision under ORS 197.352 from a local public entity that has jurisdiction to enforce a land use regulation applicable to a use of the subject property by the claimant.

This Order is entered by the Director of the DLCD as a final order of DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission under ORS 197.352, OAR 660-002-0010(8), and OAR 125, division 145, and by the Administrator for the State Services Division of the DAS as a final order of DAS under ORS 197.352, OAR 125, division 145, and ORS 293.

FOR DLCD AND THE LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION:

Lane Shetterly, Director
DLCD
Dated this 18th day of July, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

David Hartwig, Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 18th day of July, 2006.

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL OR OTHER JUDICIAL RELIEF

You are entitled, or may be entitled, to judicial remedies including the following:

1. Judicial review under ORS 183.484: Judicial review under ORS 183.484 may be obtained by filing a petition for review within 60 days from the service of this order. A petition for judicial review under ORS 183.484 may be filed in the Circuit Court for Marion County or the Circuit Court in the county in which you reside.

2. A cause of action under ORS 197.352 (Measure 37 (2004)): If a land use regulation continues to apply to the subject property more than 180 days after the present owner of the property has made written demand for compensation under ORS 197.352[1], the present owner of the property, or any interest therein, shall have a cause of action in the circuit court in which the real property is located.

(Copies of the documents that comprise the record are available for review at the Department's office at 635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150, Salem, Oregon 97301-2540)

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

The Oregon Department of Justice has advised the Department of Land Conservation and Development that "[i]f the current owner of the real property conveys the property before the new use allowed by the public entity is established, then the entitlement to relief will be lost."

[1] By order of the Marion County Circuit Court, "all time lines under Measure 37 [were] suspended indefinitely" on October 25, 2005. This suspension was lifted on March 13, 2006 by the court. As a result, a period of 139 days (the number of days the time lines were suspended) has been added to the 180-day time period under ORS 197.352(6) for claims that were pending with the state on October 25, 2005.

ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
Final Staff Report and Recommendation

July 18, 2006

STATE CLAIM NUMBER:	M122268
NAME OF CLAIMANT:	Steven R. Buermann
MAILING ADDRESS:	821 Sam's Creek Road Logsden, Oregon 97357
PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:	Township 10N, Range 09W, Section 00 Tax lot 501 Lincoln County
OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION:	Dawn Pavitt PO Box 5 Newport, Oregon 97365
OTHER INTEREST IN PROPERTY:	Katherine Grant-Buermann
DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:	September 9, 2005
180-DAY DEADLINE:	July 25, 2006[1]

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimant, Steven Buermann, seeks compensation in the amount of $102,000 for the reduction in fair market value as a result of land use regulations that are alleged to restrict the use of certain private real property. The claimant desires compensation or the right to divide the 21.01-acre property into one 15.12-acre parcel and one 5.9-acre parcel and to develop a dwelling on the 5.9-acre parcel.[2] The subject property is located at 821 Sam's Creek Road, near Logsden, in Lincoln County. (See claim.)

---

[1] This date reflects 180 days from the date the claim was submitted, as extended by the 139 days that all timelines under Measure 37 were suspended during the pendency of *MacPherson v. Dept. of Admin. Srvcs.*, 340 Or 117 (2006).

[2] The claim also indicates that the claimant may desire to sell the 5.9-acre parcel for development. In effect, the claimant requests that a decision of the department to "not apply" (waive) certain laws as set forth in this report be transferable with the property. ORS 197.352 only authorizes a state agency to waive a law in order to allow the current owner a use of the property permitted at the time that owner acquired the property. A determination of transferability is beyond the scope of relief that the department may grant under ORS 197.352. The Oregon Department of Justice has advised the department that "[i]f the current owner of the real property conveys the property before a new use allowed by the public entity is established, then the entitlement to relief will be lost." Therefore, the relief granted in this report cannot and does not create a transferable waiver.

II. SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings and conclusions set forth below, the Department of Land Conservation and Development (the department) has determined that the claim is valid. Department staff recommends that, in lieu of compensation, the requirements of the following state laws enforced by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (the Commission) or the department not apply to Steven Buermann's division of the 21.01-acre property into one 15.12-acre parcel and one 5.9-acre parcel and to his development of a dwelling on the 5.9-acre parcel: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 4 (Forest Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 6, enacted or adopted after March 27, 1979. These laws will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired the property in 1979. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On April 26, 2006, pursuant to OAR 125-145-0080, the Oregon Department of Administrative Services (DAS) provided written notice to the owners of surrounding properties. According to DAS, one written comment wase received in response to the 10-day notice.

The comment is relevant as to whether the restriction of the claimants' use of the subject property reduces the fair market value of the property, whether statewide planning goals apply, whether waivers are transferable and whether state agencies can waive statutes. The comment has been considered by the department in preparing this report. (See the comment letter in the department's claim file.)

IV. TIMELINESS OF CLAIM

Requirement

ORS 197.352(5) requires that a written demand for compensation be made:

1. For claims arising from land use regulations enacted prior to the effective date of Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), within two years of that effective date, or the date the public entity applies the land use regulation as an approval criteria to an application submitted by the owner, whichever is later; or

2. For claims arising from land use regulations enacted after the effective date of Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), within two years of the enactment of the land use regulation, or the date the owner of the property submits a land use application in which the land use regulation is an approval criteria, whichever is later.

Findings of Fact

This claim was submitted to DAS on September 9, 2005, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Goal 4, ORS 92 and 215 and OAR 660, division 6, as the basis

for the claim. Only laws that were enacted or adopted prior to December 2, 2004, are the basis for this claim.

Conclusions

The claim has been submitted within two years of the effective date of Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), based on land use regulations enacted or adopted prior to December 2, 2004, and is therefore timely filed.

V. ANALYSIS OF CLAIM

1. Ownership

ORS 197.352 provides for payment of compensation or relief from specific laws for "owners" as that term is defined in ORS 197.352. ORS 197.352(11)(C) defines "owner" as "the present owner of the property, or any interest therein."

Findings of Fact

The claimant, Steven Buermann, acquired the subject property on March 27, 1979, as reflected by a land sale contract included with the claim. The Lincoln County Assessor's Office confirms the claimant's current ownership of the subject property.[3]

Conclusions

The claimant, Steven Buermann, is an "owner" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of March 27, 1979.

2. The Laws That are the Basis for This Claim

In order to establish a valid claim, ORS 197.352(1) requires, in part, that a law must restrict the claimant's use of private real property in a manner that reduces the fair market value of the property relative to how the property could have been used at the time the claimant or a family member acquired the property.

Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that the claimant desires to divide the 21.01-acre property into one 15.12-acre parcel and one 5.9-acre parcel and to develop a dwelling on the 5.9-acre parcel, and that current land use regulations prevent this desired use.

The claim is based generally on Lincoln County's current Timber Conservation (T-C) zone and the applicable provisions of state law that require such zoning. The claimant's property is zoned T-C, as required by Goal 4, in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, because the

[3] Katherine Grant-Buermann is also a current owner of the subject property, having acquired an interest in the property from the claimant on June 14, 2000. However, she is not a claimant for the purposes of this ORS 197.352 claim.

claimant's property is "forest land" under Goal 4. Goal 4 became effective on January 25, 1975, and requires that forest land be zoned for forest use (see statutory and rule history under OAR 660-015-0000(4)). The forest land administrative rules (OAR 660, division 6) became effective on September 1, 1982, and ORS 215.705 to 215.755 and 215.780 became effective on November 4, 1993 (Chapter 792, Oregon Laws 1993). OAR 660-006-0026 and 660-006-0027 were amended on March 1, 1994, to implement those statutes.

The claimant acquired the subject property after the adoption of the statewide planning goals but before the Commission acknowledged the Lincoln County's land use regulations to be in compliance with the statewide planning goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251. Because the Commission had not acknowledged the county's plan and land use regulations when the claimant acquired the subject property on March 27, 1979, the statewide planning goals, and Goal 4 in particular, applied directly to the claimant's property when he acquired it.[4]

Goal 4 went into effect on January 25, 1975, "to conserve forest lands for forest uses" and required, "Lands suitable for forest uses shall be inventoried and designated as forest lands. Existing forest land uses shall be protected unless proposed changes are in conformance with the comprehensive plan." Those forest uses were defined as follows: "(1) the production of trees and the processing of forest products; (2) open space, buffers from noise, and visual separation of conflicting uses; (3) watershed protection and wildlife and fisheries habitat; (4) soil protection from wind and water; (5) maintenance of clean air and water; (6) outdoor recreational activities and related support services and wilderness values compatible with these uses; and (7) grazing land for livestock."

No information has been presented in the claim to establish that the claimant's desired division of the 21.01-acre subject property into one 15.12-acre parcel and one 5.9-acre parcel or his development of a dwelling on the 5.9-acre parcel complies with the Goal 4 standards in effect when the claimant acquired the property in 1979.[5]

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by Goal 4, ORS 215.705 to 215.755 and 215.780, and OAR 660-006-0026 and 660-006-0027 were all enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired the subject property in 1979 and do not allow the claimant's desired division or development of the property. However, the claim does not

---

[4] The statewide planning goals became effective on January 25, 1975, and were applicable to legislative land use decisions and some quasi-judicial land use decisions prior to the Commission's acknowledgment of each county's land use regulations. *Perkins v. City of Rajneeshpuram*, 300 Or 1 (1985); *Alexanderson v. Polk County*, 289 Or 427, *rev den* 290 Or 137 (1980); *Sunnyside Neighborhood Assn. v. Clackamas County*, 280 Or 3 (1977); *Jurgenson v. Union County*, 42 Or App 505 (1979); and *1000 Friends of Oregon v. Benton County*, 32 Or App 413 (1978). After the county's plan and land use regulations were acknowledged by the Commission, the statewide planning goals and implementing rules no longer directly applied to such local land use decisions. *Byrd v. Stringer*, 295 Or 311 (1983). However, statutory requirements continue to apply, and insofar as the state and local provisions are materially the same, the local provisions must be interpreted consistent with the substance of the goals and implementing rules. *Foster v. Polk County*, 115 Or App 475 (1992); *Kenagy v. Benton County*, 115 Or App 131 (1992).

[5] While the claimant asserts that this desired use would have been compatible with the Goal 4 standards in effect when the claimant acquired the property in 1979, no documentation or other information was included with the claim to establish compliance.

establish whether or to what extent the claimant's desired use of the subject property complies with the standards for land divisions and development under Goal 4 in effect when the claimant acquired the property on March 27, 1979.

This report addresses only those state laws that are identified in the claim, or that the department is certain apply to the subject property, based on the use that the claimant has identified. There may be other laws that currently apply to the claimant's use of the subject property, and that may continue to apply to the claimant's use of the property, that have not been identified in the claim. In some cases, it will not be possible to know which laws apply to a use of subject property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the claimant seeks a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws apply to that use.

3. Effect of Regulations on Fair Market Value

In order to establish a valid claim, ORS 197.352(1) requires that the land use regulation(s) (described in Section V.(2) of this report) must have "the effect of reducing the fair market value of the property, or any interest therein."

Findings of Fact

The claim includes an estimate of $102,000 as the reduction in the subject property's fair market value due to the regulations that restrict the claimant's desired use of the property. This amount is based on an appraiser's report included with the claim.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimant is Steven Buermann who acquired the subject property on March 27, 1979. Under ORS 197.352, the claimant is due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property and have the effect of reducing its fair market value. Based on the findings and conclusions in Section V.(2) of this report, laws enacted or adopted since the claimant acquired the subject property restrict the claimant's desired use of the property. The claimant estimates that the effect of the regulation(s) on the fair market value of the subject property is a reduction of $102,000.

Without additional information and verification of whether or the extent to which the claimant's desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when he acquired the property, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount by which the land use regulations have reduced the fair market value of the property. Nevertheless, based on the evidence in the record for this claim, the department determines that the fair market value of the subject property has been reduced to some extent as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department.

4. Exemptions Under ORS 197.352(3)

ORS 197.352 does not apply to certain land use regulations. In addition, under ORS 197.352(3), certain types of laws are exempt from ORS 197.352.

Findings of Fact

The claim is based on state land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property, including applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, which Lincoln County has implemented through its current T-C zone. With the exception of provisions of Goal 4 adopted before the claimant acquired the subject property on March 27, 1979, these state land use regulations were not in effect when the claimant acquired the property.

Conclusions

Without a specific development proposal for the subject property, it is not possible for the department to determine all the laws that may apply to a particular use of the property, or whether those laws may fall under one or more of the exemptions under ORS 197.352. It appears that the general statutory, goal and rule restrictions on residential division and development of the subject property are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) to the extent they were enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired the property. Provisions of Goal 4 in effect when the claimant acquired the subject property in 1979 are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the property.

Other laws in effect when the claimant acquired the subject property are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will also continue to apply to the claimant's use of the property. In addition, the department notes that ORS 215.730 and OAR 660, division 6, include standards for siting dwellings in forest zones. These provisions include fire protection standards for dwellings and for surrounding forest lands. ORS 197.352(3)(B) specifically exempts regulations "restricting or prohibiting activities for the protection of public health and safety, such as fire and building codes. . . ." Accordingly, siting standards for dwellings in forest zones in ORS 215.730 and OAR 660, division 6, are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(B).

There may be other laws that continue to apply to the claimant's use of the subject property that have not been identified in the claim. In some cases, it will not be possible to know which laws apply to a use of the subject property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the claimant seeks a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws currently apply to that use and may continue to apply to that use. In some cases, some of these laws may be exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(A) to (D).

This report addresses only those state laws that are identified in the claim, or that the department is certain apply to the subject property based on the uses that the claimant has identified. Similarly, this report only addresses the exemptions provided for under ORS 197.352(3) that are clearly applicable, given the information provided to the department in the claim. The claimant should be aware that the less information he has provided to the department in the claim, the greater the possibility that there may be additional laws that will later be determined to continue to apply to his use of the subject property.

VI. FORM OF RELIEF

ORS 197.352(1) provides for payment of compensation to an owner of private real property if the Commission or the department has enforced one or more laws that restrict the use of the property in a manner that reduces its fair market value. In lieu of compensation, the department

may choose to not apply the law in order to allow the present owner to carry out a use of the property permitted at the time the present owner acquired the property. The Commission, by rule, has directed that if the department determines a claim is valid, the Director of the department must provide only non-monetary relief unless and until funds are appropriated by the legislature to pay claims.

Findings of Fact

Based on the findings and conclusions set forth in this report, laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict the claimant's desired use of the subject property. The claim asserts that existing state land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department have the effect of reducing the fair market value of the subject property by $102,000. However, because the claim does not provide other relevant evidence demonstrating that the land use regulations described in Section V.(2) reduce the fair market value of the subject property, a specific amount of compensation cannot be determined. In order to determine a specific amount of compensation due for this claim, it would also be necessary to verify whether or the extent to which the claimant's desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when he acquired the property. Nevertheless, based on the record for this claim, the department has determined that the laws on which the claim is based have reduced the fair market value of the subject property to some extent.

No funds have been appropriated at this time for the payment of claims. In lieu of payment of compensation, ORS 197.352 authorizes the department to modify, remove or not apply all or parts of certain land use regulations to allow Steven Buermann to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time he acquired the property on March 27, 1979.

Conclusions

Based on the record, the department recommends that the claim be approved, subject to the following terms:

1. In lieu of compensation under ORS 197.352, the State of Oregon will not apply the following laws to Steven Buermann's division of the 21.01-acre property into one 15.12-acre parcel and one 5.9-acre parcel or to his development of a dwelling on the 5.9-acre parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, enacted or adopted after March 27, 1979. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired the property on March 27, 1979.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on March 27, 1979. On that date, the property was subject to compliance with Goal 4.

3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that the subject property may not be used without a permit, license or other form of authorization or consent, the order will not authorize the use of the property unless the claimant first obtains that permit, license or other form of authorization or consent. Such requirements may include, but are not limited to: a building permit, a land use decision, a

"permit" as defined in ORS 215.402 or 227.160, other permits or authorizations from local, state or federal agencies and restrictions on the use of the subject property imposed by private parties.

4. Any use of the subject property by the claimant under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in (1) above; (b) any laws enacted or enforced by a public entity other than the Commission or the department; and (c) those laws not subject to ORS 197.352 including, without limitation, those laws exempted under ORS 197.352(3).

5. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing terms and conditions, in order for the claimant to use the subject property, it may be necessary for him to obtain a decision under ORS 197.352 from a city and/or county and/or metropolitan service district that enforces land use regulations applicable to the property. Nothing in this order relieves the claimant from the necessity of obtaining a decision under ORS 197.352 from a local public entity that has jurisdiction to enforce a land use regulation applicable to a use of the subject property by the claimant.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on July 3, 2006. OAR 125-145-0100(3), provided an opportunity for the claimant or the claimant's authorized agent and any third parties who submitted comments under OAR 125-145-0080 to submit written comments, evidence and information in response to the draft staff report and recommendation. Comments received have been taken into account by the department in the issuance of this final report.