

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)	FINAL ORDER
COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352)	CLAIM NO. M121521
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF)	
Edward and Ruth Nash, and)	
Byron Williams, CLAIMANTS)	

Claimants: Edward and Ruth Nash, and Byron Williams (the Claimants)

Property: Township 9S, Range 1E, Section 9D, Tax lot 100, Marion 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 Byron Williams' division of the 23.42-acre property into two parcels or to his development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after December 27, 2002. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Byron Williams is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow him to use the subject property in the manner set forth in the claim.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to Byron Williams to use the property subject to the standards in effect on December 27, 2002. At that time, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, currently in effect.
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 claimant Byron Williams 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 claimant Byron Williams 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 claimant Byron Williams 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 Byron Williams 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 his use of the subject property.

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 Deputy 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 1st day of June, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE
SERVICES:


Dugan Petty, Deputy Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 1st day of June, 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 197.352¹, 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

June 1, 2006

STATE CLAIM NUMBER: M121521

NAMES OF CLAIMANTS: Edward and Ruth Nash
Byron Williams

MAILING ADDRESS: None Provided

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION: Township 9S, Range 1E, Section 9D
Tax lot 100
Marion County

OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION: David E. Hilgemann
The Equitable Center
530 Center Street NE, Suite 700
Salem, Oregon 97301

DATE RECEIVED BY DAS: July 21, 2005

180-DAY DEADLINE: June 5, 2006¹

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, Edward and Ruth Nash and Byron Williams, seek compensation in the amount of \$51,220 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 claimants desire compensation or the right to divide the 23.42-acre property into two parcels and to develop a dwelling on each parcel. No street address was provided for the subject property, which is located near Stayton, in Marion County. (See claim.)

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 this claim is valid in part. 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 Byron Williams' division of the 23.42-acre property into two parcels and to his

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. Svcs.*, 340 Or 117 (2006).

development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after December 27, 2002. These laws will not apply to claimant Byron Williams 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 December 27, 2002. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Byron Williams is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow him to use the subject property in the manner set forth in the claim. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

The department has further determined that the claim is not valid as to claimants Edward and Ruth Nash because they are not owners of the subject property.

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On September 21, 2005, 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, two written comments, evidence or information were received in response to the 10-day notice.

The comments do not address whether the claim meets the criteria for relief under ORS 197.352. Comments concerning the effects a use of the property may have on surrounding areas generally are not something that the department is able to consider in determining whether to waive a state law. If funds do become available to pay compensation, then such effects may become relevant in determining which claims to pay compensation for instead of waive a state law. (See the comment letters 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 July 21, 2005, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Goals 3 and 4 (Forest Lands) and provisions of ORS 215 and OAR 660 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 the statute. ORS 197.352(11)(C) defines “owner” as “the present owner of the property, or any interest therein.”

Findings of Fact

Claimants Edward and Ruth Nash acquired the subject property on February 6, 1957, as evidenced by a warranty deed included in the claim. On December 27, 2002, Edward and Ruth Nash conveyed the property to their grandson, claimant Byron Williams, as reflected by a memorandum of contract of sale included with the claim. The Marion County Assessor’s Office confirms claimant Byron Williams’ current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

Claimant Byron Williams is an “owner” of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C) as of December 27, 2002. Edward and Ruth Nash are “family members” of Byron Williams as defined by ORS 197.352(11)(A), as of February 6, 1957. However, Edward and Ruth Nash are not current owners of the subject property.

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 a 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 a claimant or a family member acquired the property.

Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that the claimants desire to divide the subject property into two parcels and to develop a dwelling on each parcel, and identifies Goals 3 and 4 and provisions of ORS 215 and OAR 660 as restricting that desired use.²

² On its face, Goal 4 does not appear to restrict the use of the property. In the absence of any explanation by the claimants as to how Goal 4 restricts the use of the property, this report does not address this regulation further.

The claim is based generally on Marion County's current Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zone and the applicable provisions of state law that require such zoning. The subject property is zoned EFU as required by Goal 3 in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because the property is "agricultural land" as defined by Goal 3.³ Goal 3 became effective on January 25, 1975, and required that agricultural lands as defined by the Goal be zoned EFU pursuant to ORS 215.

Current land use regulations, particularly ORS 215.263, 215.284 and 215.780 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, prohibit the division of EFU-zoned land into parcels less than 80 acres and establish standards for the development of dwellings on existing or any proposed parcel on that land.

ORS 215.780 establishes an 80-acre minimum size for the creation of new lots or parcels in EFU zones and became effective on November 4, 1993 (Chapter 792, Oregon Laws 1993).

ORS 215.263 (2005 edition) establishes standards for the creation of new parcels for non-farm uses and dwellings allowed in an EFU zone.

OAR 660-033-0135 (applicable to farm dwellings) became effective on March 1, 1994, and interprets the statutory standard for a primary dwelling in an EFU zone under ORS 215.283(1)(f). OAR 660-033-0130(4) (applicable to non-farm dwellings) became effective on August 7, 1993, and was amended to comply with ORS 215.284(4) on March 1, 1994. The Commission subsequently adopted amendments to comply with House Bill 3326 (Chapter 704, Oregon Laws 2001, effective on January 1, 2002), which became effective on May 22, 2002. (See administrative rule history for OAR 660-033-0100, -0130 and -0135.)

Claimants and family members Edward and Ruth Nash first acquired the subject property in 1957, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and rules. No county zoning applied to the subject property in 1957.

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, were all enacted or adopted after the Nash family acquired the subject property. These laws restrict the use of the subject property relative to the uses allowed when the Nash family acquired the property.

3. Effect of Regulations on Fair Market Value

In order to establish a valid claim, ORS 197.352(1) requires that any land use regulation 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."

³ The subject property is "agricultural land" because it contains National Resources Conservation Service Class I-IV soils.

Findings of Fact

The claim includes an estimate of \$51,220 for the reduction in the subject property's fair market value due to current regulations. The amount is based on the claimants' own estimate.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimants are Edward and Ruth Nash who acquired the subject property in 1957, and their grandson Byron Williams to whom they have since conveyed the property. Under ORS 197.352, claimant Byron Williams is due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of the property in a manner that reduces its fair market value. Based on the findings and conclusions in Section V.(2) of this report, laws enacted or adopted since the Nash family acquired the subject property restrict the desired division and development of the property.

Without an appraisal or other documentation, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount the claimants demand for compensation. Nevertheless, based on the submitted information, the department determines that it is more likely than not 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 since the Nash family acquired the property.

4. Exemptions Under ORS 197.352

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 the statute.

Findings of Fact

The claim is based on state land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property relative to the uses permitted when the Nash family acquired the property, including applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, which Marion County has implemented through its current EFU zone. All of these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after the Nash family acquired the subject property.

Conclusions

It appears that none of the general statutory, goal and rule restrictions on residential division and development of the subject property were in effect when the Nash family acquired the property on February 6, 1957. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E). Laws in effect when the Nash family acquired the subject property are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and do not provide a basis for compensation. In addition, other land use laws enacted or adopted for a purpose set forth in ORS 197.352(3)(A) to (D) are also exempt, and would not provide a basis for compensation.

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 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 current 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 claimant Byron Williams' ability to divide the 23.42-acre property into two parcels and to develop a dwelling on each parcel. The claim asserts that the laws enforced by the Commission or the department reduce the fair market value of the subject property by \$51,220. However, because the claim does not provide an appraisal or other specific documentation for how the specified restrictions reduce the fair market value of the subject property, a specific amount of compensation cannot be determined. Nevertheless, based on the record for this claim, the department acknowledges that the laws on which the claim is based likely 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 the current owner of the property, Byron Williams, to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time he acquired the property on December 27, 2002.

At the time Byron Williams acquired the subject property, it was zoned EFU by Marion County and subject to the current lot size and dwelling standards under Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, and as described in Section V.(2) of this report.

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 claimants have 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. Claimant Byron Williams should be aware that the less information he has provided to the department in his 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.

Conclusions

Based on the record, the department recommends that the claim be denied as to claimants Edward and Ruth Nash, because they are not owners of the subject property. The department further recommends that the claim be approved as to claimant Byron Williams, 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 Byron Williams' division of the 23.42-acre property into two parcels or to his development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after December 27, 2002. The department

acknowledges that the relief to which Byron Williams is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow him to use the subject property in the manner set forth in the claim.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to Byron Williams to use the property subject to the standards in effect on December 27, 2002. At that time, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, currently in effect.
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 claimant Byron Williams 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 claimant Byron Williams 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 claimant Byron Williams 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 Byron Williams 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 his use of the subject property.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on May 15, 2006. OAR 125-145-0100(3), provided an opportunity for the claimants or the claimants' 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.