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 Michael Alley, Margueritte Alley, Jack David "J.D." Alley and Tamera Alley, CLAIMANTS	))))))	FINAL ORDER CLAIM NO. M124383

Claimants: Michael Alley, Margueritte Alley, Jack David "J.D." Alley and Tamera Alley (the Claimants)

Property: Township 11S, Range 13E, Section 31, Tax lot 800, Jefferson 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 the claimants' development of two dwellings on the subject property: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after May 7, 1990. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimants only to the extent necessary to allow them to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when they acquired the property on May 7, 1990.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimants to use the property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on May 7, 1990. On that date, the property was subject to compliance Goal 3 and OAR 660, division 5, as implemented by Jefferson County's acknowledged EFU zone, and the applicable provisions of ORS 215 then 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 the claimants first obtain 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 property by the claimants 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 claimants to use the subject property, it may be necessary for them 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 claimants 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 claimants.

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 6th day of September, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

David Hartwig, Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 6th day of September, 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, 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."

ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION

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

September 6, 2006

STATE CLAIM NUMBER:	M124383
NAMES OF CLAIMANTS:	Michael Alley Margueritte Alley Jack David "J.D." Alley Tamera Alley
MAILING ADDRESS:	None provided
PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:	Township 11S, Range 13E, Section 31 Tax lot 800 Jefferson County
OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION:	Bob Harris PO Box 698 Madras, Oregon 97741
DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:	March 15, 2006
180-DAY DEADLINE:	September 11, 2006

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, Michael, Margueritte, J.D. and Tamera Alley, seek compensation in the amount of $1 million 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 develop two dwellings on the subject property. The subject property is located at geographic coordinates listed above in Jefferson 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 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 the claimants' development of two dwellings on the subject property: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after May 7, 1990. These laws will not apply to the claimants only to the extent necessary to allow them to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when

they acquired the property on May 7, 1990. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On June 27, 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, two written comments were received in response to the 10-day notice.

One of the comments des not address whether the claim meets the criteria for relief under ORS 197.352. Comments concerning the effects a use of the subject property may have on surrounding areas are generally 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.

The other comment is relevant to when the claimants became the present owners of the subject property. The comment has been considered by the department in preparing this report. (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 March 15, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Jefferson County's EFU-80 zone 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 claimants, Michael, Margueritte, J.D. and Tamera Alley, acquired the subject property on May 7, 1990, as reflected by a quitclaim deed included with the claim. The Jefferson County Assessor's Office confirms the claimants' current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimants, Michael, Margueritte, J.D. and Tamera Alley, are "owners" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of May 7, 1990.

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 claimants' 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 claimants or a family member acquired the property.

Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that the claimants desire to develop two dwellings on the subject property and that current land use regulations prohibit the desired use.

The claim is based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zoning and restrict uses on EFU-zoned land. The claimants' property is zoned EFU-80 by Jefferson County, as required by Goal 3, in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because the claimants' property is "agricultural land" as defined by Goal 3.[1] 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.

[1] The claimants' property is "agricultural land" because it contains Natural Resources Conservation Service Class I–VI soils.

Current land use regulations, particularly ORS 215.284 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, establish standards for development of dwellings on existing or proposed parcels on EFU-zoned land.

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 were effective on May 22, 2002. (See administrative rule history for OAR 660-033-0100, -0130 and -0135.)

At the time the claimants acquired the subject property, it was subject to Jefferson County's acknowledged EFU zone.[2] When the claimants acquired the subject property, the claimants' desired use of the property would have been governed by the county's acknowledged EFU zone and the applicable provisions of ORS 215 then in effect.[3] In 1990, ORS 215.283(1)(f) (1989 edition) generally allowed farm dwellings "customarily provided in conjunction with farm use." Non-farm dwellings were allowed under ORS 215.283(3) if they were determined to be compatible with farm use, not interfere seriously with accepted farm practices, not materially alter the stability of the land use pattern in the area and be situated on generally unsuitable land for the production of farm crops and livestock.

The claim does not establish whether or to what extent the claimants' desired development of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when they acquired the property on May 7, 1990.

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements and dwelling standards established by ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, were enacted or adopted after the claimants acquired the subject property in 1990 and do not allow the claimants' desired development of the property. However, the claim does not establish whether or to what extent the claimants' desired use of the subject property complies with the standards for development under Jefferson County's EFU zone and comprehensive plan in effect when the claimants acquired the property on May 7, 1990.

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 claimants have identified. There may be other laws that currently apply to the claimants' use of the subject property, and that may continue to apply to the claimants' 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 the subject property

---

[2] Jefferson County's EFU zone was acknowledged by the Commission for compliance with Goal 3 on July 26, 1985.

[3] After the county's comprehensive plan and land use regulations were acknowledged by the Commission as complying with the Statewide Planning Goals, the Goals and implementing rules no longer applied directly to individual 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. *Forster v. Polk County*, 115 Or App 475 (1992) and *Kenagy v. Benton County*, 115 Or App 131 (1992).

until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the claimants seek 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 $1 million as the reduction in the subject property's fair market value due to the regulations that restrict the claimants' desired use of the property. This amount is based on the claimants' assessment of the subject property's value.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimants are Michael, Margueritte, J.D. and Tamera Alley who acquired the subject property on May 7, 1990. Under ORS 197.352, the claimants are 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 claimants acquired the subject property restrict the claimants' desired use of the property. The claimants estimate that the effect of the regulations on the fair market value of the subject property is a reduction of $1 million.

Without an appraisal or other documentation and without verification of whether or the extent to which the claimants' desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when they 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 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, which Jefferson County has implemented through its current EFU-80 zone. With the exception of applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660 in effect when the claimants acquired the subject property on May 7, 1990, these state land use regulations were enacted or adopted after the claimants 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 development of the subject property are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) only to the extent they were enacted or adopted after the claimants acquired the property on May 7, 1990. Provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660 in effect when the claimants acquired the subject property in 1990 are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the property.

Other laws in effect when the claimants acquired the subject property are also exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the claimants' use of the property. There may be other laws that continue to apply to the claimants' 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 subject property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the claimants seek a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws 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 use 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. The claimants should be aware that the less information they have 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 their 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 claimants' 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 $1 million. However, because the claim does not provide an appraisal or 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 the compensation due for this claim, it would also be necessary to verify whether or the extent to which the claimants' desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when they 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 Michael, Margueritte, J.D. and Tamera Alley to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time they acquired the property on May 7, 1990.

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 the claimants' development of two dwellings on the subject property: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after May 7, 1990. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimants only to the extent necessary to allow them to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when they acquired the property on May 7, 1990.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimants to use the property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on May 7, 1990. On that date, the property was subject to compliance Goal 3 and OAR 660, division 5, as implemented by Jefferson County's acknowledged EFU zone, and the applicable provisions of ORS 215 then 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 the claimants first obtain 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 property by the claimants 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 claimants to use the subject property, it may be necessary for them 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 claimants 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 claimants.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on August 21, 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.