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 Delilah Knight and Cheryl Oguri, CLAIMANTS	))))	FINAL ORDER CLAIM NOs. M124769, M124770, M124771 and M124772[1]

Claimants: Delilah Knight and Cheryl Oguri (the Claimants)

Property: Township 23S, Range 5W, Section 29, Tax lot 1000
Township 23S, Range 5W, Section 30, Tax lot 900
Township 23S, Range 5W, Section 31, Tax lot 100
Township 23S, Range 5W, Section 32, Tax lot 100
Douglas 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 Delilah Knight and Cheryl Oguri's (1) division of 80-acre tax lot 900 into two parcels and development of a dwelling on the resulting undeveloped parcel; (2) development of a dwelling on 80-acre tax lot 100 (section 31) and on 80-acre tax lot 1000; and (3) division of 152.80-acre tax lot 100 (section 32) into two parcels and development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and 660, divisions 6, and 33, enacted or adopted after March 19, 1999. These laws will not apply to the claimants only to the extent

[1] The claimants submitted four separate claims that were consolidated under this review. M124769 seeks relief in the amount of $145,000 or the right to divide and develop tax lot 900. M124770 seeks relief in the amount of $109,000 or the right to develop tax lot 100 (section 31). M124771 seeks relief in the amount of $110,000 or the right to divide and develop tax lot 100 (section 32). M124772 seeks compensation in the amount of $107,000 or the right to develop tax lot 1000.

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 March 19, 1999. The department acknowledges that the relief to which the claimants are entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow the claimants to use the subject property in the manner set forth in the claims.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimants to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on March 19, 1999. At that time, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6, and 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 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 subject 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 Director 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 26th day of September, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

Lindsay A. Ball, Director
DAS
Dated this 26th 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 26, 2006

STATE CLAIM NUMBERS:	M124769, M124770, M124771 and M124772[1]
NAMES OF CLAIMANTS:	Delilah Knight (personal representative, Estate of Marie Knight) Cheryl Oguri (personal representative, Estate of Marie Knight)
MAILING ADDRESS:	Delilah Knight 3460 Rice Valley Road Oakland, Oregon 97462 Cheryl Oguri 3280 Rice Valley Road Oakland, Oregon 97462
PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:	Township 23S, Range 5W, Section 29 Tax lot 1000 Township 23S, Range 5W, Section 30 Tax lot 900 Township 23S, Range 5W, Section 31 Tax lot 100 Township 23S, Range 5W, Section 32 Tax lot 100 Douglas County
DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:	April 5, 2006
180-DAY DEADLINE:	October 2, 2006

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, Delilah Knight and Cheryl Oguri, seek compensation in the amount of $471,000 for the total reduction in fair market value as a result of land use regulations that are alleged to

[1] The claimants submitted four separate claims that were consolidated under this review. M124769 seeks relief in the amount of $145,000 or the right to divide and develop tax lot 900. M124770 seeks relief in the amount of $109,000 or the right to develop tax lot 100 (section 31). M124771 seeks relief in the amount of $110,000 or the right to divide and develop tax lot 100 (section 32). M124772 seeks compensation in the amount of $107,000 or the right to develop tax lot 1000.

restrict the use of certain private real property. The claimants desire compensation or the right to: (1) divide 80-acre tax lot 900 into two parcels and develop a dwelling on the resulting undeveloped parcel; (2) develop a dwelling on 80-acre tax lot 100 (section 31) and on 80-acre tax lot 1000; and (3) divide 152.8-acre tax lot 100 (section 32) into two parcels and develop a dwelling on each parcel. The subject property is located near Oakland, in Douglas County. (See claims.)

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 claims are 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 Delilah Knight and Cheryl Oguri's (1) division of 80-acre tax lot 900 into two parcels and development of a dwelling on the resulting undeveloped parcel; (2) development of a dwelling on 80-acre tax lot 100 (section 31) and on 80-acre tax lot 1000; and (3) division of 152.8-acre tax lot 100 (section 32) into two parcels and development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goals 3 (Agricultural Lands) and 4 (Forest Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, divisions 6, and 33, enacted or adopted after March 19, 1999. 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 March 19, 1999. The department acknowledges that the relief to which the claimants are entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow the claimants to use the subject property in the manner set forth in the claims. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On July 24, 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, no written comments were received in response to the 10-day notice.

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

These claims were submitted to DAS on April 5, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claims identify the county's current "FG and FF" zoning as the basis for the claims. Only laws that were enacted or adopted prior to December 2, 2004, are the basis for the claims.

Conclusions

The claims have 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 are 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, Delilah Knight and Cheryl Oguri, acquired the subject property on March 19, 1999, as personal representatives of the estate of their mother, Marie Knight, as reflected by probate documents included with the claims. Marie Knight acquired the subject property on August 31, 1956, as evidenced by a warranty deed included with the claims. The Douglas County Assessor's Office confirms the claimants' current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimants, Delilah Knight and Cheryl Oguri, are "owners" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of March 19, 1999. Marie Knight is a "family member" of the claimants, as defined by ORS 197.352(11)(A), and acquired the subject property on August 31, 1956.

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 claims indicate that the claimants desire to: (1) divide 80-acre tax lot 900 into two parcels and develop a dwelling on the resulting undeveloped parcel; (2) develop a dwelling on 80-acre tax lot 100 (section 31) and on 80-acre tax lot 1000; and (3) divide 152.8-acre tax lot 100 (section 32) into two parcels and develop a dwelling on each parcel. It indicates that the property's current zoning prohibits the desired use.

The claims are based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) and forest zoning.

Sixty acres of tax lot 100 (section 31) and fourteen acres of tax lot 900 are zoned EFU-FG (Exclusive Farm Use-Farm Grazing) by Douglas 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.[2] Goal 3 became effective on January 25, 1975, and required that agricultural lands as defined by Goal 3 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.

Tax lots 100 (section 32) and 1000, twenty acres of tax lot 100 (section 31) and sixty-six acres of tax lot 900 are zoned Farm Forest (FF), which is a mixed agricultural and forest land zone, as required by Goal 4 and the implementing provisions of OAR 660-006-0050 (effective on February 5, 1990), subsequently amended on March 1, 1994, to comply with the provisions of House Bill 3661 (Chapter 792, Oregon Laws 1993).

Under OAR 660-006-0050, all the uses permitted under Goals 3 and 4 are allowed in mixed agriculture and forest zones except that for dwellings, either the Goal 3 or 4 standards are applicable based on the predominant use of the tract on January 1, 1993.[3] Depending on the predominant use on that date, the property is subject to either the requirements for dwellings applicable under EFU zoning required by Goal 3 and OAR 660, division 33, or forest zone provisions required by Goal 4 and OAR 660, division 6.

---

[2] Sixty acres of tax lot 100 (section 31) and fourteen acres of tax lot 900 are "agricultural land" because they contain National Resources Conservation Service Class I–IV soils.

[3] No information was provided to the department regarding the predominant use of the property on January 1, 1993.

For land divisions, OAR 660-006-0055 authorizes the creation of new parcels based on the standards applicable to farm or forest zones that implement the 80-acre minimum lot size specified in ORS 215.780. Under ORS 215.780(2)(a), the minimum lot size in Douglas County's FF zone is 80 acres.

The claimants' family first acquired the subject property in 1956, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations. No county zoning applied to the subject property in 1956.

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6, and 33, were all enacted or adopted after the claimants' family acquired the subject property. These laws restrict the use of the subject property relative to the uses allowed when the claimants' 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 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 claims include a total estimate of $471,000 (for the four claims) 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' comparison of the sales of similar properties in the area.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimants are Delilah Knight and Cheryl Oguri whose family acquired the subject property in 1956. Under ORS 197.352, the claimants are due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of the 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' family 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 $471,000.

Without an appraisal or other documentation, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount by which the land use regulations have reduced the fair market value of the subject property. Nevertheless, based on the evidence in the record for the claims, 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 since the claimants' family acquired the property.

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 claims are based on state land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property relative to the uses permitted when the claimants' family acquired the property, including applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6, and 33, which Douglas County has implemented through its current EFU-FG and FF zones. All of these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after the claimants' 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 claimants' family acquired the property on August 31, 1956. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E). Laws in effect when the claimants' 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 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 claims assert 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 $471,000. However, because the claims do 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 compensation due for these claims, 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 their family acquired the property. Nevertheless, based on the record for these claims, the department has determined that the laws on which the claims are 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 Delilah Knight and Cheryl Oguri to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time they acquired the property on March 19, 1999.

At the time the claimants acquired the subject property, it was subject to Douglas County's EFU FG and FF zones and the provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6 and 33, currently in effect, and as described in Section V.(2) of this report.

In addition to the provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6, and 33, currently in effect, there may be other laws that apply to the claimants' use of the property that have not been identified in the claims. In addition, the department notes that ORS 215.730 and OAR 660, division 6, include standards for siting dwellings in forest zones. The provisions include fire protection standards for dwellings and for surrounding forest zones. 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. . . ." To the extent they are applicable to the claimants' property, the siting standards for dwellings in forest zones in ORS 215.730 and OAR 660, division 6, are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(B).

This report addresses only those state laws that are identified in the claims, 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 claims. The claimants should be aware that the less information they have provided to the department in the claims, 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.

Conclusions

Based on the record, the department recommends that the claims 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 Delilah Knight and Cheryl Oguri's (1) division of 80-acre tax lot 900 into two parcels and development of a dwelling on the resulting undeveloped parcel; (2) development of a dwelling on 80-acre tax lot 100 (section 31) and on 80-acre tax lot 1000; and (3) division of 152.80-acre tax lot 100 (section 32) into two parcels and development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and 660, divisions 6, and 33, enacted or adopted after March 19, 1999. 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 March 19, 1999. The department acknowledges that the relief to which the claimants are entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow the claimants to use the subject property in the manner set forth in the claims.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimants to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on March 19, 1999. At that time, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6, and 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 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 subject 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 September 11, 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.