

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. M124936
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF	)	
Richard W. Egg and Janette Heathman	)	
CLAIMANTS	)	

Claimants: Richard W. Egg and Janette Heathman (the Claimants)

Property: Township 6N, Range 35, Section 24C, Tax lot 400  
Umatilla 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 Richard Egg and Janette Heathman's development of the subject property for a commercial use: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after August 8, 1980. 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 August 8, 1980.
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 August 8, 1980. On that date, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goal 3 and 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 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 Manager for the Measure 37 Services Division 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

  
Michael Morrissey, Manager  
DLCD, Measure 37 Division  
Dated this 5<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF  
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

  
Lindsay A. Ball, Director  
DAS

Dated this 5<sup>th</sup> day of October, 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**

October 5, 2006

**STATE CLAIM NUMBER:** M124936

**NAMES OF CLAIMANTS:** Richard W. Egg  
Janette Heathman

**MAILING ADDRESS:** Richard W. Egg  
85032 Highway 11  
Milton Freewater, Oregon 97862

Janette Heathman  
PO Box 128  
Hartline, Washington 99135

**PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:** Township 6N, Range 35, Section 24C  
Tax lot 400  
Umatilla County

**DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:** April 14, 2006

**180-DAY DEADLINE:** October 11, 2006

**I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM**

The claimants, Richard Egg and Janette Heathman, seek compensation in the amount of \$950,000 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 claimants desire compensation or the right to develop the subject property for a commercial use.<sup>1</sup> The subject property is located at 85032 Highway 11, near Milton Freewater, in Umatilla County. (See claim.)

---

<sup>1</sup> In response to the draft staff report dated September 20, 2006, pursuant to OAR 125-145-0080, the claimants' consultant submitted a completed sale agreement through which the claimants intend to transfer the subject 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 Richard Egg and Janette Heathman's development of the subject property for a commercial use: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after August 8, 1980. 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 August 8, 1980. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

## III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

### Comments Received

On August 9, 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.

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 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. (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 April 14, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Umatilla County's Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zoning, ORS 197 and 215 and OAR 660 as the basis for the claim.<sup>2</sup> 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, Richard Egg and Janette Heathman, acquired the subject property on August 8, 1980, as reflected by a probate order included with the claim. The Umatilla County Assessor's Office confirms the claimants' current ownership of the subject property.

## **Conclusions**

The claimants, Richard Egg and Janette Heathman, are "owners" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of August 8, 1980.

### **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 acquired the property.

---

<sup>2</sup> In response to the draft staff report dated September 20, 2006, pursuant to OAR 125-145-0080, the claimants' attorney submitted a letter, dated September 18, 2006, requesting a waiver of ORS 197. However, the claimants' attorney does not specify how ORS 197 applies to and restricts the claimants' asserted desired use of the property with the effect of reducing the property's fair market value. If claimants desire a specific use that would necessitate a waiver of ORS 197, they may file a claim for compensation under ORS 197.352 based upon that specified desired use. In addition, the claimants' attorney identifies OAR 666 as restricting the desired use. However, the Oregon Administrative Rules do not include a chapter 666.

## Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that the claimants desire to develop the subject property for a commercial use, and that the current zoning prohibits the desired use.

The claim is based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require EFU zoning and restrict uses on EFU-zoned land. The claimants' property is zoned EFU by Umatilla 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.<sup>3</sup> 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 215.283 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, identify and restrict commercial uses permitted on EFU-zoned land. ORS 215.283(1) identifies a limited number of commercial uses permitted on EFU-zoned land. ORS 215.283(2) allows other commercial activities on EFU-zoned, provided those commercial uses are in conjunction with farm use, and subject to standards set forth in ORS 215.296.

The claimants acquired the subject property after the adoption of the statewide planning goals, but before the Commission acknowledged Umatilla County's land use regulations to be in compliance with the statewide planning goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251. In 1980, the subject property was zoned by Umatilla County as C-1 (General Commercial), which permitted development of a large range of commercial uses appropriate in both urban and rural areas. However, because the Commission had not acknowledged the county's plan and land use regulations when the claimants acquired the subject property on August 8, 1980, and because the property was resource land, the statewide planning goals and Goal 3 in particular, applied directly to the claimants' property when they acquired it.<sup>4</sup>

As adopted on January 25, 1975, Goal 3 required that agricultural land be preserved and zoned for EFU pursuant to ORS 215. Implementing Goal 3, ORS 215.213(2) (1979 edition) identified non-farm uses conditionally allowed on farm land, and specifically, ORS 215.213(2)(a) allowed commercial activities only to the extent the activities were "in conjunction with farm use."

No information has been presented in the claim to establish that the claimants' desired commercial development of the subject property complies with the Goal 3 standards and the requirements of ORS 215.213(2), in effect when the claimants acquired the property in 1980.

---

<sup>3</sup> The claimants' property is "agricultural land" because it contains Natural Resources Conservation Service Class I-VI soils.

<sup>4</sup> 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 comprehensive plan and implementing 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 applied directly 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. *Forster v. Polk County*, 115 Or App 475 (1992) and *Kenagy v. Benton County*, 115 Or App 131 (1992).

## **Conclusions**

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, do not allow the claimants' desired development of the subject property. However, the claim does not establish whether or the extent to which the claimants' desired use of the subject property complies with the standards for development under the requirements of Goal 3 and ORS 215.213 in effect when the claimants acquired the subject property on August 8, 1980.

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 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 \$950,000 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 a land consultant's opinion, submitted with the claim.

## **Conclusions**

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimants are Richard Egg and Janette Heathman who acquired the subject property on August 8, 1980. 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 \$950,000.

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 Umatilla County has implemented through its current EFU zone. With the exception of provisions of Goal 3 and ORS 215 in effect when the claimants acquired the subject property on August 8, 1980, these 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 with the exception of provisions of Goal 3 and ORS 215 in effect in 1980, the statutory, goal and rule restrictions on division and development of the claimants' property were not in effect when the claimants acquired it, and therefore, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E). Provisions of Goal 3 and ORS 215 in effect when the claimants acquired the subject property in 1980 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 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 \$950,000. 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 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 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 Richard Egg and Janette Heathman to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time they acquired the property on August 8, 1980.

### **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 Richard Egg and Janette Heathman's development of the subject property for a commercial use: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after August 8, 1980. 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 August 8, 1980.
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 August 8, 1980. On that date, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goal 3 and 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 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 20, 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.