



**OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND  
DEVELOPMENT**

**ORS 195.300 to ORS 195.336 (MEASURE 49) SUPPLEMENTAL REVIEW  
OF MEASURE 37 CLAIM  
Final Order of Denial**

**STATE ELECTION NUMBER:**

E124387

**CLAIMANTS:**

Carl R. and Virginia L. Kostol  
3115 N Second Street  
Baker City, OR 97814

**MEASURE 37 PROPERTY  
IDENTIFICATION:**

Township 8S, Range 39E, Section 25  
Tax lot 400  
Baker County

The claimants, Carl and Virginia Kostol, filed a claim with the state under ORS 197.352 (2005) (Measure 37) on March 15, 2006, for property located near Baker City, in Baker County. ORS 195.300 to ORS 195.336 (Measure 49) entitles claimants who filed Measure 37 claims to elect supplemental review of their claims. The claimants elected supplemental review of their Measure 37 claim under Section 6 of Measure 49, which allows the Department of Land Conservation and Development (the department) to authorize up to three home site approvals to qualified claimants. This Final Order of Denial is the conclusion of the supplemental review of this claim.

**I. ANALYSIS OF CLAIM**

**A. Maximum Number of Home Sites for Which the Claimants May Qualify**

Under Section 6 of Measure 49, the number of home site approvals authorized by the department cannot exceed the lesser of the following: three; the number stated by the claimant in the election materials; or the number described in a Measure 37 waiver issued by the state, or if no waiver was issued, the number of home sites described in the Measure 37 claim filed with the state. The claimants have requested one home site approval in the election material. The Measure 37 waiver issued for this claim describes one home site. Therefore, the claimants may qualify for a maximum of one home site approval under Section 6 of Measure 49.

**B. Qualification Requirements**

To qualify for a home site approval under Section 6 of Measure 49, the claimants must meet each of the following requirements:

## **1. Timeliness of Claim**

A claimant must have filed a Measure 37 claim for the property with either the state or the county in which the property is located on or before June 28, 2007, and must have filed a Measure 37 claim with both the state and the county before Measure 49 became effective on December 6, 2007. If the state Measure 37 claim was filed after December 4, 2006, the claim must also have been filed in compliance with the provisions of OAR 660-041-0020 then in effect.

### **Findings of Fact and Conclusions**

The claimants, Carl and Virginia Kostol, filed a Measure 37 claim, M124387, with the state on March 15, 2006. The claimants filed a Measure 37 claim, M37-05-047, with Baker County on December 7, 2005. The state claim was filed prior to December 4, 2006. The claimants timely filed a Measure 37 claim with both the state and Baker County.

## **2. The Claimant Is an Owner of the Property**

Measure 49 defines “Owner” as: “(a) The owner of fee title to the property as shown in the deed records of the county where the property is located; (b) The purchaser under a land sale contract, if there is a recorded land sale contract in force for the property; or (c) If the property is owned by the trustee of a revocable trust, the settlor of a revocable trust, except that when the trust becomes irrevocable only the trustee is the owner.”

### **Findings of Fact and Conclusions**

According to the deed submitted by the claimants, Carl and Virginia Kostol are the owners of fee title to the property as shown in the Baker County deed records and, therefore, are owners of the property under Measure 49. Baker County has confirmed that the claimants are the current owners of the property.

## **3. All Owners Have Consented in Writing to the Claim**

All owners of the property must consent to the claim in writing.

### **Findings of Fact and Conclusions**

All owners of the property have consented to the claim in writing.

## **4. The Property Is Located Entirely Outside Any Urban Growth Boundary and Entirely Outside the Boundaries of Any City**

The Measure 37 claim property must be located entirely outside any urban growth boundary and entirely outside the boundaries of any city.

### **Findings of Fact and Conclusions**

The Measure 37 claim property is located in Baker County, outside the urban growth boundary and outside the city limits of the nearest city, Baker City.

### **5. One or More Land Use Regulations Prohibit Establishing the Lot, Parcel or Dwelling**

One or more land use regulations must prohibit establishing the requested lot, parcel or dwelling.

### **Findings of Fact and Conclusions**

The property is currently zoned Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) by Baker County, in accordance with ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because the property is “agricultural land” as defined by Goal 3. Goal 3 requires agricultural land to be zoned exclusive farm use. Applicable provisions of ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, provide standards for the establishment of a dwelling in an EFU zone. In general and subject to some exceptions, those standards require that the property be a minimum of 80 acres in size in an EFU zone and generate a minimum annual income from the sale of farm products.

The combined effect of the standards for the establishment of a dwelling in an EFU zone is to prohibit the claimants from establishing a dwelling on the Measure 37 claim property.

### **6. The Establishment of the Lot, Parcel or Dwelling Is Not Prohibited by a Land Use Regulation Described in ORS 195.305(3)**

ORS 195.305(3) exempts from claims under Measure 49 land use regulations:

- (a) Restricting or prohibiting activities commonly and historically recognized as public nuisances under common law;
- (b) Restricting or prohibiting activities for the protection of public health and safety;
- (c) To the extent the land use regulation is required to comply with federal law; or
- (d) Restricting or prohibiting the use of a property for the purpose of selling pornography or performing nude dancing.

### **Findings of Fact and Conclusions**

Based on the documentation submitted by the claimants, the establishment of the one home site for which the claimants may qualify on the property is not prohibited by land use regulations described in ORS 195.305(3).

**7. On the Claimant's Acquisition Date, the Claimant Lawfully Was Permitted to Establish at Least the Number of Lots, Parcels or Dwellings on the Property That Are Authorized Under Section 6 of Measure 49**

A claimant's acquisition date is "the date the claimant became the owner of the property as shown in the deed records of the county in which the property is located. If there is more than one claimant for the same property under the same claim and the claimants have different acquisition dates, the acquisition date is the earliest of those dates."

**Findings of Fact and Conclusions**

Baker County deed records indicate that the claimants acquired the property on December 28, 1987.

On December 28, 1987, the Measure 37 claim property was subject to Baker County's acknowledged EFU zone. Baker County's EFU zone required 40 irrigated acres<sup>1</sup> for the establishment of a dwelling on a vacant lot or parcel. The Measure 37 claim property consists of 67 non-irrigated acres. Therefore, the claimants lawfully could not have established any home sites on the Measure 37 claim property on their date of acquisition

Because this requirement has not been met, the claimants are not entitled to any relief under Measure 49, and, therefore, the remaining approval criteria will not be evaluated.

**II. COMMENTS ON THE PRELIMINARY EVALUATION**

The department issued its Preliminary Evaluation for this claim on January 21, 2009. Pursuant to OAR 660-041-0090, the department provided written notice to the owners of surrounding properties. No written comments were received in response to the 28-day notice.

**III. CONCLUSION**

Based on the analysis above, the claimants, Carl and Virginia Kostol, do not qualify for any Measure 49 home site approvals because the claimants were not lawfully permitted to establish any dwellings on the claimants' date of acquisition.

---

<sup>1</sup> Baker County's EFU zone required 40 irrigated acres (i.e., 40 acres fully covered with adjudicated water rights); or in the alternative, a combination of irrigated acres and non-irrigated acres whereby four non-irrigated acres were considered equal to one irrigated acre. Since none of the claimants' property contains adjudicated water rights, the claimants would have needed at least an additional 23.25 irrigated acres, or a total of 160 non-irrigated acres to establish a dwelling on their date of acquisition.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this Final Order of Denial is entered by the Director of the Department of Land Conservation and Development as a final order of the department and the Land Conservation and Development Commission under ORS 197.300 to ORS 195.336 and OAR 660-041-0000 to 660-041-0160.

FOR THE DEPARTMENT AND THE LAND  
CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT  
COMMISSION:

\_\_\_\_\_/S/\_\_\_\_\_  
Richard Whitman, Director  
Dept. of Land Conservation and Development  
Dated this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2009.

**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 is available to anyone who is an owner of the property as defined in Measure 49 that it the subject of this final determination, or a person who timely submitted written evidence or comments to the department concerning this final determination.
2. 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 must be filed in the Circuit Court in the county in which the affected property is located. Upon motion of any party to the proceedings, the proceedings may be transferred to any other county with jurisdiction under ORS 183.484 in the manner provided by law for change of venue.
3. Judicial review of this final determination is limited to the evidence in the record of the department at the time of its final determination. Copies of the documents that comprise the record are available for review at the department's office at 635 Capitol St. NE, Suite 150, Salem, OR 97301-2540. Judicial review is only available for issues that were raised before the department with sufficient specificity to afford the department an opportunity to respond.