



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:

H134298

CLAIMANTS:

Donald O. Bieber
41-016 Hilu Street
Waimanalo, HI 96795

Robert W. Graham
2140 Home Avenue
Klamath Falls, OR 97601

**MEASURE 37 PROPERTY
IDENTIFICATION:**

Township 38S, Range 11E
Section 17, Tax lots 1000, 1100, 1200, 1400
and 1500
Section 18, Tax lots 600 and 700
Section 20, Tax lots 1700, 1800, 1900 and
2000
Section 21, Tax lots 2100 and 2200
Klamath County

The claimants, Donald Bieber and Robert Graham, filed a claim with the state under ORS 197.352 (2005) (Measure 37) on March 2, 2007, for property located at 5800 Happy Hollow Lane, near Bonanza, in Klamath 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.¹ However, as initially enacted in 2007, a claimant was not eligible for relief under Measure 49 if the claimant filed a Measure 37 claim with the state after December 4, 2006 but did not comply with the provisions of OAR 660-041-0020, then in effect. Donald Bieber and Robert Graham were not entitled to Measure 49 relief on that basis.

However, the Oregon State Legislative Assembly subsequently amended this Measure 49 requirement through the passage of House Bill 3225 (Chapter 855 (2009 Laws)) (HB 3225). As a result, this requirement no longer prevents the claimants, Donald Bieber and Robert Graham,

¹ The claimants elected review under Section 7 of Measure 49. However, under HB3225 the department may only review claim H134298 under Section 6 of Measure 49.

from obtaining Measure 49 relief. The claimants elected to seek relief under Measure 49, as amended by HB 3225, and submitted the \$175 fee required by Section 18 of HB 3225 in order to have the claim reviewed.

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 ten home site approvals in the election material. No waiver was issued for this claim. The Measure 37 claim filed with the state describes division and development that could have resulted in more than three home sites. Therefore, the claimants may qualify for a maximum of three home site approvals under Section 6 of Measure 49.

B. Qualification Requirements

To qualify for a home site approval under Section 6 of Measure 49, as amended by HB 3225, 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 the state before Measure 49 became effective on December 6, 2007. If the claimant filed their state Measure 37 claim after December 4, 2006, the claimant must also have either (a) filed the claim in compliance with the provisions of OAR 660-041-0020 then in effect; (b) submitted a land use application as described in OAR 660-041-0020 then in effect prior to June 28, 2007; or (c) filed a Measure 37 claim with the county on or before December 4, 2006.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions

The claimants, Donald Bieber and Robert Graham, filed a Measure 37 claim, M134298, with the state on March 7, 2007. The claimants filed a Measure 37 claim, 64-06 with Klamath County on November 29, 2006. The state claim was filed after December 4, 2006 and the claimants also filed a county Measure 37 claim before December 4, 2006.

The claimants filed a timely Measure 37 claim with the state along with any additional claims or applications that the claimants had to have filed in order to be eligible for review under Measure 49, as amended by HB 3225.

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 deeds submitted by the claimants, Donald Bieber and Robert Graham are the owners of fee title to the property as shown in the Klamath County deed records and, therefore, are owners of the property under Measure 49.

Klamath County has confirmed that the claimants are the current owners of the property.

3. All Owners of the Property 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 Majority of the Measure 37 Claim Property Is Located Outside Any Urban Growth Boundary and Outside the Boundaries of Any City or the Measure 37 Claim Property is Located within the Boundaries of A City and Entirely Outside Any Urban Growth Boundary

Either the majority of the Measure 37 claim property must be located outside any urban growth boundary and outside the boundaries of any city or the Measure 37 Claim Property must be located within the boundaries of a city and entirely outside any urban growth boundary.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions:

The Measure 37 claim property is located in Klamath County and the property is located outside any urban growth boundary and outside the city boundary of the nearest city, Bonanza.

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 Forestry Range (FR) by Klamath County, in accordance with Goals 3 and 4, as implemented by OAR 660-006-0050. State land use regulations, including

applicable provisions of ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6 and 33, generally prohibit the establishment of a lot or parcel less than 80 acres in size in a mixed farm/forest zone. Those provisions also regulate the establishment of dwellings on new or existing lots or parcels and include restrictions on establishing more than one dwelling on a single tract.

The claimants' property consists of 1,220.14 acres that make up a single tract. Therefore, state land use regulations prohibit the claimants from establishing on the Measure 37 claim property the three home sites the claimants may qualify for under Section 6 of Measure 49.

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;
- (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, it does not appear that the establishment of the three home sites for which the claimants may qualify on the property is 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

Klamath County deed records indicate that the claimants acquired the property on April 30, 2004.²

The zoning of the Measure 37 property has not changed since the claimants acquired the property. As it is currently, on April 30, 2004, the Measure 37 claim property was zoned Forestry

² A recorded warranty deed dated April 30, 2004, conveyed the claim property from Hungry Hollow Youth Ranch, a partnership, to the claimants as individuals.

Range (FR) by Klamath County in accordance with the applicable provisions of ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6 and 33. The FR zone requires a minimum of 80 acres for the creation of a new lot or parcel on which a dwelling could be established. The claimants were not lawfully permitted to establish more than one dwelling on a tract on their date of acquisition. The claimants' property consists of 1,220.14 acres and is developed with five dwellings. The claimants are not qualified for Measure 49 relief on the Measure 37 claim property because the zoning and lawfully permitted uses of the property have not changed since the claimants acquired the property, and the claimants lawfully could not have established any home sites on their date of acquisition.

II. COMMENTS ON THE PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

The department issued its Preliminary Evaluation for this claim on June 15, 2010. Pursuant to OAR 660-041-0090, the department provided written notice to the owners of surrounding properties. Comments received have been taken into account by the department in the issuance of this Final Order of Denial. Specifically, the claimants submitted comments stating that they acquired the property in 1974. It does appear that the Hungry Hollow Youth Ranch Partnership did acquire the bulk of the claim property in 1974; however, the Hungry Hollow Youth Ranch Partnership is not a claimant and is also no longer an owner of the property. While the claimants may have had interests in the Hungry Hollow Youth Ranch Partnership, the Partnership was a separate and distinct legal entity from the claimants. The claimants and current owners of the property are Donald Bieber and Robert Graham as individuals and based on the Klamath County deed records they acquired the property on April 30, 2004.

III. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis above, the claimants do not qualify for Measure 49 home site approvals because the zoning and lawfully permitted uses of the property have not changed since their acquisition date and the claimants were not lawfully permitted to establish the lots, parcels or dwellings on the claimants' date of acquisition.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this Final Order and 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:



Kristin May, Division Manager
Dept. of Land Conservation and Development
Dated this 2th day of August 2010

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 is 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.