



**OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND
DEVELOPMENT**

**ORS 195.300 to ORS 195.336 (MEASURE 49) SUPPLEMENTAL REVIEW
OF MEASURE 37 CLAIM
Preliminary Evaluation**

November 12, 2009

STATE ELECTION NUMBER: E133792A¹

CLAIMANT: Judith M. Iverson
1872 Willamette Street
Eugene, OR 97401

**MEASURE 37 PROPERTY
IDENTIFICATION:** Township 16S, Range 5E, Section 15
Tax lots 201 and 205
Lane County

I. ELECTION

The claimant, Judith Iverson, filed a claim with the state under ORS 197.352 (2005) (Measure 37) on December 4, 2006, for property located south of McKenzie Highway 126 and east of the community of McKenzie Bridge, near Springfield, in Lane 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 claimant has elected supplemental review of her 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.

II. SUMMARY OF PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

Based on the department's preliminary analysis, it appears that the claimant is not eligible for any relief under Measure 49 because the claimant would not have been lawfully permitted to establish any home sites when she acquired the property.

¹ Claim E133792 has been divided into three claims because the claim includes multiple tax lots or parcels that are not in the same ownership. E133792A refers to tax lots 201 and 205 and claimant Judith Iverson. E133792B refers to tax lot 203 and claimant Boyd Iverson. E133792C refers to tax lot 204 and claimant Jordon Iverson.

III. THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF HOME SITE APPROVALS FOR WHICH THE CLAIMANT 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 claimant has requested three home site approvals in the election material. No waiver was issued for this claim. The Measure 37 claim filed with the state describes four home sites. Therefore, the claimant may qualify for a maximum of three home site approvals under Section 6 of Measure 49.

IV. PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF QUALIFICATION FOR HOME SITE APPROVAL

1. Preliminary Analysis

To qualify for a home site approval under Section 6 of Measure 49, 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.

The claimant, Judith Iverson, filed a Measure 37 claim, M133792, with the state on December 4, 2006. The claimant filed a Measure 37 claim, PA 06-6744, with Lane County on October 9, 2006. The state claim was filed on December 4, 2006.

It appears that the claimant timely filed a Measure 37 claim with both the state and Lane County.

In addition to filing a claim with both the state and the county in which the property is located, to qualify for a home site approval under Section 6 of Measure 49 the claimant must establish each of the following:

(a) 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."

According to the deed submitted by the claimants, Judith Iverson is the owner of fee title to the property as shown in the Lane County deed records and, therefore, is an owner of the property under Measure 49.

(b) All Owners of the Property Have Consented in Writing to the Claim

It appears that the claimant is the sole owner of the property. Therefore, no additional consent is required.

(c) The Measure 37 Claim Property Is Located Entirely Outside Any Urban Growth Boundary and Entirely Outside the Boundaries of Any City

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

(d) One or More Land Use Regulations Prohibit Establishing the Lot, Parcel or Dwelling

As stated in Section III above, the claimant may qualify for up to three home site approvals.

The property is currently zoned Impact Forest (F2) by Lane County, in accordance with ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660, division 6, because the property is “forest land” under Goal 4. Applicable provisions of ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660 division 6, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 4, generally prohibit the establishment of a lot or parcel less than 80 acres in size in a forest zone and regulate the establishment of dwellings on new or existing lots or parcels.

The claimant’s property consists of 0.07 acres. Therefore, state land use regulations prohibit the claimant from establishing on the Measure 37 claim property the three home sites the claimant may qualify for under Section 6 of Measure 49.

(e) 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.

Based on the documentation submitted by the claimant, it does not appear that the establishment of the three home sites for which the claimant may qualify on the property would be prohibited by land use regulations described in ORS 195.305(3).

(f) 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."

Lane County deed records indicate that the claimant acquired the property on January 6, 1987.

The claimant acquired the Measure 37 claim property after adoption of the statewide planning goals, but before the Commission acknowledged Lane County's comprehensive plan and land use regulations to be in compliance with those goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251. At that time, the Measure 37 claim property was zoned Non-Impacted Forest (F1) by Lane County. However, the Commission had not acknowledged that zone for compliance with the goals. When the claimant acquired the property on January 6, 1987, the statewide planning goals, and in particular Goal 4 and ORS chapter 215 applied directly to the Measure 37 claim property when the claimant acquired it.

To determine whether a use of property that was not subject to an acknowledged zone at the time the claimant acquired it would have complied with Goal 4, OAR 660-041-0110 provides that DLCD will apply the first acknowledged local land use regulations, unless the evidence in the record, including but not limited to, county records, county Measure 37 waivers or local land use determinations issued at the time the property was acquired, establishes that a greater number of lots, parcels or dwellings would have been lawfully permitted.

In 1987, Goal 4 was "to conserve forest lands for forest uses." It required that forest land "be retained for the production of wood fiber and other forest uses," and that "[l]ands suitable for forest uses be inventoried and designated as forest lands."²

On February 14, 1992, the Commission acknowledged the application of Lane County's F1 zone to the Measure 37 claim property. The Commission's acknowledgement of Lane County's F1 zone confirmed that zone's compliance with Goal 4 and ORS chapter 215. Lane County's

² As adopted in 1975, Goal 4 defined "Forest Lands" as:

"(1) [L]ands composed of existing and potential forest lands which are suitable for commercial forest uses; (2) other forested lands needed for watershed protection, wildlife and fisheries habitat and recreation; (3) lands where extreme conditions of climate, soil and topography require the maintenance of vegetative cover irrespective of use; (4) other forested lands in urban and agricultural areas which provide urban buffers, wind breaks, wildlife and fisheries habitat, livestock habitat, scenic corridors, and recreational use."

Goal 4 defined "Forest Uses" as:

(1) [T]he production of trees and the processing of forest products; (2) open space, buffers from noise, and visual separation of conflicting uses; (3) watershed protection and wildlife and fisheries habitat; (4) soil protection from wind and water; (5) maintenance of clean air and water; (6) outdoor recreational activities and related support services and wilderness values compatible with these uses; and (7) grazing land for livestock."

acknowledged F1 zone required 80 acres for the creation of a new lot or parcel on which a dwelling could be established. The claimant's property consists of 0.07 acres.

Therefore, on the claimant's acquisition date, she could not have established any home sites in the zone that was ultimately acknowledged to comply with the statewide planning goals and implementing regulations. There is no evidence in the record that establishes that the creation of a new parcel of less than 80 acres for the development of a dwelling would have satisfied ORS 215 or Goal 4 prior to acknowledgement. It appears that the claimant does not qualify for any home sites, unless the claimant can show that a direct application of the Goals and ORS chapter 215 would have allowed the claimant to establish home sites.

2. Preliminary Conclusion

Based on the preliminary analysis, the claimant, Judith Iverson, does not qualify for Measure 49 home site approvals because the claimant was not lawfully permitted to establish the lots, parcels or dwellings on the claimant's date of acquisition.

V. NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT

A claimant or a claimant's authorized agent, a county and any third party may submit written comments, evidence and information in response to the preliminary evaluation. The comments, evidence and information must be filed with the department no more than twenty-eight (28) calendar days after the date this evaluation is mailed to the claimant and the claimant's agent and notice of this evaluation is mailed to third parties.

The department will mail a copy of all materials timely filed by a county or a third party with the department to the claimant and the claimant's agent. A claimant or a claimant's authorized agent may then file written comments, evidence or information in response to the materials filed by the third party or county. That response must be filed no more than twenty-one (21) calendar days after the date the department mails the materials to the claimant and the claimant's authorized agent.

All comments, evidence and information in response to the preliminary evaluation and all responses to materials filed by a third party or a county shall be delivered to Supplemental Measure 49 Claim Review, 635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150, Salem, Oregon 97301-2540 and will be deemed timely filed either (1) if actually delivered to the department before the close of business on the final eligible calendar day, or (2) if mailed on or before the final eligible calendar day.

Note: Please reference the claim number and claimant name and clearly mark your comments as "Preliminary Evaluation Comments." Comments must be submitted in original written form only. Comments submitted electronically or by facsimile will not be accepted.