



**OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND  
DEVELOPMENT**

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

June 23, 2010

**STATE ELECTION NUMBER:**

H131707

**CLAIMANT:**

Myung Ok Lee  
1165 Galls Creek Road  
Gold Hill, OR 97525

**MEASURE 37 PROPERTY  
IDENTIFICATION:**

Township 36S, Range 3W, Section 28  
Tax lot 201  
Jackson County

**I. ELECTION**

The claimant, Myung Lee, filed a claim with the state under ORS 197.352 (2005) (Measure 37) on November 29, 2006, for property located at 1165 Galls Creek Road, near Gold Hill, in Jackson 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. However, as initially enacted in 2007, a claimant was not eligible for relief under Measure 49 if the claimant did not file a Measure 49 election within 90 days of the department mailing the election packet. Myung Ok Lee was 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). HB 3225 extends the time period during which claimants were required to elect relief under Measure 49 to 120 days. As a result, this requirement no longer prevents the claimant, Myung Lee, from obtaining Measure 49 relief. The claimant 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.

**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 additional home sites when she acquired the property.

### **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 three home sites. Therefore, the claimants 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, as amended by HB 3225, 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.

The claimant, Myung Lee, filed a Measure 37 claim, M131707, with the state on November 29, 2006. The claimant filed a Measure 37 claim, M372006-00192, with Jackson County on November 28, 2006. The state claim was filed prior to December 4, 2006.

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

In addition to timely filing a state claim, to qualify for a home site approval under Section 6 of Measure 49 the claimant must also 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 trust documents submitted by the claimant Myung Lee is the settlor of a revocable trust into which she conveyed the Measure 37 claim property 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 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**

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

**(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 Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) by Jackson 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, generally prohibit the establishment of a lot or parcel less than 80 acres in size in an EFU zone and regulate the establishment of dwellings on new or existing lots or parcels.

The claimant’s property consists of 18.40 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."

Jackson County deed records indicate that the claimant acquired the property on May 16, 1978.

The claimant acquired the Measure 37 claim property after adoption of the statewide planning goals, but before the Land Conservation and Development Commission (the Commission) acknowledged Jackson County's comprehensive plan and land use regulations to be in compliance with those goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251. On May 16, 1978, the Measure 37 claim property was zoned Rural Residential (RR-5) by Jackson County. Jackson County's RR-5 zone included a fixed minimum acreage standard of five acres. However, the Commission had not acknowledged that zone for compliance with the goals when the claimant acquired the property on May 16, 1978. Accordingly, the statewide planning goals, and in particular Goal 3 and ORS chapter 215 applied directly to the Measure 37 claim property when the claimant acquired it.

On May 16, 1983, the Commission acknowledged the application of Jackson County's Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zone to the Measure 37 claim property. The Commission's acknowledgement of Jackson County's EFU zone confirmed that zone's compliance with Goal 3 and ORS chapter 215. Jackson County's acknowledged EFU 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 18.40 acres and is developed with a dwelling. Therefore, on the claimant's acquisition date, she could not have established any additional home sites in the zone that was ultimately acknowledged to comply with the statewide planning goals and implementing regulations.

However, because of uncertainty during the time period between adoption of the statewide planning goals in 1975 and each county's acknowledgment of its plan and land use regulations regarding the factual and legal requirements for establishing compliance with the statewide planning goals, the 2010 Legislative Assembly amended Measure 49. Senate Bill (SB) 1049 (2010) specifies the number of home sites considered lawfully permitted, for purposes of Measure 49, for property acquired during this period unless the record for the claim otherwise demonstrates the number of home sites that a claimant would have been lawfully permitted to establish, including existing development. Those amendments provide, in relevant part, that subject to consistency with local land use regulations in effect when they acquired the Measure 37 claim property, claimants whose property consists of less than 20 acres were lawfully permitted to establish one home site, including existing development.

The Measure 37 claim property consists of 18.40 acres and is developed with one dwelling. Therefore, based on the analysis under SB 1049 (2010), it appears that the claimant was not lawfully permitted to establish any additional home sites under Measure 49, as amended.

## **2. Preliminary Conclusion**

Based on the preliminary analysis, the claimant, Myung Lee, does not qualify for Measure 49 home site approvals because the claimant was not lawfully permitted to establish any additional 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.**