



**OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND
DEVELOPMENT**

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

July 29, 2010

STATE ELECTION NUMBER: H134246A^{1, 2}

CLAIMANT: Eileen L. Grimes
12049 Highway 140 E
Klamath Falls, OR 97603

**MEASURE 37 PROPERTY
IDENTIFICATION:** Township 39S, Range 10E
Section 16, Tax lots 1300, 1400 and 1900
Section 21, Tax lot 300
Klamath County

I. ELECTION

The claimant, Eileen Grimes, filed a claim with the state under ORS 197.352 (2005) (Measure 37) on December 5, 2006, for property located at 11990 Highway 140 E, near Klamath Falls, 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 claimant 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.³ 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. Eileen Grimes 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). As a

¹ Claim H134246 has been split into four claims, H134246A, H134246B, H134246C and H134246D, because the Measure 37 claim sought relief for non-contiguous parcels. H134246A refers to tax lots 1300, 1400, 1900 (T39S R10E S16) and tax lot 300 (T39S R10E S21). H134246B refers to tax lots 2100 (T39S R10E S10C) and 300 (T39S R10E S15). H134246C refers to tax lot 200 (T39S R10E S16). H134246D refers to tax lot 600 (T39S R10E S15).

² On December 18, 2009, the department issued a preliminary evaluation based on Measure 49 election E134246 in which the department indicated that the claimant would not be eligible for Measure 49 relief. This preliminary evaluation supersedes the preliminary evaluation for E134246.

³ The claimant initially elected to have her claim reviewed under Section 7 of Measure 49, but amended her election to request review under Section 6.

result, this requirement no longer prevents the claimant, Eileen Grimes, 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 98 home sites.⁴ 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, 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, Eileen Grimes, filed a Measure 37 claim, M134246, with the state on December 5, 2006. The claimant filed a Measure 37 claim, 103-06, with Klamath County on December 4, 2006. The state claim was filed after December 4, 2006 and the claimant also filed a county Measure 37 claim on 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.

⁴ The Measure 37 waiver described the property and provided relief for tax lots 2100, 300 (Section 15), 600, 200, 1300, 1400, 1900, and 300 (Section 21).

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 deed submitted by the claimant, Eileen Grimes 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 Klamath County and the property is located outside any urban growth boundary and outside the city boundary of the nearest city, Klamath.

(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-C) by Klamath 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 118.31 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."

Klamath County deed records indicate that the claimant acquired the property on April 2, 1991.

On April 2, 1991, the Measure 37 claim property was subject to Klamath County's acknowledged Exclusive Farm Use (EFU-C) zone. Klamath County's EFU-C 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 118.31 acres, and is developed with one dwelling. Therefore, the claimant lawfully could not have established any additional home sites on her date of acquisition.

2. Preliminary Conclusion

Based on the preliminary analysis, the claimant, Eileen Grimes, 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.