

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES,
THE DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF
THE STATE OF OREGON

IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM FOR) FINAL ORDER
COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352) CLAIM NO. M118554
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF)
Regis and Rosalie Raujol, CLAIMANTS)

Claimants: Regis and Rosalie Raujol (the Claimants)

Property: Tax lots 1800, 2000, 2301, Township 2S, Range 1E, Section 22,
Clackamas County (the Property)

Claim: The demand for compensation and any supporting information received from the
Claimants by the State of Oregon (the Claim).

Claimants submitted the Claim to the State of Oregon under ORS 197.352. Under OAR 125-145-0010 *et seq.*, the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) referred the Claim to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) as the regulating entity. This order is based on the record herein, including the Findings and Conclusions set forth in the Final Staff Report and Recommendation of DLCD (the DLCD Report) attached to and by this reference incorporated into this order.

ORDER

The Claim is approved as to laws administered by DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) for the reasons set forth in the DLCD Report, and subject to the following terms:

1. In lieu of compensation under ORS 197.352, the State of Oregon will not apply the following laws to Regis and Rosalie Raujol's division of the 31.88-acre property for residential development: applicable provisions of Goal 14 and OAR 660-004-0040. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimants only to the extent necessary to allow them to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when they acquired the property on September 9, 1964 (tax lot 1800), February 4, 1970 (tax lot 2000) and October 17, 1972 (tax lot 2301).
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimants to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on September 9, 1964 (tax lot 1800), February 4, 1970 (tax lot 2000) and October 17, 1972 (tax lot 2301).
3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that the subject property may not be used without a permit, license or other form of authorization or consent, the order will not authorize the use of the property

unless the claimants first obtain that permit, license or other form of authorization or consent. Such requirements may include, but are not limited to: a building permit, a land use decision, a "permit" as defined in ORS 215.402 or 227.160, other permits or authorizations from local, state or federal agencies and restrictions on the use of the subject property imposed by private parties.

4. Any use of the subject property by the claimants under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in Condition 1 above; (b) any laws enacted or enforced by a public entity other than the Commission or the department; and (c) those laws not subject to ORS 197.352 including, without limitation, those laws exempted under ORS 197.352(3).

5. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing terms and conditions, in order for the claimants to use the subject property, it may be necessary for them to obtain a decision under ORS 197.352 from a city and/or county and/or metropolitan service district that enforces land use regulations applicable to the property. Nothing in this order relieves the claimants from the necessity of obtaining a decision under ORS 197.352 from a local public entity that has jurisdiction to enforce a land use regulation applicable to a use of the subject property by the claimants.

This Order is entered by the Deputy Director of the DLCD as a final order of DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission under ORS 197.352, OAR 660-002-0010(8), and OAR 125, division 145, and by the Deputy Administrator for the State Services Division of the DAS as a final order of DAS under ORS 197.352, OAR 125, division 145, and ORS 293.

FOR DLCD AND THE LAND CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION:


Lane Shetterly, Director



George Naughton, Deputy Director
DLCD

Dated this 14th day of April, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE
SERVICES:



Dugan Petty, Deputy Administrator
DAS, State Services Division

Dated this 14th day of April, 2006.

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 under ORS 183.484:** 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 may be filed in the Circuit Court for Marion County or the Circuit Court in the county in which you reside.
2. **A cause of action under ORS 197.352 (Measure 37 (2004)):** If a land use regulation continues to apply to the subject property more than 180 days after the present owner of the property has made written demand for compensation under ORS 197.352¹, the present owner of the property, or any interest therein, shall have a cause of action in the circuit court in which the real property is located.

(Copies of the documents that comprise the record are available for review at the Department's office at 635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150, Salem, Oregon 97301-2540)

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

The Oregon Department of Justice has advised the Department of Land Conservation and Development that "[i]f the current owner of the real property conveys the property before the new use allowed by the public entity is established, then the entitlement to relief will be lost."

¹ By order of the Marion County Circuit Court, "all time lines under Measure 37 [were] suspended indefinitely" on October 25, 2005. This suspension was lifted on March 13, 2006 by the court. As a result, a period of 139 days (the number of days the time lines were suspended) has been added to the 180-day time period under ORS 197.352(6) for claims that were pending with the state on October 25, 2005.

**BALLOT MEASURE 37 (ORS 197.352)
CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION**

**OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
Final Staff Report and Recommendation**

April 14, 2006

STATE CLAIM NUMBER: M118554

NAMES OF CLAIMANTS: Regis and Rosalie Raujol

MAILING ADDRESS: 1090 South Station Lane
West Linn, Oregon 97068

IDENTIFICATION OF PROPERTY: Township 2S, Range 1E, Section 22
Tax lots 1800, 2000, 2301
Clackamas County

DATE RECEIVED BY DAS: June 3, 2005

180-DAY DEADLINE: April 18, 2006¹

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, Regis and Rosalie Raujol, seek compensation in the amount of \$2.4 million for the reduction in fair market value as a result of land use regulations that are alleged to restrict the use of certain private real property. The claimants desire compensation or the right to divide the 31.88-acre property for residential development. The subject property is located at 1090 South Station Lane, near West Linn, in Clackamas County. (See claim.)

II. SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings and conclusions set forth below, the Department of Land Conservation and Development (the department) has determined that the claim is valid. Department staff recommends that, in lieu of compensation, the requirements of the following state laws enforced by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (the Commission) or the department not apply to claimants Regis and Rosalie Raujol's division of the 31.88-acre property for residential development: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 14 (Urbanization) and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660-004-0040. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimants only to the extent necessary to allow them to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when they acquired

¹ This date reflects 180 days from the date the claim was submitted as extended by the 139 days enforcement of Ballot Measure 37 was suspended during the pendency of the appeal of *MacPherson v. Dep't of Admin. Servs.*, 340 Or ___, 2006 Ore. LEXIS 104 (February 21, 2006).

tax lot 1800 in 1964, tax lot 2000 in 1970 and tax lot 2301 in 1972. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On August 26, 2005, pursuant to OAR 125-145-0080, the Oregon Department of Administrative Services (DAS) provided written notice to the owners of surrounding properties. According to DAS, eight written comments were received.

One comment is relevant to whether the restriction of the claimants' use of the subject property reduces the fair market value of the property. The comment has been considered by the department in preparing this report.

The remaining comments do not address whether the claim meets the criteria for relief under ORS 197.352 (Ballot Measure 37). Comments concerning the effects a use of the subject property may have on surrounding areas generally are not something that the department is able to consider in determining whether to waive a state law. If funds do become available to pay compensation, then such effects may become relevant in determining which claims to pay compensation for instead of waive a state law. (See comment letters in the department's claim file.)

IV. TIMELINESS OF CLAIM

Requirement

ORS 197.352(5) requires that a written demand for compensation be made:

1. For claims arising from land use regulations enacted prior to the effective date of Ballot Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), within two years of that effective date or the date the public entity applies the land use regulation as an approval criteria to an application submitted by the owner, whichever is later; or
2. For claims arising from land use regulations enacted after the effective date of Ballot Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), within two years of the enactment of the land use regulation, or the date the owner of the property submits a land use application in which the land use regulation is an approval criteria, whichever is later.

Findings of Fact

This claim was submitted to DAS on June 3, 2005, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies "Senate Bill 100 (1973) and all regulatory enactments adopted thereafter including but not limited to House Bill 3661, ORS Chapter 215 and Rules set forth in Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) goals and regulatory restrictions," as well as specific provisions of ORS 215 and OAR 600 related to division and development of land zoned for forest use, as the basis for the claim. Only laws that were enacted or adopted prior to December 2, 2004, are the basis for this claim.

Conclusions

The claim has been submitted within two years of the effective date of Ballot Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), based on land use regulations enacted or adopted prior to December 2, 2004, and is therefore timely filed.

V. ANALYSIS OF CLAIM

1. Ownership

ORS 197.352 provides for payment of compensation or relief from specific laws for “owners” as that term is defined in ORS 197.352. ORS 197.352(11)(C) defines “owner” as “the present owner of the property, or any interest therein.”

Findings of Fact

The subject property consists of three tax lots. The claimants, Regis and Rosalie Raujol, acquired tax lot 1800 on September 9, 1964, tax lot 2000 on February 4, 1970, and tax lot 2301 on October 17, 1972, as reflected by deeds included with the claim. Real property tax statements (2004-05), submitted with the claim, establish the claimants’ current ownership.

Conclusions

The claimants, Regis and Rosalie Raujol, are “owners” of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of September 9, 1964, for tax lot 1800, as of February 4, 1970, for tax lot 2000 and as of October 17, 1972, for tax lot 2301.

2. The Laws That are the Basis for This Claim

In order to establish a valid claim, ORS 197.352(1) requires, in part, that a law must restrict the claimants’ use of private real property in a manner that reduces the fair market value of the property relative to how the property could have been used at the time the claimants or a family member acquired the property.

Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that Senate Bill 100 and all regulatory enactments adopted thereafter, including but not limited to House Bill 3661, ORS chapter 215 and rules set forth in Oregon Administrative Rules, Goals and regulatory restrictions, as well as specific provisions of ORS 215 and OAR 660 related to division and development of land zoned for forest use, as land use regulations that prevent the claimants from dividing their property for residential development.²

² The claim does not assert how each of these state land use regulations restricts the use of the property in a manner that reduces the fair market value of the property. Several of these statutes and rules are either not applicable to the subject property or do not, on their face, restrict the use of the subject property. Specifically, the provisions in ORS 215 and OAR 660 related to division and development of property zoned for forest use do not apply to the subject property, which is zoned for rural residential use. Except for the regulations addressed in this report, absent

The claim is based generally on Clackamas County's current Rural Residential Farm Forest 5-Acre (RRFF-5) zone and the applicable provisions of state law that require such zoning. The county's RRFF zone is a rural residential zone as required by Goal 14, which generally requires that land outside of Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB) be used for rural uses.

Goal 14 was effective on January 25, 1975, and requires that local comprehensive plans identify and separate urbanizable land from rural land in order to provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use. In 2000, as a result of a 1986 Oregon Supreme Court decision,³ the Commission amended Goal 14 and adopted OAR 660-004-0040 (Application of Goal 14 to Rural Residential Areas), which was effective on October 4, 2000. For rural residential properties less than one mile of the UGB for the Portland metropolitan area, the rule states that the minimum area for any new lot or parcel shall be 20 acres (OAR 660-004-0040(8)(e)). The subject property is within one mile of the Portland metropolitan UGB and therefore, is subject to the 20-acre minimum lot size standard.⁴

The claimants acquired the subject property in 1964, 1970 and 1972, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and rules. At that time, it was zoned R-20 by the county, which allowed 20,000 square foot lots for single-family dwellings.

Conclusions

The minimum lot size requirements for rural residential lots or parcels established by Goal 14 and OAR 660-004-0040, were adopted since the claimants acquired the subject property in 1964, 1970 and 1972 and do not allow the desired division of the property.

This report addresses only those state laws that are identified in the claim, or that the department is certain apply to the subject property based on the uses that the claimants have identified. There may be other laws that currently apply to the claimants' use of the subject property, and that may continue to apply to the claimants' use of the property, that have not been identified in the claim. In some cases, it will not be possible to know which laws apply to a use of subject property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the claimants seek a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws apply to that use.

3. Effect of Regulations on Fair Market Value

In order to establish a valid claim, ORS 197.352(1) requires that any land use regulation described in Section V.2 of this report must have "the effect of reducing the fair market value of the property, or any interest therein."

an explanation by the claimants as to each land use regulation cited restricts the use of the claimants' property in a manner that reduces the property's fair market value, the regulations are not addressed further in this report

³ *1000 Friends of Oregon v. LCDC (Curry County)*, 301 Or 447 (1986).

⁴ The Portland metropolitan service area does not have an urban reserve area acknowledged to comply with OAR 660, division 21. Therefore, the provisions under OAR 660-004-0040(d) exempting lots or parcels from the 20-acre standard do not apply.

Findings of Fact

The claim includes an estimate of \$2.4 million as the reduction in the subject property's fair market value due to current regulations. This amount is based on the claimants' estimated loss of value for the maximum utilization of the subject property.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.1 of this report, the claimants are Regis and Rosalie Raujol who acquired the subject property on September 9, 1964 (tax lot 1800), February 4, 1970 (tax lot 2000) and October 17, 1972 (tax lot 2301). Under ORS 197.352, the claimants are due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property in a manner that reduces its fair market value. Based on the findings and conclusions in Section V.2 of this report, laws adopted since the claimants acquired the subject property restrict the desired division of the property. The claimants estimate the reduction in value due to the restrictions to be \$2.4 million.

Without an appraisal or other documentation, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount the claimants demand for compensation. Nevertheless, based on the submitted information, the department determines that it is more likely than not that the fair market value of the subject property has been reduced to some extent as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department.

4. Exemptions Under ORS 197.352(3)

ORS 197.352 does not apply to certain land use regulations. In addition, under ORS 197.352(3), certain types of laws are exempt from ORS 197.352.

Findings of Fact

The claim is based on state land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property, including Goal 14 and OAR 660-004-0040, which Clackamas County has implemented through its RRF-5 zone. Both of these land use regulations were adopted after the claimants acquired the subject property.

Conclusions

Without a specific development proposal for the subject property, it is not possible for the department to determine all the laws that may apply to a particular use of the property, or whether those laws may fall under one or more of the exemptions under ORS 197.352. It appears that none of the general statutory, goal and rule restrictions on divisions of rural residential land were in effect when the claimants acquired the subject property in 1964, 1970 and 1972. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E).

Laws in effect when the claimants acquired the subject property are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the claimants' use of the property. There may be other laws that continue to apply to the claimants' use of the subject property that have not been identified in the claim. In some cases, it will not be possible to know which laws apply to a

use of property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the claimants seek a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws apply to that use. In some cases, some of these laws may be exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(A) to (D).

This report addresses only those state laws that are identified in the claim, or that the department is certain apply to the subject property based on the uses that the claimants have identified. Similarly, this report only addresses the exemptions provided for under ORS 197.352(3) that are clearly applicable, given the information provided to the department in the claim. The claimants should be aware that the less information they have provided to the department in their claim, the greater the possibility that there may be additional laws that will later be determined to continue to apply to their use of the subject property.

VI. FORM OF RELIEF

ORS 197.352(1) provides for payment of compensation to an owner of private real property if the Commission or the department has enforced laws that restrict the use of the property in a manner that reduces its fair market value. In lieu of compensation, the department may choose to not apply the law in order to allow the present owner to carry out a use of the property permitted at the time the current owner acquired the property. The Commission, by rule, has directed that if the department determines a claim is valid, the Director of the department must provide only non-monetary relief unless and until funds are appropriated by the legislature to pay claims.

Findings of Fact

Based on the findings and conclusions set forth in this report, laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict the claimants' ability to divide the 31.88-acre property for residential use. The claim asserts that the laws enforced by the Commission or the department reduce the fair market value of the subject property by \$2.4 million. However, because the claim does not provide an appraisal or other specific documentation for how the specified restrictions reduce the fair market value of the subject property, a specific amount of compensation cannot be determined. Nevertheless, based on the record for this claim, the department acknowledges that the laws on which the claim is based likely have reduced the fair market value of the subject property to some extent.

No funds have been appropriated at this time for the payment of claims. In lieu of payment of compensation, ORS 197.352 authorizes the department to modify, remove or not apply all or parts of certain land use regulations to allow Regis and Rosalie Raujol to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time they acquired tax lot 1800 on September 9, 1964, tax lot 2000 on February 4, 1970, and tax lot 2301 on October 17, 1972.

Conclusions

Based on the record, the department recommends that the claim be approved, subject to the following terms:

1. In lieu of compensation under ORS 197.352, the State of Oregon will not apply the following laws to Regis and Rosalie Raujol's division of the 31.88-acre property for residential development: applicable provisions of Goal 14 and OAR 660-004-0040. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimants only to the extent necessary to allow them to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when they acquired the property on September 9, 1964 (tax lot 1800), February 4, 1970 (tax lot 2000) and October 17, 1972 (tax lot 2301).
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimants to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on September 9, 1964 (tax lot 1800), February 4, 1970 (tax lot 2000) and October 17, 1972 (tax lot 2301).
3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that the subject property may not be used without a permit, license or other form of authorization or consent, the order will not authorize the use of the property unless the claimants first obtain that permit, license or other form of authorization or consent. Such requirements may include, but are not limited to: a building permit, a land use decision, a "permit" as defined in ORS 215.402 or 227.160, other permits or authorizations from local, state or federal agencies and restrictions on the use of the subject property imposed by private parties.
4. Any use of the subject property by the claimants under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in Condition 1 above; (b) any laws enacted or enforced by a public entity other than the Commission or the department; and (c) those laws not subject to ORS 197.352 including, without limitation, those laws exempted under ORS 197.352(3).
5. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing terms and conditions, in order for the claimants to use the subject property, it may be necessary for them to obtain a decision under ORS 197.352 from a city and/or county and/or metropolitan service district that enforces land use regulations applicable to the property. Nothing in this order relieves the claimants from the necessity of obtaining a decision under ORS 197.352 from a local public entity that has jurisdiction to enforce a land use regulation applicable to a use of the subject property by the claimants.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on March 14, 2006. OAR 125-145-0100(3), provided an opportunity for the claimants or the claimants' authorized agent and any third parties who submitted comments under OAR 125-145-0080 to submit written comments, evidence and information in response to the draft staff report and recommendation. Comments received have been taken into account by the department in the issuance of this final report.