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 COMPENSATION UNDER OAR 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF Frank and Jane Beals, CLAIMANTS	))))	FINAL ORDER CLAIM NO. M118458

Claimants: Frank and Jane Beals (the Claimants)

Property: Tax lot 701, Township 3S, Range 3W, Section 19, Yamhill 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 OAR 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 Frank and Jane Beals' division of the 42.3-acre property into one parcel of 2.3 acres and one parcel of 40 acres: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215, and OAR 660, division 33, enacted after April 14, 1987. These land use regulations will not apply to Frank and Jane Beals' use of the property only to the extent necessary to allow the claimants to use the property for the use described in this report, to the extent that use was permitted at the time they acquired the property on April 14, 1987.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimants to use the property for the use described in this report subject to the standards in effect on April 14, 1987. On that date, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 5, then in effect.

3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that the 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 ORS 227.160, other permits or authorizations from local, state or federal agencies, and restrictions on the use of the property imposed by private parties.

4. Any use of the property by the claimants under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in (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 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 property by the claimants.

This Order is entered by the Director of the DLCD as a final order of DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission under OAR 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 OAR 197.352, OAR 125, division 145, and ORS 293.

FOR DLCD AND THE LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION:

Lane Shetterly, Director
DLCD
Dated this 27th day of March, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

Dugan Petty, Deputy Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 27th day of March, 2006.

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL OR OTHER JUDICIAL RELIEF

You are entitled, or may be entitled, to the following judicial remedies:

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 197.352[1], 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

March 27, 2006

STATE CLAIM NUMBER:	M118458
NAMES OF CLAIMANTS:	Frank and Jane Beals
MAILING ADDRESS:	12601 Northeast Hendricks Road Carlton, Oregon 97111
PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:	Township 3S, Range 3W, Section 19 Tax lot 701 Yamhill County
DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:	May 18, 2005
180-DAY DEADLINE:	April 2, 2006[1]

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, Frank and Jane Beals, seek compensation in the amount of $200,000 for the reduction in fair market value as a result of certain 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 42.3-acre property into one parcel of 2.3 acres and one parcel of 40 acres. The subject property is located at 12601 NE Hendricks Road, near Carlton, in Yamhill 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 Frank and Jane Beals' division of the property into one parcel of 2.3 acres and one parcel of 40 acres: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215, and OAR 660, division 33 enacted after April 14, 1987. These laws will not apply to the claimants only to the extent necessary to allow Frank and Jane Beals a use of the property

[1] This date reflects 180 days from the date the claim was submitted as extended by the 139 days enforcement of 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).

permitted at the time they acquired it in 1987. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On June 28, 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, two written comments, evidence or information were received in response to the 10-day notice.[2]

The comments are relevant to whether the restriction of the claimants' use of the property reduces the fair market value of the property. The comments have been considered by the department in preparing this report. (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 the Measure (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 the Measure (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 May 18, 2005, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies county zoning restrictions on the use of the property as the basis for the claim. Only laws that were enacted prior to December 2, 2004, the effective date of Measure 37, are the basis for this claim. (See citations of statutory and administrative rule history of the Oregon Revised Statutes and Oregon Administrative Rules.)

---

[2] The 10-day notice period was suspended for 139 days during the pendency of the *Macpherson v. Dep't of Admin. Servs.*, 340 Or __, 2006 Ore. LEXIS 104 (February 21, 2006), which suspended all Measure 37 deadlines.

Conclusions

The claim has been submitted within two years of December 2, 2004; the effective date of Measure 37, based on land use regulations 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 claimants, Frank and Jane Beals, acquired the subject property on April 14, 1987, as reflected by a Memorandum of Contract included with the claim. A copy of a Yamhill County Lot Book report dated February 25, 2005, indicates that Frank and Jane Beals are the current owners of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimants, Frank and Jane Beals, are "owners" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of April 14, 1987.

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 states that, "When we purchased the property in April of 1987, Yamhill County Zoning Ordinance #402 allowed us to divide off up to 2.3 acres for retirement purposes. In 1993, the ordinance was changed and we were no longer able to do this." Additional information submitted with the claim indicates the claimants' intent to divide 42.3 acres into one 2.3-acre parcel, on which an existing dwelling is located, and one 40-acre parcel, on which another existing dwelling is located.

The claim is based, generally, on Yamhill County's current EF-80 (Exclusive Farm – 80-acre minimum lot size) zone and the applicable provisions of state law that require such zoning. The claimants' property is zoned Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) as required by Statewide Planning Goal 3, in accordance with OAR 660, division 33, and ORS 215 because the claimants' property

is "agricultural land" as defined by Goal 3.[3] Goal 3 became effective on January 25, 1975, and required that agricultural lands as defined by the Goal are zoned EFU pursuant to ORS 215. Current land use regulations, particularly ORS 215.263, 215.284, ORS 215.780 and OAR 660, division 33, as applied by Goal 3, do not allow the subject property to be divided and developed with a farm or non-farm dwelling.

ORS 215.780 established an 80-acre minimum size for the creation of new lots or parcels in EFU zones and became effective November 4, 1993 (Chapter 792, Oregon Laws 1993). ORS 215.263 (2003 edition) establishes standards for the creation of new parcels for non-farm uses and dwellings allowed in an EFU zone.

OAR 660-033-0135 (applicable to farm dwellings) became effective on March 1, 1994, and interprets the statutory standard for a primary dwelling in an EFU zone under ORS 215.283(1)(f).

OAR 660-033-0130(4) (applicable to non-farm dwellings) became effective on August 7, 1993, and was amended to comply with ORS 215.284(4) on March 1, 1994. Subsequent amendments to comply with HB 3326 (Chapter 704, Oregon Laws 2001, effective January 1, 2002,) were adopted by the Commission effective May 22, 2002. (See citations of administrative rule history for OAR 660-033-0100, 0130 and 0135.)

The claimants acquired the subject property on April 14, 1987. Yamhill County's EFU zone was acknowledged by the Commission on June 12, 1980. At that time, the property was zoned by Yamhill County as EF-40 (Exclusive Farm Use with a 40-acre minimum lot size). The claim does not provide information to establish that the claimants' desired partition and dwelling complies with the approval standards for partitions and dwellings at the time they acquired the property on April 14, 1987. According to the claimants, the EF-40 zone permitted a 40-acre minimum lot size allowed one "retirement parcel" containing up to three acres with one retirement dwelling.

Conclusions

The zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands) and provisions applicable to land zoned EFU in ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, were enacted after Frank and Jane Beals acquired ownership of the subject property in April 1987, and do not allow further division of the property, which may restrict the use of the property relative to the uses allowed when the property was acquired. In 1987, the property was subject to the requirements of the County's EFU zone, which were adopted pursuant to the provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215 and applicable provisions of OAR 660, division 5, then in effect.

---

[3] The claimants' property is "agricultural land" because it predominantly contains Chehalem silty clay loam (Class IIIe), Hazleair silty clay loam (Class IIIe), Panther silty clay loam (Class VIw) and Wapato silty clay loam (Class IIIw), and Willakenzie silty clay loam (Class IVe). See USDA Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey of Yamhill Area, Oregon, January 1974, Sheet #50, Guide to Mapping Units.

This report addresses only those state laws that are identified in the claim, or that the department is certain apply to the property based on the uses that the claimants have identified. There may be other laws that currently apply to the claimants' use of the 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 what 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.

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."

Findings of Fact

The claim includes an estimate of $200,000 as the property's reduction in fair market due to restrictive land use regulations. This amount is based on the claimants' estimate of the market value of the property if divided into two parcels. The claim does not include a formal appraisal or other documentation to substantiate the alleged reduction in value as a result of restricting land use regulation.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the current owners are Frank and Jane Beals, who acquired the property on April 14, 1987. Under ORS 197.352, Mr. and Ms. Beals 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 property restrict division of the subject property. The claimants estimate the reduction in value due to the restrictions to be $200,000.

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 there may have been some reduction in the fair market value of the subject property 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 land use regulations that may restrict the use of the property relative to what would have been allowed in 1987 when the property was acquired by Frank and Jane Beals.

These provisions include Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands) and applicable provisions of ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, which Yamhill County has implemented through its EFU zone. These laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E), to the extent they were enacted or adopted after the claimants acquired the property. Provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215 and applicable provisions of OAR 660, division 5, enacted or adopted before April, 14, 1987, are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E), which exempts laws in effect when the claimants acquired the property.

Conclusions

Without a specific development proposal for the property, it is not possible for the department to determine what laws 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 does appear that the general statutory, goal and rule restrictions on residential development and use of farm land apply to the claimants' use of the property, and these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) to the extent they were enacted or adopted after the claimants acquired the property. Provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215 and applicable provisions of OAR 660, division 5, in effect when the claimants acquired the property on April, 14, 1987, are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the property.

Other laws in effect when the claimants acquired the property are also 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 property that have not been identified in the claim. In some cases, it will not be possible to know what 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. And, 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 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 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 a law that restricts 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 owners to carry out a use of the property permitted at the time the current owners acquired the property. The Commission, by rule, has directed that if the department determines a claim is valid, the Director 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 subject property into two parcels. The claim asserts the laws enforced by the Commission or department reduce the fair market value of the subject property by $200,000. 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 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 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 Frank and Jane Beals to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time they acquired the property on April 14, 1987.

Conclusion

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 Frank and Jane Beals' division of the 42.3-acre property into one parcel of 2.3 acres and one parcel of 40 acres: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215, and OAR 660, division 33, enacted after April 14, 1987. These land use regulations will not apply to Frank and Jane Beals' use of the property only to the extent necessary to allow the claimants to use the property for the use described in this report, to the extent that use was permitted at the time they acquired the property on April 14, 1987.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimants to use the property for the use described in this report subject to the standards in effect on April 14, 1987. On that date, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 5, then in effect.

3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that the 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 ORS 227.160, other permits or authorizations from local, state or federal agencies, and restrictions on the use of the property imposed by private parties.

4. Any use of the property by the claimants under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in (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 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 property by the claimants.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on October 24, 2005. OAR 125-145-0100(3), provided an opportunity for the claimant or the claimant's 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.