

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 A
COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352)	CLAIM NO. M129463
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF)	
William and Zella Laraway and)	
Laraway and Sons, Inc., CLAIMANTS)	

Claimants: William and Zella Laraway and Laraway and Sons, Inc. (the Claimants)

Property: Township 2N, Range 11E, Section 6, Tax lot 2700
Township 2N, Range 11E, Section 7, Tax lots 1100 and 1200
Hood River 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 William and Zella Laraway's division of tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700 and Laraway and Sons, Inc.'s division of tax lot 1400 into one 21-acre parcel, 26 acres developed to 1-acre parcels and 5 acres to be undeveloped, half of the 21 acres with a density of 4 units per acre for single-family lots, 6.7 units per acre for multi-family lots on the other half, and the 26 acre balance with an average density of one lot per acre: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after William and Zella Laraway acquired tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700, and after Laraway and Sons, Inc. acquired tax lot 1400. These laws will not apply to William and Zella Laraway only to the extent necessary to allow them to use tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700 for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when they acquired these tax lots on February 12, 1949; and will not apply to Laraway and Sons, Inc. only to the extent necessary to allow it to use tax lot 1400 for the use described in

this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when it acquired tax lot 1400 on August 4, 1980.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to William and Zella Laraway to use tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700 for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on February 12, 1949; and to Laraway and Sons, Inc. to use tax lot 1400 for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on August 4, 1980. On August 4, 1980, tax lot 1400 was subject to the provisions of Goals 3 and 14, and ORS 215 then in effect.

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 (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 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 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
DLCD
Dated this 28th day of November, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:



David Hartwig, Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 28th day of November, 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 197.352, 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.”

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 B
COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352) CLAIM NO. M129463
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF)
William and Zella Laraway and)
Laraway and Sons, Inc., CLAIMANTS)

Claimants: William and Zella Laraway and Laraway and Sons, Inc. (the Claimants)

Property: Township 2N, Range 11E, Section 7, Tax lot 1400
Hood River 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 denied as to laws administered by DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) for the reasons set forth in the DLCD Report.


This Order is entered by the 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 chapter 125, division 145, and by the Administrator for the State Services Division of the DAS as a final order of DAS under ORS 197.352, OAR chapter 125, division 145, and ORS chapter 293.

FOR DLCD AND THE LAND
CONSERVATION AND
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION:


Lane Shetterly, Director
DLCD

Dated this 28th day of November, 2006.

FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:


David Hartwig, Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 28th day of November, 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, 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)

ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION

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

November 28, 2006

STATE CLAIM NUMBER: M129463

NAMES OF CLAIMANTS: William and Zella Laraway
Laraway and Sons, Inc.

MAILING ADDRESS: 2371 Old Dalles Drive
Hood River, Oregon 97031

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION: Township 2N, Range 11E, Section 6
Tax lot 2700

Township 2N, Range 11E, Section 7
Tax lots 1100, 1200 and 1400

Hood River County

OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION: Steven B. Andersen
PO Box 135
Mosier, Oregon 97040

DATE RECEIVED BY DAS: June 6, 2006

180-DAY DEADLINE: December 3, 2006

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, William and Zella Laraway and Laraway and Sons, Inc., seek compensation in the amount of \$14,904,705 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 52.55-acre subject property into one 21-acre parcel, 26 acres developed to 1-acre parcels and 5 acres to be undeveloped, half of the 21 acres with a density of 4 units per acre for single-family lots, 6.7 units per acre for multi-family lots on the other half, and the 26 acre balance with an average density of one lot per acre.¹ The subject

¹ The subject property consists of four tax lots. Tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700, owned by William and Zella Laraway, total 37.35 acres. Tax lot 1400, owned by Laraway and Sons, Inc., is 15.2 acres.

The claim also indicates that the claimants desire to sell the newly created parcels for development. In effect, the claimants request that a decision of the department to "not apply" (waive) certain laws as set forth in this report be transferable with the property. ORS 197.352 only authorizes a state agency to waive a law in order to allow the current owner a use of the property permitted at the time that owner acquired the property. A determination of

property is located at the geographic coordinates listed above, near Hood River, in Hood River 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 in part. 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 William and Zella Laraway's division tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700 and Laraway and Sons, Inc.'s division of tax lot 1400, one 21-acre parcel, 26 acres developed to 1-acre parcels and 5 acres to be undeveloped, half of the 21 acres with a density of 4 units per acre for single-family lots, 6.7 units per acre for multi-family lots on the other half, and the 26 acre balance with an average density of one lot per acre: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goals 3 (Agricultural Lands) and 14 (Urbanization), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after William and Zella Laraway acquired tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700, and after Laraway and Sons, Inc. acquired tax lot 1400. These laws will not apply to William and Zella Laraway only to the extent necessary to allow them to use tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700 for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when they acquired these tax lots on February 12, 1949; and will not apply to Laraway and Sons, Inc. only to the extent necessary to allow it to use tax lot 1400 for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when it acquired tax lot 1400 on August 4, 1980. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

Department staff further determined that William and Zella Laraway's claim for tax lot 1400 is not valid because they are not owners of this tax lot; and Laraway and Sons, Inc.'s claim for tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700 is not valid because it is not an owner of these tax lots.

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On October 4, 2006, 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, one written comment was received in response to the 10-day notice.

The comment does not address whether the claim meets the criteria for relief under ORS 197.352. Comments concerning the effects a use of the subject property may have on surrounding areas are generally 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 the comment letter in the department's claim file.)

transferability is beyond the scope of relief that the department may grant under ORS 197.352. The Oregon Department of Justice has advised the department that "[i]f the current owner of the real property conveys the property before a new use allowed by the public entity is established, then the entitlement to relief will be lost." Therefore, the relief granted in this report cannot and does not create a transferable waiver.

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 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 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 6, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Hood River County zoning ordinances and Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zoning; ORS 92, 197 and 215; and OAR 660, division 33, 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 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

Claimants William and Zella Laraway acquired tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700 on February 12, 1949, as reflected by deeds included with the claim. William and Zella Laraway transferred tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700 to the William C. Laraway Revocable Living Trust and the Zella F. Laraway Revocable Living Trust, with themselves as trustees, on April 5, 2004.² The Hood River County Assessor’s Office confirms these claimants’ current ownership of tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700. There is no indication in the claim or from the county that claimant Laraway and Sons, Inc. is an owner of tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700.

² Transfer of property to a revocable trust does not result in a change in ownership for purposes of ORS 197.352.

Claimant Laraway and Sons, Inc. acquired tax lot 1400 on August 4, 1980, as reflected by a plant service report included with the claim. The Hood River County Assessor's Office confirms this claimant's current ownership of tax lot 1400. There is no indication in the claim or from the county that claimants William and Zella Laraway are owners of tax lot 1400.

Conclusions

Claimants William and Zella Laraway are "owners" of tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700, as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of February 12, 1949. Claimant Laraway and Sons, Inc. is an "owners" of tax lot 1400, as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of August 4, 1980. William and Zella Laraway are not owners of tax lot 1400, and Laraway and Sons, Inc. is not an owner of tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700.

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 the claimants desire to divide the 52.55-acre subject property into one 21-acre parcel, 26 acres developed to 1-acre parcels and 5 acres to be undeveloped, half of the 21 acres with a density of 4 units per acre for single-family lots, 6.7 units per acre for multi-family lots on the other half, and the 26 acre balance with an average density of one lot per acre. It indicates that current land use regulations prevent the desired use.³

The claim is based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require EFU zoning and restrict uses on EFU-zoned land. The claimants' property is zoned EFU by Hood River County as required by Goal 3, in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because the claimants' property is "agricultural land" as defined by Goal 3.⁴ Goal 3 became effective on January 25, 1975, and required that agricultural lands as defined by Goal 3 be zoned EFU pursuant to ORS 215.

Current land use regulations, particularly ORS 215.263, 215.284 and 215.780 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, prohibit the division of EFU-zoned land into parcels less than 80 acres and establish standards for development of dwellings on existing or proposed parcels on that land.

³ The claimants summarily cite numerous state land use laws as applicable to this claim, but do not establish how the laws either apply to the claimants' desired use of the subject property or restrict its use with the effect of reducing its fair market value. On their face, most of these regulations either do not apply to the claimants' property or do not restrict the claimants' desired use of the property with the effect of reducing its fair market value. This report addresses only those regulations that the department finds are applicable to and restrict the claimants' use of the subject property, based on the claimants' asserted desired use.

⁴ The claimants' property is "agricultural land" because it contains Natural Resources Conservation Service Class I-IV soils.

ORS 215.780 establishes an 80-acre minimum size for the creation of new lots or parcels in EFU zones and became effective on November 4, 1993 (Chapter 792, Oregon Laws 1993). ORS 215.263 (2005 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. The Commission subsequently adopted amendments to comply with House Bill 3326 (Chapter 704, Oregon Laws 2001, effective on January 1, 2002), which were effective on May 22, 2002. (See administrative rule history for OAR 660-033-0100, -0130 and -0135.)

Goal 14, which also became effect on January 25, 1975, would likely apply to the division of the claimants' property into parcels less than two acres. Goal 14 generally requires that land outside of urban growth boundaries be used for rural uses.

William and Zella Laraway acquired tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700 on February 12, 1949, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations.

Laraway and Sons, Inc. acquired tax lot 1400 after the adoption of the statewide planning goals, but before the Commission acknowledged Hood River County's land use regulations to be in compliance with the statewide planning goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251. Because the Commission had not acknowledged the county's plan and land use regulations when Laraway and Sons, Inc. acquired tax lot 1400 on August 4, 1980, the statewide planning goals, and Goal 3 in particular, applied directly to the property when Laraway and Sons, Inc. acquired it.⁵

As adopted on January 25, 1975, Goal 3 required that agricultural land be preserved and zoned for EFU pursuant to ORS 215. The Goal 3 standard for land divisions involving property where the local zoning was not acknowledged required that the resulting parcels must be of a size that is "appropriate for the continuation of the existing commercial agricultural enterprise within the area." Further, ORS 215.263 (1973 edition) only authorized the partition of land subject to EFU zoning, and required that all divisions of land subject to EFU zoning comply with the legislative intent set forth in ORS 215.243 (Agricultural Land Use Policy). Thus, Laraway and Sons, Inc.'s opportunity to divide tax lot 1400 when it acquired the tax lot in 1980 was limited to land divisions that were consistent with Goal 3, which required that the resulting parcels be (1)

⁵ The statewide planning goals became effective on January 25, 1975, and were applicable to legislative land use decisions and some quasi-judicial land use decisions prior to the Commission's acknowledgment of each county's comprehensive plan and implementing regulations. *Perkins v. City of Rajneeshpuram*, 300 Or 1 (1985); *Alexanderson v. Polk County*, 289 Or 427, rev. den 290 Or 137 (1980); *Sunnyside Neighborhood Assn. v. Clackamas County*, 280 Or 3 (1977); *Jurgenson v. Union County*, 42 Or App 505 (1979); and *1000 Friends of Oregon v. Benton County*, 32 Or App 413 (1978). After the county's plan and land use regulations were acknowledged by the Commission, the statewide planning goals and implementing rules no longer applied directly to such local land use decisions. *Byrd v. Stringer*, 295 Or 311 (1983). However, statutory requirements continue to apply, and insofar as the state and local provisions are materially the same, the local provisions must be interpreted consistent with the substance of the goals and implementing rules. *Forster v. Polk County*, 115 Or App 475 (1992) and *Kenagy v. Benton County*, 115 Or App 131 (1992).

appropriate for the continuation of the existing commercial agricultural enterprise in the area and (2) shown to comply with the legislative intent set forth in ORS 215.

Under the Goal 3 standards in effect on August 4, 1980, farm dwellings were allowed if they were determined to be "customarily provided in conjunction with farm use" under ORS 215.213(1)(e) (1973 edition). Non-farm dwellings were subject to compliance with ORS 215.213(3) (1973 edition).

No information has been presented in the claim to establish that Laraway and Sons, Inc.'s desired division of tax lot 1400 complies with the "commercial" standard for farm parcels under Goal 3 or the standards for non-farm parcels under ORS 215.263 (1973 edition), nor is there any information to establish that this claimant's desired development of dwellings on the subject property satisfies the standards for farm or non-farm dwellings under ORS 215.213 (1973 edition).

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, were all enacted or adopted after William and Zella Laraway acquired the tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700 in 1949 and after Laraway and Sons, Inc. acquired tax lot 1400 in 1980, and do not allow the desired division or residential development of the property. However, the claim does not establish whether or the extent to which Laraway and Sons, Inc.'s desired use of tax lot 1400 complies with the standards for land divisions and development under the requirements of Goals 3 and 14 and ORS 215 in effect when it acquired tax lot 1400 on August 4, 1980.

William and Zella Laraway are not owners of tax lot 1400, and therefore, no state land use regulations restrict their use of this tax lot. Laraway and Sons, Inc. is not an owner of tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700, and therefore, no state land use regulations restrict its use of these tax lots.

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 the 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 the land use regulation(s) (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 \$14,904,705 as the reduction in the subject property's fair market value due to the regulations that restrict the claimants' desired use of the property. This amount is based on the claimants' consultant's review of comparable properties in the area.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimants are William and Zella Laraway who acquired tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700 on February 12, 1949, and Laraway and Sons, Inc., which acquired tax lot 1400 on August 4, 1980. Under ORS 197.352, William and Zella Laraway are due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700 and have the effect of reducing their fair market value; and Laraway and Sons, Inc. is due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of tax lot 1400 and has the effect of reducing its fair market value. Based on the findings and conclusions in Section V.(2) of this report, laws enacted or adopted since each of the claimants acquired each of the subject tax lots restrict the claimants' desired use of the property. The claimants estimate that the effect of the regulations on the fair market value of the property is a reduction of \$14,904,705.

Without an appraisal or other documentation, and without verification of whether or the extent to which the claimants' desired use of the property was permitted under the laws in effect when they each acquired each of the subject tax lots, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount by which the land use regulations have reduced the fair market value of the subject property. Nevertheless, based on the evidence in the record for this claim, the department determines 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 applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, which Hood River County has implemented through its current EFU zone. With the exception of provisions of Goals 3 and 14 and ORS 215 in effect when Laraway and Sons, Inc. acquired tax lot 1400 in 1980, these laws were enacted or adopted after William and Zella Laraway acquired tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700, and after Laraway and Sons, Inc. acquired tax lot 1400.

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 William and Zella Laraway's division and development of tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700 were in effect when William and Zella Laraway acquired these tax lots in 1949. With the exception of provisions of

Goals 3 and 14 and ORS 215 in effect when Laraway and Sons, Inc. acquired tax lot 1400, none of these regulations were in effect when Laraway and Sons, Inc. acquired tax lot 1400 in 1980. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) only to the extent they were enacted or adopted after each of the claimants acquired each of the subject tax lots.

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 the 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. 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 the 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 subject 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 subject property permitted at the time the present 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' desired use of the subject property. The claim asserts that existing state land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department have the effect of reducing the fair market value of the subject property by \$14,904,705. However, because the claim does not provide an appraisal or other relevant evidence demonstrating that the land use regulations described in Section V.(2) reduce the fair market value of the subject property, a specific amount of compensation cannot be determined. In order to determine a specific amount of compensation due for this claim, it would also be necessary to verify whether or the extent to which the claimants' desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when they acquired the property. Nevertheless, based on the record for this claim, the department has determined that the laws on which the claim is based 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 William and Zella Laraway to use tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700 for a use permitted at the time they acquired these tax lots on February 12, 1949; and to allow Laraway and Sons, Inc. to use tax lot 1400 for a use permitted at the time this claimant acquired it on August 4, 1980.

Conclusions

Based on the record, the department recommends that William and Zella Laraway's claim be denied as to tax lot 1400 because they are not owners of this tax lot, and Laraway and Sons, Inc. claim be denied as to tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700 because it is not an owner of these tax lots. The department otherwise 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 William and Zella Laraway's division of tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700 and Laraway and Sons, Inc.'s division of tax lot 1400 into one 21-acre parcel, 26 acres developed to 1-acre parcels and 5 acres to be undeveloped, half of the 21 acres with a density of 4 units per acre for single-family lots, 6.7 units per acre for multi-family lots on the other half, and the 26 acre balance with an average density of one lot per acre: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after William and Zella Laraway acquired tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700, and after Laraway and Sons, Inc. acquired tax lot 1400. These laws will not apply to William and Zella Laraway only to the extent necessary to allow them to use tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700 for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when they acquired these tax lots on February 12, 1949; and will not apply to Laraway and Sons, Inc. only to the extent necessary to allow it to use tax lot 1400 for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when it acquired tax lot 1400 on August 4, 1980.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to William and Zella Laraway to use tax lots 1100, 1200 and 2700 for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on February 12, 1949; and to Laraway and Sons, Inc. to use tax lot 1400 for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on August 4, 1980. On August 4, 1980, tax lot 1400 was subject to the provisions of Goals 3 and 14, and ORS 215 then in effect.
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 (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 November 7, 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. No comments were received.