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 ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF Peggy and Jerry Vernia, CLAIMANTS	))))	FINAL ORDER CLAIM NO. M129773

Claimants: Peggy and Jerry Vernia (the Claimants)

Property: Township 26S, Range 6W, Section 20, Tax lot 1500
Douglas 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 the claimants' division of the 9.36-acre subject property into six parcels or their development of a dwelling on each of the five resulting undeveloped parcels: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after each claimant acquired the subject property. These laws will not apply to 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 Peggy Vernia acquired the property on April 7, 1959, and only to the extent that use was permitted when Jerry Vernia acquired the property on May 10, 1988. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Jerry Vernia is entitled under ORS 197.352 may not allow him to use the subject property for the claimants' desired use.

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 when Peggy Vernia acquired the property on April 7, 1959, and subject to the standards in effect on May 10, 1988, when Jerry Vernia acquired the property. On May 10, 1988, the property was subject to

the applicable provisions of Goal 3 and OAR 660, division 5, as implemented through Douglas County's acknowledged EFU zone, and the provisions of 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 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 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

Cora R. Parker

Cora R. Parker, Deputy Director
DLCD
Dated this 13th day of October, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

David Hartwig, Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 13th day of October, 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."

ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION

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

October 13, 2006

STATE CLAIM NUMBER:	M129773
NAMES OF CLAIMANTS:	Peggy and Jerry Vernia
MAILING ADDRESS:	8551 Garden Valley Road Roseburg, Oregon 97470
PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:	Township 26S, Range 6W, Section 20 Tax lot 1500 Douglas County
DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:	April 21, 2006
180-DAY DEADLINE:	October 18, 2006

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, Peggy and Jerry Vernia, seek compensation in the amount of $639,000 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 9.36-acre subject property into six parcels and to develop a dwelling on each of the five resulting undeveloped parcels.[1] The subject property is located at 8551 Garden Valley Road, near Roseburg, in Douglas 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 Peggy and Jerry Vernia's division of the 9.36-acre subject property into six parcels and to their development a dwelling on each of the five resulting undeveloped parcels: 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 each claimant acquired the subject property. These laws 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 Peggy Vernia acquired the property on April

[1] The claimants were previously granted a waiver under ORS 197.352 for division of the subject property into two 2.5-acre parcels and to their development of a dwelling on each parcel. See claim M122581.

7, 1959, and only to the extent that use was permitted when Jerry Vernia acquired the property on May 10, 1988. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Jerry Vernia is entitled under ORS 197.352 may not allow him to use the subject property for the claimants' desired use. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On August 7, 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, no written comments were received in response to the 10-day notice,

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 April 4, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Douglas County's Exclusive Farm Use-Grazing (FG) zone 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

Claimant Peggy Vernia (formerly Peggy Hughes) acquired the subject property on April 7, 1959, as reflected by a warranty deed included with the claim. On May 10, 1988, Peggy Vernia conveyed an undivided one-half interest in the subject property to her husband, claimant Jerry Vernia, as reflected by a deed creating an estate by the entirety included with the claim. The Douglas County Assessor's Office confirms the claimants' current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimants, Peggy and Jerry Vernia, are "owners" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C). Peggy Vernia acquired the subject property on April 7, 1959. Jerry Vernia acquired the subject property on May 10, 1988. Peggy Vernia is a "family member" of Jerry Vernia as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(A).

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 9.36-acre subject property into six parcels and to develop a dwelling on each of the five resulting undeveloped parcels. It indicates that the current zoning prohibits the desired use.

The claim is based generally on applicable provisions of state law that require Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zoning and restrict uses on EFU-zoned land. The claimants' property is zoned FG by Douglas 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.[2] 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.

---

[2] The claimants' property is "agricultural land" because it contains Natural Resources Conservation Service Class I–IV soils.

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.

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

Claimant Peggy Vernia acquired the subject property on April 7, 1959, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing regulations. No county zoning applied to the subject property in 1959.

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 Peggy Vernia acquired the subject property in 1959 and do not allow the desired division or residential development of the property. These laws restrict the use of the subject property relative to the uses allowed when Peggy Vernia acquired 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 use 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 $639,000 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 a comparative market analysis included with the claim.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimants are Peggy Vernia who acquired the subject property on April 7, 1959, and her husband Jerry Vernia. Under ORS 197.352, the claimants are due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property and have 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 Peggy Vernia acquired the subject property restrict the claimants' desired use of the property. The claimants estimate that the effect of the regulations on the fair market value of the subject property is a reduction of $639,000.

Without an appraisal or other documentation, 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, relative to the uses permitted when Peggy Vernia acquired the property, including Goals 3 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, which Douglas County has implemented through its current FG zone. All of these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after Peggy Vernia acquired the subject property.

Conclusions

Although a site plan proposal for the property was submitted with the claim, 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 division and development of the claimants' property were in effect when Peggy Vernia acquired it in 1959. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E). Laws in effect when Peggy Vernia acquired the property in 1959 are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and do not provide a basis for compensation. In addition, other land use laws enacted or adopted for a purpose set forth in Ors 197.352(3)(A) to (D) are also exempt and would not provide a basis for compensation.

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 $639,000. 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 property was allowed under the standards in effect when Peggy Vernia 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 Peggy Vernia to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time she acquired the property on April 7, 1959, and to allow Jerry Vernia to use the property for a use permitted at the time he acquired the property on May 10, 1988.

When Jerry Vernia acquired the subject property, it was subject to Douglas County's acknowledged EFU zone.[3] Jerry Vernia's desired use of the property would have been governed by the county's acknowledged EFU zone and the applicable provisions of ORS 215 then in effect.[4] In 1988, ORS 215.263 (1987 edition) required that divisions of land in EFU zones be "appropriate for the continuation of the existing commercial agricultural enterprise within the area" or not smaller than the minimum size in the county's acknowledged plan. ORS 215.283(1)(f) (1987 edition) generally allowed farm dwellings "customarily provided in conjunction with farm use." Non-farm dwellings were allowed under ORS 215.283(3) if they

[3] Douglas County's EFU zone was acknowledged by the Commission for compliance with Goal 3 on December 24, 1985.

[4] After the county's comprehensive plan and land use regulations were acknowledged by the Commission as complying with the statewide planning goals, the goals and implementing rules no longer applied directly to individual 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).

were determined to be compatible with farm use, not interfere seriously with accepted farm practices, not materially alter the stability of the land use pattern in the area and be situated on generally unsuitable land for the production of farm crops and livestock.

The claim does not establish whether or to what extent Jerry Vernia's desired division and development of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when he acquired the property on May 10, 1988.

In addition to the laws in effect when each claimant acquired the subject property, there may be other laws that 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, and depending on when they were enacted or adopted, may continue to apply to the claimants' property. In addition, some of these laws may be exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(A) to (D) and will continue to apply to the subject property on that basis.

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 use 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.

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 the claimants' division of the 9.36-acre subject property into six parcels or their development of a dwelling on each of the five resulting undeveloped parcels: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after each claimant acquired the subject property. These laws will not apply to 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 Peggy Vernia acquired the property on April 7, 1959, and only to the extent that use was permitted when Jerry Vernia acquired the property on May 10, 1988. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Jerry Vernia is entitled under ORS 197.352 may not allow him to use the subject property for the claimants' desired use.

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 when Peggy Vernia acquired the property on April 7, 1959, and subject to the standards in effect on May 10, 1988, when Jerry Vernia acquired the property. On May 10, 1988, the property was subject to the applicable provisions of Goal 3 and OAR 660, division 5, as implemented through Douglas County's acknowledged EFU zone, and the provisions of 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 September 27, 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.