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 Kathleen E. Hawkins, CLAIMANT	))))	FINAL ORDER CLAIM NO. M129733

Claimant: Kathleen E. Hawkins (the Claimant)

Property: Township 35S, Range 2E, Tax lot 6400, Jackson County (the Property)

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

Claimant 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 Kathleen Hawkins' division of the 50-acre subject property into one 10-acre parcel and one 40-acre parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow her to divide the subject property as described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when she acquired the property on January 26, 1966.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to divide the property as described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on January 26, 1966.

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 claimant first obtains 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 claimant 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 claimant to use the subject property, it may be necessary for her 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 claimant 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 claimant.

This Order is entered by the Manager for the Measure 37 Services Division 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

Michael Morrissey, Manager
DLCD, Measure 37 Services Division
Dated this 19th day of January, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

David Hartwig, Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 19th day of January, 2007.

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

January 19, 2007

STATE CLAIM NUMBER:	M129733
NAME OF CLAIMANT:	Kathleen E. Hawkins
MAILING ADDRESS:	PO Box 25 Butte Falls, Oregon 97522
PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:	Township 35S, Range 2E Tax lot 6400 Jackson County
OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION:	Mark S. Bartholomew 717 Murphy Road Medford, Oregon 97504
DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:	July 24, 2006
180-DAY DEADLINE:	January 20, 2007

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimant, Kathleen Hawkins, seeks compensation in the amount of $100,000 for the reduction in fair market value as a result of land use regulations that are alleged to restrict her desired use of certain private real property. The claimant desires compensation or the right to divide the 50-acre subject property into one 10-acre parcel and one 40-acre parcel.[1] The subject property is located at 1520 Obenchain Road, near Butte Falls, in Jackson 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

[1] The claim also indicates that the claimant desires to transfer a parcel created through a division of the subject property after approval of the claim under ORS 197.352. In effect, the claimant requests 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 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."

by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (the Commission) or the department not apply to Kathleen Hawkins' division of the 50-acre subject property into one 10-acre parcel and one 40-acre parcel: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 4 (Forest Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 6. These laws will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow her to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when she acquired the property in 1966. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On November 16, 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 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 July 24, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Goals 3 (Agricultural Lands), 4, 5 (Open Spaces), 11 (Public Facilities and Services) and 14 (Urbanization); ORS 92, 195, 197 and 215; applicable provisions of OAR 340, division 96, and OAR 660, divisions 4, 11, 12, and 33; "change to WR zoning"; "wildlife and wetlands regulations"; and "any other statutes or rules inhibiting the partitioning desired by Mrs. Hawkins" as restricting the claimant's desired use of the property. 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

The claimant, Kathleen Hawkins, acquired the subject property on January 26, 1966, as reflected by the warranty deed included with the claim. The Jackson County Assessor's Office confirms that the claimant is the current owner of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimant, Kathleen Hawkins, is an "owner" of the subject property, as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of January 26, 1966.

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 claimant's 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 claimant or a family member acquired the property.

Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that that the claimant desires to divide the 50-acre subject property into one 10-acre parcel and one 40-acre parcel and convey the 10-acre parcel to her daughter and son-in-law, and that state land use regulations restrict the claimant's desired use of the property.[2]

The claim identifies Goals 3, 4, 5, 11 and 14; ORS 92, 195, 197 and 215; and OAR 660-004-0040(7)(e)(A), 660-011-0060(2), 660-012-0065, 660-012-0070, 660-033-0120, 660-033-0130, 660-033-0135, 340-096-0020 and 340-096-0034 as the state land use regulations that restrict the claimant's desired use of the subject property. The claim contains no information or documentation establishing that Goals 3, 5, 11 or 14 apply to the claimant's desired use of the subject property. Similarly, the claim contains no information or documentation establishing that ORS 92, 195 or 197 apply to the claimant's desired use of the subject property or restrict that use. Further, nothing in the claim establishes that OAR 660-004-0040(7)(e)(A), 660-011-

[2] The claimant summarily cites numerous land use regulations as applicable to the property, but does not establish how these regulations either apply to the subject property or restrict it use with the effect of reducing its fair market value. One their face, most of these land use regulations either do not apply to the claimant's property or do not restrict the claimant's 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 claimant's use of the property, based on the claimant's asserted desired use. Laws administered by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality or Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife are identified in the claim, but there is no demonstration or explanation of how these laws apply to or restrict the claimant's desired use of the property.

0060(2), 660-012-0065, 660-012-0070, 340-096-0020 or 340-096-0034 apply to or restrict the claimant's desired use of the subject real property. The statutory provisions listed relate to procedural requirements for land divisions and the statewide land use planning system generally. With the exception of Goal 4, none of the listed goals apply to the division of the subject property into two parcels. The rural residential rule listed does not apply to land zoned for resource uses. The listed Goal 11 and 12 implementing rules do not apply to land divisions. The provisions of OAR 340 listed either apply to composting operations (in one case) or do not exist (in the other case).

The claim is based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require forest zoning and restrict uses on forest-zoned land. The claimant's property is zoned by Jackson County as Woodland Resource (WR) as required by Goal 4 and the implementing provisions of OAR 660, division 6, because the claimant's property is forest land" under Goal 4. Goal 4 became effective on January 25, 1975, and requires that forest lands be zoned for forest use (see statutory and rule history under OAR 660-015-0000(4)). The forest land administrative rules (OAR 660, division 6) became effective on November 4, 1993 (Chapter 797, Oregon laws 1993). OAR 660-006-0026 and 660-006-0027 were amended on March 1, 1994, to implement those statutes.

Together, ORS 215.705 to 215.755 and 215.780 and OAR 660, division 6, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 4, prohibit the division of forest land into parcels less than 80 acres.

The claimant acquired the subject property on January 26, 1966, prior to the adoption of statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations.

Conclusions

The current minimum lot size standards established by Goal 4 and provisions applicable to land zoned for forest use in ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, were all enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired the subject property in 1966, and do not allow the desired division of the property. These laws restrict the claimant's desired division of the property relative to what was allowed when the claimant 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 claimant has identified. There may be other laws that currently apply to the claimant's use of the subject property, and that may continue to apply to the claimant's 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 claimant seeks 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 regulations (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 $100,000 as the reduction in the subject property's fair market value due to the regulations that restrict the claimant's desired use of the property. This amount is based on the claimant's estimate of what the value of the property would be worth with the ability to partition a 10-acre parcel.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimant is Kathleen Hawkins, who acquired the subject property on January 26, 1966. Under ORS 197.352, the claimant is 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 the claimant acquired the subject property restrict the claimant's desired use of the property. The claimant estimates that the effect of the regulations on the fair market value of the subject property is a reduction of $100,000.

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 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 Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, which Jackson County has implemented through its current WR zone. All of these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired the subject property.

Conclusions

Without a specific development proposal for the subject property, it is not possible for the department to determine all the laws that may apply to a particular use of the property, or whether those laws may fall under one or more of the exemptions under ORS 197.352. It appears that none of the general statutory, goal and rule restrictions on residential division and development of the subject property were in effect when the claimant acquired it in 1966. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E).

Laws in effect when the claimant acquired the subject property are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the claimant's use of the property. There may be other laws that continue to apply to the claimant's 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 claimant seeks 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 use that the claimant has 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 claimant should be aware that the less information she has 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 her 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 one or more laws that restrict the use of the property in a manner that reduces its fair market value. In lieu of compensation, the department may choose to not apply the law in order to allow the present owner to carry out a use of the property permitted at the time the 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 claimant's 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 $100,000. 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 claimant's desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when she 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 Kathleen Hawkins to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time she acquired the property on January 26, 1966.

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 Kathleen Hawkins' division of the 50-acre subject property into one 10-acre parcel and one 40-acre parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow her to divide the subject property as described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when she acquired the property on January 26, 1966.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to divide the property as described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on January 26, 1966.

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 claimant first obtains 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 claimant 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 claimant to use the subject property, it may be necessary for her 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 claimant 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 claimant.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on December 26, 2006. 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.